

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The following-named persons to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for terms of 6 years expiring May 10, 1958 (reappointments):

Sophie Bledsoe Aberle, of New Mexico.
Chester I. Barnard, of New York.
Robert Percy Barnes, of the District of Columbia.
Detlev W. Bronk, of Maryland.
Gerty T. Cori, of Missouri.
Charles Dollard, of New York.
Robert F. Loeb, of New York.
Andrey A. Potter, of Indiana.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 12, 1952

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and everlasting God, from the strident, impelling forces of strain and stress which bear down upon us in the heat of the day, we come into the quiet solemnity of this moment of prayer. Let the hush of Thy spirit descend upon us and clear our vision of Thy purpose for us in these days when the choice is dust or destiny.

Grant that we may never become blind to the grim realities of our day and never divorce ourselves from these forces by thinking of Thee as only a haven of refuge or beacon of hope. Thou art that to us, but Thou art also a citadel of courage.

From this sacred moment send us into the day renewed in spirit and ennobled of mind that ever we may be worthy of the trust that has been placed in us. In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 9, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED 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:

H. R. 4387. An act to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; and

H. R. 4394. An act to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RUSSELL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAGNUSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, beginning on May 13 at 5 o'clock p. m., for the remainder of the week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to sit today during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I seek recognition in order that I may ask for the insertion of certain matters in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair not only recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin, but congratulates him upon following the Chair's example. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr President, after listening to the magnificent address delivered by the Vice President Saturday night at the Gridiron Club dinner, I thought that it might be well to follow in the footsteps of one who was so vigorous and brilliant and scintillating as he was on that occasion. He certainly presented a good pattern to follow. I wish to congratulate the Vice President on what, in my opinion, was one of the finest addresses to which I have listened in Washington. It fitted into the occasion perfectly. It came after a performance of a certain character, and the Vice President's task was to get the audience to laughing and feeling happy. Then he left them with a message of inspiration. Therefore, I congratulate him, and thank him for his kind words in relation to me.

INTERNAL SECURITY—RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was glad to receive today from Robert G. Wilke, department adjutant for the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, a resolution adopted by the executive committee of that department at a meeting earlier this year endorsing the

vital work of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The resolution had been submitted by the Legion department's Americanism commission.

As my colleagues know, I feel that the Internal Security Subcommittee has done a splendid job, a painstaking, conscientious job, of helping to further expose the network of Red intrigue inside and outside our land.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution praising the subcommittee be printed in the RECORD and be thereafter appropriately referred.

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

Whereas the American Legion has long led the fight against communism and subversives in and out of our Government, and the annual convention of the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion did at Green Bay, Wis., in 1950, endorse the provisions of legislation now known as the Internal Security Act, which was introduced in Congress as the Mundt-Nixon-Ferguson-McCarran bills; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee has conducted hearings for the purpose of investigating the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws and such hearings have been conducted under the chairmanship of former Nevada Supreme Court Justice and United States Senator PAT McCARRAN, and have followed evidentiary rules of procedure on a high plane, and with the sole purpose of obtaining the facts; and

Whereas such hearings by this subcommittee have established that members of the Communist Party of the United States have infiltrated in and exercise a control in certain food distributors organizations and sections of the dining car union, and have further exposed three Soviet agents, namely, Col. Otto Biheler, Jiri Stary, and Marcelle Hitschmanova, all of whom were granted passports after unfavorable reports from several intelligence units of the Government, and said committee is continuing its investigation into similar cases as well as the extent of Marxist influences upon our relations with other Governments; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion through its executive committee, duly assembled on this 26th day of January 1952, in the city of Milwaukee, as follows:

1. That the direct and forthright manner in which such committee commonly referred to as the McCarran committee, has assumed the task of watchfulness over the internal security of the United States be and the same hereby is highly commended.

2. That the outstanding work of such committee be continued and supported until the need therefor no longer exists.

3. That the members of the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion be furnished a copy of this resolution and be urged to obtain copies of the reports of such committee from the United States Government Printing Office, in order to familiarize themselves with the important information contained herein.

4. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from the State of Wisconsin and that such resolution be further presented at the next meeting of the national executive committee for adoption.

THE STEEL SEIZURE—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, NORTHEAST WISCONSIN INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION, MANITOWOC, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from E. C. Badger, manager of the Northeast Wisconsin Industrial Association, a resolution unanimously adopted by their board on the current critical steel dispute. I know that this grass-roots resolution reflects the sentiments of a great many Americans on this matter, which is now being investigated by the House Labor Committee.

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

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

Resolved, That the Northeast Wisconsin Industrial Association, acting through its board of directors, condemns the President's unjustifiable seizure of the steel industry in violation of constitutional rights, and his failure to act under laws provided by Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the association condemns the presumptuous and unauthorized attempt by the Wage Stabilization Board to impose the union shop on industry; and be it further

Resolved, That the association respectfully requests the members of the Wisconsin delegation in the Congress take an aggressive action for the purpose of enacting appropriate legislation designed to prevent further such action by the President or by any board.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH LABORATORY—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the renewed outbreaks of the dread hoof-and-mouth disease in Canada, within 60 miles from the American border, have caused deep concern to every dairyman of the Nation. As everyone knows, the State of Wisconsin produces more milk than does any other State in the Nation. Dairymen know better than the average citizen that if this scourge ever takes hold again in our country, the possible disastrous effects are incalculable.

The American people do not generally realize what the disease could mean in terms of damage to their health, to their food supply, and to their entire economy.

Now, last week, I received a brief, and unfortunately inconclusive, message from Secretary of Agriculture Brannan responding to an inquiry which I had presented to him as regards the status of Government efforts for hoof-and-mouth research. I send to the desk this letter by way of background and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, to be followed by a resolution on hoof-and-mouth research from a Wisconsin dairy group, and that they be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 6, 1952.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is in reply to your letter of March 24, your reference J-3-52, relative to research on foot-and-mouth disease.

The establishment of a foot-and-mouth disease research laboratory was authorized by Public Law 496, approved in April 1948. Following the passage of Public Law 119, approved June 23, 1949, appropriating \$500,000 for the preparation of plans and specifications for the laboratory, the Department submitted plans and an estimate to the Congress in September of 1950. The proposal for a laboratory was disapproved by the Congress. The House committee's report on this estimate stated that the Department should explore further the possibility of conducting research on foot-and-mouth disease in cooperation with those countries which have existing research facilities and are engaged in this work.

In accordance with the committee's recommendation the Department has been continuing research on the disease in Denmark, England, and the Netherlands. Considerable valuable information on this complex disease problem has been obtained. However, local interests and control problems in the foreign countries interrupt and handicap the foreign research program periodically. The limited space for American personnel, together with the difficulties of recruiting and retaining qualified persons for foreign assignment, has also affected the research work.

Following action by the Congress on the Department's estimate for funds for the laboratory, further planning was discontinued and options on the tract on Prudence Island expired.

The balance of the funds appropriated by Public Law 119 was placed in budgetary reserve.

Three bills have recently been introduced in Congress for the appropriation of money for the establishment of laboratories for research and study of foot-and-mouth and other animal diseases. These are H. R. 7181, H. R. 7271, and S. 2962.

While the establishment of a laboratory in this country for research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases probably would not be effective in combating the immediate danger to the country, the disease is an ever-present threat and the Department has under consideration the matter of again requesting funds for the establishment of such a laboratory.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

HOOF-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Whereas the hoof-and-mouth disease is a definite threat to the dairy industry of the upper tri-State area of CCW; and

Whereas in the event of their possible contamination and destruction it would take scores of years to build the herds back to the production level now existing in the area; therefore be it

Resolved, That this thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Central Cooperative Wholesale, representing tens of thousands of dairy farmers in this area, appeal to the Representatives and Senators of the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota to provide the necessary funds to the Department of Agriculture to combat and control the hoof-and-mouth disease.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2225. A bill to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification; with amendments (Rept. No. 1514).

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

S. 1086. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guy Raiola (Rept. No. 1516);

S. 1130. A bill for the relief of Ruzena Stransky (Rept. No. 1517);

S. 1336. A bill for the relief of Augusta Bleys, also known as Augustina Bleys (Rept. No. 1518);

S. 1479. A bill for the relief of Adele Fratini (Rept. No. 1519);

S. 1513. A bill for the relief of Thorvald Nin (Rept. No. 1520);

S. 1719. A bill for the relief of Silverio Salvatore Conte (Rept. No. 1521);

S. 1724. A bill for the relief of Elina Brundlund (Rept. No. 1522);

S. 1743. A bill for the relief of Altoon Saprichian (Rept. No. 1523);

S. 1744. A bill for the relief of Dr. Albert Haas (Rept. No. 1524);

S. 2308. A bill for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro (Rept. No. 1525);

S. 3007. A bill for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis (Rept. No. 1526);

S. 3008. A bill for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock (Rept. No. 1527);

H. R. 654. A bill for the relief of Ivo Cerne (Rept. No. 1528);

H. R. 975. A bill for the relief of Sarah A. Davies (Rept. No. 1529);

H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols (Rept. No. 1530);

H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of Kaiko Sugimoto (Kay Fair) and her minor children (Rept. No. 1531);

H. R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Claude Foranda (Rept. No. 1532);

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child (Rept. No. 1533);

H. R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno, Eufrasina Binotto, Maria Ballator, and Giovanna Buziol (Rept. No. 1534);

H. R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak (Rept. No. 1535);

H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman (Rept. No. 1536);

H. R. 2587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease (Rept. No. 1537);

H. R. 2628. A bill for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co. (Rept. No. 1538);

H. R. 2784. A bill for the relief of Fumiko Higa (Rept. No. 1539);

H. R. 2841. A bill for the relief of Yai Wing Lee (Rept. No. 1540);

H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. Bell (Rept. No. 1541);

H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of Mimi Fong and her children, Sing Lee and Lily (Rept. No. 1542);

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Ogden Dickerson Gillson de la Fregoniere (Rept. No. 1543);

H. R. 3070. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Rinaldo Bottini (Rept. No. 1544);

H. R. 3124. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Salih Topcuoglu (Rept. No. 1545);

H. R. 3132. A bill for the relief of Sister Apolonia Gerarda Sokolowska (Rept. No. 1546);

H. R. 3152. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Setsuyō Sumida (Rept. No. 1547);

H. R. 3561. A bill for the relief of Mary Osadchy (Rept. No. 1548);

H. R. 3572. A bill for the relief of Ying Chee Jung (Rept. No. 1549);

H. R. 3732. A bill for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath and Lucas Albert Horvath (Rept. No. 1550);

H. R. 3953. A bill for the relief of Chan Toy Har (Rept. No. 1551);

H. R. 4152. A bill for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak (Rept. No. 1552);

H. R. 4492. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Norma J. Roberts, a minor (Rept. No. 1553);

H. R. 4790. A bill for the relief of Helga Richter (Rept. No. 1554);

H. R. 5121. A bill for the relief of Felix Navedo-Merced and Carmen Ramos-Baez (Rept. No. 1555);

H. R. 5145. A bill for the relief of Tsutako Kuroki Masuda (Rept. No. 1556);

H. R. 5753. A bill for the relief of Bernard J. Keogh (Rept. No. 1557);

H. R. 5805. A bill for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray (Rept. No. 1558);

H. R. 5956. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg and Anna Lukas (Rept. No. 1559);

H. R. 5958. A bill for the relief of Pauline W. Goodyear (Rept. No. 1560);

H. R. 5976. A bill for the relief of Michiko Nakashima (Rept. No. 1561);

H. R. 5984. A bill for the relief of Jimmy Doguta (also known as Jimmy Blagg (Rept. No. 1562);

H. R. 6265. A bill for the relief of Marian Diane Delphine Sachs (Rept. No. 1563);

H. R. 6314. A bill for the relief of Kiko Oshiro (Rept. No. 1564);

H. R. 6848. A bill for the relief of Sharon Elaine Frankovich (Rept. No. 1565); and

S. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the seven-day period beginning May 18, 1952, as Olympic Week (Rept. No. 1566).

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

S. 1315. A bill for the relief of Mirko M. Bjelopetrovich (Rept. No. 1567);

S. 1740. A bill for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye (Rept. No. 1568);

S. 2067. A bill for the relief of Maria Weiland (Rept. No. 1569).

S. 2123. A bill for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic (Rept. No. 1570); and

H. R. 1826. A bill for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert (Rept. No. 1571).

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

S. 1707. A bill for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 1572); and

H. R. 1114. A bill for the relief of Edward Charles Cleverly (Rept. No. 1573).

IMPOSITION OF CERTAIN DUTIES ON IMPORTATION OF TUNA FISH—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—PERMISSION TO SUBMIT MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 5693) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1515) thereon.

Since the Committee on Finance was not unanimous in the report, I ask unanimous consent that minority views, if it is desired to submit them, may be submitted within 10 days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, permission is granted to submit minority views, as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1574) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

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

██████████ Arron, Stanley Lionel Harvey or Lionel Arron or Lionel Lewis or Lanny Lewis. ██████████ Aguinaga-Roa, Dolores or Dolores Roa-Aguinaga. ██████████ Alaraldi, Gino. ██████████ Aliprandini, Adolph. ██████████ Amino, Namizo. ██████████ Buzash, John or Ionos Buzas. ██████████ Castiglione, Vito. ██████████ Collins, Roy Warner. ██████████ Dave, Pranujam Magan. ██████████ DeArriola, Carmen Martinez or Carmen Martinez De Hernandez. ██████████ DeOrtega, Refugio Hurtado. ██████████ DeTorres, Edelmira Rico. ██████████ Dinos, Costanti. ██████████ Doralp, Ali Maksud. ██████████ Doyle, Marie Evangeline Pauline (nee Comeau).

██████████ Epstein, Rosetta (nee Rosa Rea Yaskransky). ██████████ Escamilla-Garza, Aniceto. ██████████ DeEscamilla, Guadalupe Rodriguez-Ramirez.

██████████ Fitzgerald, Marie Therese. ██████████ Forst, Otto. ██████████ Freire, Jose Maria Nunes. ██████████ Gafore, Abdul Bin alias Bin Gafore or Abdoel Bin Gaffor. ██████████ Goodman, Dorothy Ellen (nee Jeffery) formerly Thompson.

██████████ Greenwood, James Thomas. ██████████ Guillette, Aline Marie Rose. ██████████ Gutierrez, Elvira Quevedo alias Elvira Quevedo alias Elvira Quevedo Lopez. ██████████ Haggis, Ernest Charles. ██████████ Hamaguchi, Shinichihamaguchi or Chinichi.

██████████ Hiob, Arthur. ██████████ Heins, Hilde. ██████████ Heins, Karl.

██████████ Herrera, Tomas or Tomas Herrera-Juarez.

██████████ Houmis, Georgias Ioannis alias George John Houmis.

██████████ Huber, Reinhart Edward. ██████████ Iglesias, Jose Perez. ██████████ Jakobovits, Leopold alias Leon Jacoby or Leopold Weiss or Weis.

██████████ Jelovich, Marian Michael.

██████████ Jensen, August William.

██████████ Kammerer, Jacob John or Kammer.

██████████ Karatassos, Emmanuel Ignatios.

██████████ Karhu, Heikki.

██████████ Kettle, Maisie June (nee Grieve).

██████████ Kulturis, Theodore Demetreu or Theodore Kulturis or Theodore Dimitriou.

██████████ Laborie, Charles Victor Marie or Charles Labore.

██████████ Lackey, Andree Nogret.

██████████ Lopez, Manuel Varela.

██████████ Martinez-Gonzalez, Salvador.

██████████ Mathes, Nicholas Thomas.

██████████ McGlaun, William Norman, formerly Willi Reuter.

██████████ McVeigh, Keith Roderick.

██████████ Mena-Medina Victor Manuel.

██████████ Mendoza, Eduardo Pintuan or Alfred Mendoza.

██████████ Michelson, Arthur Nikolai or Arthur N. Lanes or Arthur Michelson or Nikolai Michelson or Henry Paula or Hans Kasten.

██████████ Montelongo, Salvador Cisneros.

██████████ De Cisneros, Manuela Barrera.

██████████ Nardo, Andrea Damiano Di alias Giuseppe Delicato.

██████████ Oehler, Gerald.

██████████ Otero, Jose.

██████████ Pagonis, Peter or Petros Nicolas Pagonis.

██████████ Paschal, Gertrud Lisbeth Munzke.

██████████ Peribolari, Constantinos or Konstantinos Perivolari.

██████████ Pouderoyen, Dirk Van or Dick Van Panderoyen.

██████████ Proios, Constantinos John.

██████████ Radewitz, Frederick alias Friedrich Radewitz or Fritz Radewitz or Frederick Radewitz.

██████████ Riggs, Elmire Marie formerly Labelle (nee Drouillard).

██████████ Rolle, Alexander.

██████████ Rylak, Michael or Michael Rylak or Joe Bader.

██████████ Salazar y Rosillo, Maria Efigenia.

██████████ Salvagni, Romana P.

██████████ Schmidt, Gerhardt.

██████████ Siu, Rene Kui Sang.

██████████ Sozener, Talat Mehmet.

██████████ Telenkevich, Roman or Roman Levoff or Roy Levoff or Rom G. Leveff or Roman Levoff.

██████████ Toftbo, Christian Marius Hansen or Christian Hansen.

██████████ Trailov, Michel Aurel.

██████████ Tsolakis, Alexander Nicholas or Alexander Tolakis.

██████████ Uruburu, Dionsio.

██████████ Wallace, Tane Sato.

██████████ Warnock, Margaret Sophia.

██████████ Weidemann, Paul Friedrich Wilhelm or Paul Whitman.

██████████ Weski, Richard, or Richard Edward Bock.

██████████ Young, Frances Annie.

██████████ Zapata-Estrada, Elio.

██████████ Gonzalez de Estrada, Juana.

██████████ Ali, Jobed.

██████████ Alvarado, Reyes.

██████████ Anter, Zeki.

██████████ Ansaldi, Vincent John.

██████████ Assini, Nicola.

██████████ Barisci, Nicola.

██████████ Berryere, Edmund Adam or Edward A. Beurjay or Eduard A. Beurgey.

██████████ Brown, Barbara Lee.

██████████ Cazes, Sara (nee Tovi).

██████████ Charlebois, Amable.

██████████ Chrysogelos, Constantinos or Konstantinos Chrysogelos or Gust A. Heygelos.

██████████ Chung, May Ong Soo Hoo or Mrs. Kei Thing Chung or May Chung.

██████████ Corby, Delores Marie.

██████████ Cords, Warner John.

██████████ Cortina-Lugo, Amelia Isabel.

██████████ Crone, Bernward Clemmens.

██████████ Crone, Emilie Preis.

██████████ Cymbalak, Paraska (nee Elyez).

██████████ De Acosta, Bonifacia Gonzalez Jiminez Vda.

██████████ Deluca, Antonio.

██████████ Depositar, Carlito Menez.

██████████ De Rivera, Elvira Meraz.

██████████ De Sotelo, Felicitas Pettet.

██████████ De Yapor, Suzanne Boulos Vda or Suzanne Boiles.

██████████ Evans, Stanley Arthur Eugene.

xxxxxx, Fagiolo, Gaetano Mario.
 xxxxxx, Garcia, Emeterio.
 xxxxxx, Chavez, Santos.
 xxxxxx, Ghio, Gino Stefano.
 xxxxxx, Hadjipapas, Daniel A. or Daniel Apostle Hadjipapas or Daniel Papas.
 xxxxxx, Harris, Eugene Oscar.
 xxxxxx, Hollweg, Michael.
 xxxxxx, Isaac, Joseph Arthur Lionel Mac.
 xxxxxx, Kikunaga, Sunao or Sunao Uchimura or Joe Sunao Uchimura.
 xxxxxx, Kammas, Georgios or George Komas.
 xxxxxx, Law, Baw King.
 xxxxxx, Leisner, Solomon David or Sol or Solly Leisner.
 xxxxxx, Lindner, Josephine Mary Bernadette formerly Konetzke (nee Judek).
 xxxxxx, Malone, Patrick Joseph.
 xxxxxx, Mamakos, Anna (nee Tsampa).
 xxxxxx, Marshall, Katharine, formerly Katharina Roider or Kathie Roider.
 xxxxxx, Martinez-Cunpian, Ignacio.
 xxxxxx, Matsumoto, Iwaichi.
 xxxxxx, Maxeiner, James Christian or Wolfgang Christian Maxeiner or Wolfgang Wagner.
 xxxxxx, Maxeiner, Regine Lieselotte or Regine Lieselotte Wagner.
 xxxxxx, McLeod, Albert Gordon.
 xxxxxx, Miles, Aston Newton.
 xxxxxx, Mukai, Masutaro.
 xxxxxx, Nakamura, Fumio.
 xxxxxx, Neblett, Fitzgerald.
 xxxxxx, Nicolas, Francisco Espiritu.
 xxxxxx, Nobis, Stanley Paul or Sammy Baker.
 xxxxxx, Paksoy, Ali B.
 xxxxxx, Palmer, Dorothy Helen or Helen Dorothy Sage.
 xxxxxx, Panagoulias, Leonidas Panagiotis.
 xxxxxx, Pedraza, Lois Luna or Luz Luna or Lois Luna.
 xxxxxx, Perez, Amable (nee Rodriguez Vigil).
 xxxx, Pfennig, Ewald Edmond.
 xxxxxx, Pieczyński, Jacqueline formerly Jacqueline Vanden Abeele or Vanden.
 xxxxxx, Plastakas, Constantinos or Costas.
 xxxxxx, Samarral, Saleh Mahdi.
 xxxxxx, Sanchez, Tomas Sanchez.
 xxxxxx, Sconion, Esther A. or Esther Anna Petratschek.
 xxxxxx, Serrano, Maria Vicenta Sanz or Sister Mary Frances.
 xxxxxx, Soza-Farias, Eduardo.
 xxxxxx, Staples, Stanley Sewell.
 xxxxxx, Teagle, Betty Elliott.
 xxxx, Torres, Manuel.
 xxxxxx, Torres, Manuela.
 xxxxxx, Valero-Delgado, Jesus.
 xxxxxx, Weston, Joseph Reginald.
 xxxxxx, Williams, Carmen Rosas or Carmen Rosas De Ramirez.
 xxxxxx, Adams, Angela (nee Angelina Anderson).
 xxxxxx, Akselrad, Solomon Bernard.
 xxxxxx, Alley, Katherine (nee Toews).
 xxxxxx, Alvarado-Cano, Flavio Pastor.
 xxxxxx, Anderson, Frank Batchelor.
 xxxxxx, Atilano, Francisco.
 xxxxxx, Atilano, Ana Maria.
 xxxxxx, Barron, Anni or Anni Naumann De Barron or Anni Naumann.
 xxxxxx, Barron, Gloria or Gloria Naumann.
 xxxxxx, Bond, Margaret Virginia.
 xxxxxx, Bowditch, Roy Oliver.
 xxxxxx, Burt, Doris (nee Caley).
 xxxxxx, Callwood, Reginald.
 xxxxxx, Carlstrom, Isak Asle.
 xxxx, Carstens, Frederick Adolph.
 xxxxxx, Carver, Charles Emanuel or Charles Emmanuel Carver.
 xxxxxx, Ceballos, Ricardo or Ricardo Ceballos-Flores.
 xxxxxx, Chen, George.
 xxxxxx, Chien, Chin Chang.

xxxxxx, Ciccone, Ann Niccore (nee Anne Nykorchuk).
 xxxxxx, Cochran, Dorothy Helen (nee Reeves).
 xxxxxx, Cole, Frederick.
 xxxxxx, Cortez, Pablo Martinez.
 xxxxxx, De Martinez, Manuela Covarubias.
 xxxxxx, Dahl, Sara Mathilda.
 xxxxxx, Dahl, Reinert Andreas.
 xxxxxx, De Carmona, Amada Davila.
 xxxxxx, De Gomez, Guadalupe Alvarez.
 xxxxxx, De La Cruz, Ofelia Sanchez.
 xxxxxx, Demko, John.
 xxxxxx, De Nino, Domitila Cardoza.
 xxxxxx, De Reyes, Salvador Valencia.
 xxxxxx, De Salza, Tomasa Garcia or Tomasa Garcia-Ruiz.
 xxxxxx, Dittmann, Frank.
 xxxxxx, Doherty, Daniel.
 xxxxxx, Dyer, James Wilson.
 xxxxxx, Elkins, Gertrude or Gertrude Blanc-Paques (nee Gertrude Braun).
 xxxxxx, Engel, Ervin or Erwin Engel.
 xxxxxx, Engelstad, Sigfred Leonard.
 xxxxxx, Evangelatos, Gerassimos or Gerassimos Gregorio Evangelatos.
 xxxxxx, Fleming, Maria Elizabeth (nee Smith).
 xxxxxx, Francescon, Vincent alias Vincent or Vincenzo Francescon Centa.
 xxxxxx, Fritz, Frank or Franz Fritz or Ferenc Fritz.
 xxxxxx, Galotolo, Giosue.
 xxxxxx, Garcia-Armendariz, Lorenzo.
 xxxxxx, Garganese, Mario.
 xxxxxx, Goldstein, or Manuel Goldstein.
 xxxxxx, Greenfield, Ann or Alfrida Alice Coats.
 xxxxxx, Guerrini, Edoardo.
 xxxxxx, Guerrini, Ivo John.
 xxxxxx, Guerrini, Mary Morgene.
 xxxxxx, Haktsian, San Souren or Souren Haktsian.
 xxxxxx, Hayes, James or James Edgar Hayes.
 xxxxxx, Hennings, Bruno Christian.
 xxxxxx, Hirsch, Eugen.
 xxxxxx, Hon, Chan or Hon Chan alias Hon Tsang Jen Hon.
 xxxxxx, Ibarra, Rafael Villarreal.
 xxxxxx, De Villarreal, Guadalupe Mendez.
 xxxxxx, Ivulich, Steve.
 xxxxxx, Jalomo, Julio.
 xxxxxx, Jersky, Albert.
 xxxxxx, Johnson, Herbert Henry.
 xxxxxx, Johnson, Paul Stephen Van or Paul Stephen Adams.
 xxxx, Kaufman, Jack.
 xxxxxx, Kissler, Joseph J.
 xxxxxx, Kwong, Lun Esun.
 xxxxxx, Kwong, Chu Hsin Te.
 xxxxxx, Lee, Chen Hwang.
 xxxxxx, Lesczynski, Franciszek or Frank Bawrs or Bows.
 xxxxxx, Lo, Sophie Chang.
 xxxxxx, Lo, Chaun Ming.
 xxxxxx, Long, Wolf Dieter.
 xxxxxx, Loza-Samano, Jesus.
 xxxxxx, Marcil, Claire Yvette.
 xxxxxx, Marques, Antonio Rosario.
 xxxxxx, McCrossan, Edna Margaret or Edna May McCrossan (nee Edna May Gerard).
 xxxxxx, McLean, David Scott.
 xxxxxx, Michalas, Andrianna (nee Karamalidis) or Anna Michalas.
 xxxxxx, Mihalik, Dorothy Esther or Dorothy Ester Clark or Dorothy Esther Normore.
 xxxxxx, Miranda, Silviano Linares.
 xxxxxx, Moore, Archibald Alexander.
 xxxxxx, Murillo-Urrutia, Andres or Andres Urrutia.
 xxxxxx, Myllyluoma, Aaree or Mill Brooke.
 xxxxxx, Naval, Vivencia Cortes.
 xxxxxx, Nicolas-Nosser, Roberto.
 xxxxxx, Octavo, Maria Midoriza or Midorisa Octavo.

xxxxxx, Padilla-Acosta, Arturo or Arturo Padilla-Lopez.
 xxxx, Parisi, Antonio.
 xxxxxx, Piaskowski, Vera Knittel.
 xxxxxx, Pike, Samuel Wilfrid.
 xxxxxx, Pineda, Pablo Lara alias Pablo Pineda-Lara.
 xxxxxx, Pitman, Edith.
 xxxxxx, Poy, Chin Gem or Gem Poy Chin.
 xxxxxx, Ramirez-Madrenas, Jose alias Jose Miramontes-Madrenas.
 xxxxxx, Raynor, Ernest Albert or Cecil Rose.
 xxxxxx, Reyes-Torres, Luis.
 xxxxxx, Riederer, Bertram.
 xxxxxx, Romano, Vittorio.
 xxxxxx, Rosenthal, Chajem.
 xxxxxx, Rossel, Carl Kastor R.
 xxxxxx, Salcido, Ana.
 xxxxxx, Salcido, Cruz.
 xxxxxx, Samuel, James Joseph or James J. Samuel or James Samuel or Samuels.
 xxxxxx, Savalli, Pietro Francesco Vittorio.
 xxxxxx, Savarese, Salvatore Francesco.
 xxxxxx, Schneir, Fred.
 xxxxxx, Schneir, Rose.
 xxxxxx, Serkovsky, Paul.
 xxxxxx, Setian, Yebrakse.
 xxxxxx, Simon, Harry Hollingsworth or Harry Simon.
 xxxxxx, Skou, Niels Adam.
 xxxxxx, Sloniecki, Frank Roman.
 xxxxxx, Smith, Consuelo Wood (nee Consuelo Coscoluela) formerly Consuelo Wood.
 xxxxxx, Spanopoulos, Christo George or Christ George Nicoff.
 xxxxxx, St. Clair, Alice May (nee Stearns).
 xxxxxx, Stone, Idris William.
 xxxxxx, Tammerk, Heino.
 xxxxxx, Tejada, Enrique Manuel.
 xxxxxx, Temeico, Bogoia or Simeon Bogoia Temeico or Andrianos Dauliane or Dimitre Ella.
 xxxxxx, Ternowcky, Metro or Mitro Tarnowsky.
 xxxxxx, Theobalds, Thomas Richard.
 xxxxxx, Treherne, Arthur.
 xxxxxx, Troupos, Gerasimos or Jerry Gresto Troupos.
 xxxxxx, Ventura, Morris Malki.
 xxxxxx, Villa, Jesus.
 xxxxxx, Wallace, Marry C. or Maria Caratachea-Murillo or Mary Elearnor Caratachea.
 xxxxxx, Watari, Fujiko Ono.
 xxxxxx, Waterbury, Annie Adela nee Tomich or Anna Adele Talmadge.
 xxxxxx, White, John Henry.
 xxxxxx, Ybarra-Beltran, Jose or Jose Beltran Ybarra.
 xxxxxx, Zeissel, Johan or John Zeissel or Johan Ziessel or John Ziessel or John Giessel.
 xxxxxx, Zerbes, George.
 xxxxxx, Zitz, Peter or Peter Zic.
 xxxxxx, Altman, Morris or Moses Chaim Altman.
 xxxxxx, Avila-Alamillo, Vicente.
 xxxxxx, Avilez, Robert G. or Roberto Gonzalez.
 xxxxxx, Barton, Donald Eugene formerly Donald Eugene Danis.
 xxxxxx, Benavides, Martin Gomez or Jose Bocanegra.
 xxxx, Bien, Edward M.
 xxxx, Bien, Frederick S.
 xxxxxx, Bostwick, Mary or Baszczak (nee Skulmouski).
 xxxxxx, Bostwick, Anthony or Baszczak.
 xxxxxx, Brunings, Charles Martin Lambertus or Charles Martin Brunings.
 xxxxxx, Buday, Joseph.
 xxxxxx, Cairo, Raffaele or Ralph Cairo.
 xxxxxx, Capo-Porcel, Jaime.
 xxxxxx, De Capo, Maria Luisa Carrasco Masia.

XXXXXX, Casanova, Amelia Amalia Battallan.
 XXXXXX, Chew, William.
 XXXXXX, Chun, Young Sii formerly Young Sii Song.
 XXXXXX, Colantonio, Michele or Michael Colantonio.
 XXXXXX, Cons-Sierra, Salvador.
 XXXXXX, De Cons, Apolonia Jalomo or Maria Preciado Apolonia Jalomo De Cons.
 XXXXXX, De Arreguin, Maria Luisa Lopez.
 XXXXXX, De Carrizal, Imelda Ramirez or Imelda Ramirez-Melgarejo.
 XXXXXX, De Ceja, Jessie Ramirez or Jessie R. Ceja.
 XXXXXX, De Chavez, Ramona Alvarado or Ramona Alvarado.
 XXXXXX, De Dobbelaere, Jules Gerard.
 XXX, De Lagunas, Tomasa Avila.
 XXXXX, De Nardis, Giuseppe or Francesco Maenza.
 XXXXXX, De Urias, Dolores Valenzuela Vda.
 XXXXX, Diaz, Gregorio C.
 XXXXXX, Eastman, Albert Edward.
 XXXXXX, Eisenkraft, Leib or Leo Eisenkraft.
 XXXXXX, Ernst, Christine Emily (nee Pfeiffer) or Christina E. Ernst or Christine or Christine Emilia Ernst or Christina Emily Ernst or Gellert or Christine Ernst.
 XXXXXX, Fizuleto, Joseph Sime or Sam Filston.
 XXXXXX, Floyd, Frank formerly Frank Gunther Helden.
 XXXXXX, Floyd, Margit formerly Margit Froeschle.
 XXXXXX, Floyd Vera formerly Vera Froeschle.
 XXXXXX, Gabbard, Caroline Bartley.
 XXXXXX, Graza-Solis, Maria Celia.
 XXXXXX, George, Paul S. or Pavlos Stergos Georgas.
 XXXXXX, Giberson, Harold Donald.
 XXXXXX, Gonzalez, Candido Munumer.
 XXXXXX, Gonzalez-Cacio, Francisco.
 XXXXXX, Guaneri, Domenico Vincenzo or Dominick V. or Domenico or Vincent Guaneri or Guarneri.
 XXXXXX, Gutierrez-Valdez, Eliseo.
 XXXXXX, Gutierrez-Valdez, Engracia.
 XXXXXX, Halekakis, Catherine or Halekakis.
 XXXXXX, Henrich, Michael.
 XXXXX, Hoffman, Julia or Yulia Hoffman (nee Schneider).
 XXXXXX, Homling, Elizabeth.
 XXXXXX, Huntsinger, Muriel Lottie Gilmore.
 XXXXXX, Iannotti, Rosa.
 XXXXXX, Irwin, Marian Kristine nee Plummer.
 XXXXXX, Kann, Hubert.
 XXXXXX, Karabetian, Karabed.
 XXXXXX, Kazemir, Illeg or John Kazemir or Ivan Kazemir or Iwan Kazemir or Alex Casmer.
 XXXXXX, Kelley, Margaret Mary (nee McLellan).
 XXXXXX, Kotlowski, Sepp Theodor or Sepp Haase.
 XXXXXX, Koroneos, Anastasios or Tom Koronas.
 XXXXXX, Kotler, Malka or Molly Kotler.
 XXXXXX, Kozuchowicz, Murray or Moszek Kozuchowicz.
 XXXXXX, Kuber, Shrinivas Ramchandra.
 XXXXXX, Laakso, Yrjo Tuomo.
 XXXXXX, La Fontaine, Maurice.
 XXXXXX, La Fontaine, Marie Anne.
 XXXXXX, Lataam, Arthur Wallace.
 XXXXXX, Lazanis, Antonios or Anthony Lazanis.
 XXXXXX, Lemacks, Roger Emile.
 XXXX, Livanos, Demetrios or James.
 XXXXXX, Lui, Mock Yu or Mock Shee or Mrs. Chew Tin Hang.
 XXXXXX, Maher, Margaret or Margaret McCluskey.
 XXXXXX, Mauga, Lisi or Lisi Atoa Mauga.
 XXXXXX, McCord, Louise or Nan Louise Ling.

XXXXXX, Meofas, Markos Demetrios or Mydfyas.
 XXXXXX, Millstead, Joyce Louise or Joyce Louise Livingstone.
 XXXXXX, Nassr, Farid Selim.
 XXXXXX, Navarro-Castellano, Elias.
 XXXXXX, Negr, Fong Foo or Fong Foo Ngar or Nagn or Nger.
 XXXXXX, Ocampo-Arivaldo, Alejandro.
 XXXXXX, De Ocampo, Maria Inez Loza.
 XXXXXX, Olivarez, Hipolito or Hipolito Oliveraz-Martinez.
 XXXXXX, Pizano-Pizana, Jesus.
 XXXXXX, Radabaugh, Margaret Georgina (nee Harmon).
 XXXXXX, Ramos, Fredy Requimman.
 XXXXXX, Ramos-Gomez, Alfredo.
 XXXXXX, Reis, Francis Elizabeth (nee Kuntz).
 XXXXXX, Rice, David.
 XXXXXX, Rodriguez-Carreon, Victoria or Victoria Rodriguez.
 XXXXXX, Salamone, Anthony.
 XXXXXX, Salamone, Bettina.
 XXXXXX, Santos, Eulogio Gamboa Delos.
 XXXXXX, Sarkissian, Mariam or Maron.
 XXXXXX, Sauve, Jack Robert.
 XXXXXX, Sawyer, Anne Mary or Anna Mary Zauner.
 XXXXXX, Siprut, Marcus.
 XXXXXX, Sloan, Judith Hilda.
 XXXXXX, Snyder, Goldie Jennie.
 XXXXXX, Stettinius, Alois Max.
 XXXXXX, Stevens, Isabelle or Isabelle Boyd.
 XXXXXX, Tchou, Jen-yen or Robert Jen Yen Tchou.
 XXXXXX, Timpano, Rosarina or Rosarina (Rena) Grispo.
 XXXXXX, Velasquez, Inez.
 XXXXXX, Velasquez, Estevan.
 XXXXXX, Velasquez, Socorro.
 XXXXXX, Velasquez, Consuelo.
 XXXXXX, Visovich, John Mario.
 XXXXXX, Wehkamp, Rosalia Lauria or Rosalia Lauria or Rose Loria.
 XXXXXX, Wiley, Gwendoline Freda or Anderson or Tarchuk or Gross (nee Gibbons).
 XXXXXX, Winter, Jean or Jane Nicol.
 XXXXXX, Wong, Levinia Mah (nee Mah You Bow).
 XXXXXX, Zorrozua, Julian or Juan Julian Zorrozua.
 XXXXXX, Olazabel, Florentina Fernandez.
 XXXXXX, Roski, Bernhard Bruno.
 XXXXXX, Ades, Mary.
 XXXXXX, Balgobin, Frank Fitzgerald.
 XXXXXX, Balgobin, Pearl Lina (nee Ram-persaud).
 XXXXXX, Ballis, Athanasios or Bails or Athanatos Ballis.
 XXXXXX, Ciocca, Nicola.
 XXXXXX, Di Meglio, Maria (nee Eraso).
 XXXXXX, Flores-Carrera, Paz or Paz C. Flores or Paz Flores.
 XXXXXX, Gambera, Peter.
 XXXXXX, Girard, Dorothy formerly Strike.
 XXXXXX, Gonzalez, Hilario or Hilario Gonzalez-Lopez.
 XXXXXX, Gonzalez, Benito.
 XXXXXX, Hall, Eileen Haswell (nee Haswell) or Massey.
 XXXXXX, Higa, Kameko.
 XXXXXX, Ho, Beyne.
 XXXXXX, Kwartz, Michael Joseph.
 XXXXXX, Lew, Alfred.
 XXXXXX, Liljeback, Eric Daniel.
 XXXXXX, Louda, Svatava.
 XXXXXX, Malinow, Charles or Charles Malinoff.
 XXXXXX, McPherson, Keith Ivan.
 XXXXXX, Nobumoto, Zeichi or Kumaichi Kakimoto or Kumazo Kakimoto.
 XXXXXX, Pagonis, Constantinos or Gust Pagonis or Gustas Pagonis or Gust N. Pagonis.
 XXXXXX, Rodriguez, Gerardo H. or Gerardo Rodriguez or Gerardo Herrera Rodriguez or Lale Rodriguez.
 XXXXXX, Rojas, Vicente.
 XXXXXX, Rubinstein, Jenny Hermane.

XXXXXX, Rutkowski, Witold Feliks.
 XXXXXX, Rutkowski, Natalia.
 XXXXXX, Sanles, Ricardo Gomez.
 XXXXXX, Seki, Yoshiko.
 XXXXXX, Skultety, Julius Harry.
 XXXXXX, Smith, Jean.
 XXXXXX, Sturgeon, Ethel Smith or Ethel Beld.
 XXXXXX, Vela, Lazaro Francisco or Frank Vda.
 XXXXXX, Wilson, Raymond Murdoch.
 XXXXXX, Horvat, Marica or Marijana Ivana Frischauer or Marianne Grossmann.
 XXXXXX, Friedrich, Louise Martha also known as Louisa or Luise Friedrich.
 XXXXXX, Koutoulis, Antonios.
 XXXXXX, Koutoulis, Catherine.
 XXXXXX, Dwyer, Patrick John.
 XXXXXX, Cohen, Erna Elsa or Erna Elsa Kahl.
 XXXXXX, Cohen, Friedrich or Friedrich Cohen.
 XXXXXX, Shamash, Jack Edward.
 XXXXXX, Balouris, Ionis also known as John Balouris.
 XXXXXX, Eisenberg, Emanuel.
 XXXXXX, Kloss, Wanda Victoria.
 XXXXXX, Kloss, Theodore Peter (Durbacz).
 XXXXXX, Chillemi, Sebastian.
 XXX, Yuan, Chien Shiung or Chien-Shiun Wu Yuan.
 XXXXXX, Halabi, Nour Eddine.
 XXXXXX, Birbach, Lars Ernesto.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 3158. A bill providing for a Public Welfare Act of 1952, to protect the common welfare and maintain the sovereignty of government in labor disputes vitally affecting the public welfare, public health, and public safety; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

PUBLIC WELFARE ACT OF 1952

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement with respect to a bill which I propose to introduce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as the junior Senator from South Dakota has remarked a time or two, he is very reluctant to enter into the field of labor relations, because he had one experience some years ago in that field, and he finds that anyone who addresses himself to these problems takes on a big job, and usually a thankless job.

However, the experiences which the junior Senator from South Dakota had when working on the so-called Case labor bill of 1946, which was passed by a substantial majority in both the House and Senate, led him at that time to make some study of the problem which confronts the country when we come to the end dispute, that is, the dispute which is not solved by collective bargaining.

We are at such an impasse today in the steel industry. We are practically in the same position in the railroad and transportation industry, because the railroads are now being operated by the

Government under seizure, and the issues involved are not being settled. The railway workers today are practically working without their consent, because they cannot strike against the Government, and the issues are going unsolved.

In 1947, following my experiences with the labor bill which we sought to enact in 1946, and would have been enacted had there been only a few more votes to override the veto, I drafted a bill dealing with the public welfare disputes, those end disputes which are not solved by collective bargaining.

At that time the proposals ran from seizure by the Government on the one hand to proposals for strengthening injunctive procedures, neither of which seemed to me to be satisfactory. In the case of injunctions we adopt an iron policy with respect to labor, a very difficult thing to carry through in dealing with human relations. On the other hand, seizure is satisfactory neither to management nor to labor.

I decided to resurrect the proposal which I offered in the spring of 1947, and have prepared a bill which would provide for a limited form of compulsory arbitration—limited because its awards would not be effective for more than 6 months, in case they were not satisfactory to the employer, but still would be effective if accepted by labor for that period of time. It is the hope of the author of the bill, first of all, that further attempts at collective bargaining would resolve the issues in dispute; but failing that the Congress might take direct action under whatever circumstances might arise.

It seems to me that we ought not to welcome seizure. We ought not to welcome further injunctive processes if there is any other way of finding a resolution of the disputes at issue.

Therefore, I introduced for appropriate reference a bill providing for a Public Welfare Act of 1952, to protect the common welfare and maintain the sovereignty of government in labor disputes vitally affecting the public welfare, public health, and public safety.

The bill (S. 3158) providing for a Public Welfare Act of 1952, to protect the common welfare and maintain the sovereignty of government in labor disputes vitally affecting the public welfare, public health, and public safety, introduced by Mr. CASE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared explaining the features of the bill which I have just introduced.

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

STATEMENT ON BILL TO ESTABLISH PROCEDURE FOR RESOLVING ISSUES IN LABOR DISPUTES AFFECTING THE PUBLIC WELFARE, HEALTH, OR SAFETY

The bill for a Public Welfare Act of 1952 seeks to provide a means for settling issues in those end disputes which threaten the public health, welfare, or safety.

It is patterned closely after a measure which I introduced April 1, 1947, in the House of Representatives, growing out of my experience with the bill on labor disputes generally, which was passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress but was vetoed by President Truman.

Taft-Hartley takes the injunction route for dealing with these serious disputes that mediation and conciliation have failed to settle. This machinery has served well on many occasions, and I do not propose to modify the existing Taft-Hartley machinery but to offer an alternative.

What I propose is an additional tool, a further means for resolving these serious end disputes in vital industries. A tool that could well be used either before, after, or in lieu of the injunction procedures provided by Taft-Hartley. It could also be used in railway disputes which are exempted from that act.

My proposal is for a form of limited arbitration—limited because it binds the employee to nothing that a majority of his fellow workers do not approve, limited because it binds an employer for no more than 6 months to something he may not approve.

In a body to which I am still relatively new, and in the company of so many Senators who have distinguished themselves in the field of labor legislation, I have not been anxious to offer a labor bill. But the steel crisis has thrown the whole problem into new and sharp focus.

Proposals have been put forward in the Senate to write permanent legislation by which seizure could be invoked. I have said several times in this chamber in the past 2 weeks that I do not believe seizure should be the subject of permanent legislation. I fear it would result in acceptance of Government ownership as an easy, if not almost normal, means of preventing strikes.

Invoked too often, seizure probably would not prevent strikes forever. And it certainly would tend to weaken private and Government-sponsored efforts to effect voluntary compromises and settlements. The side which thinks presidential seizure will favor it will relax and let seizure come, and the pattern this could establish is already clear from our present experience with the railroads, over which the flag still flies.

Opposing seizure, I feel constrained to offer an alternative. We must maintain a certain amount of moral suasion in both sides in a dispute, as long as possible. One way, perhaps the surest way, is to establish machinery that will be as impartial and disinterested but competent as we can achieve, to make recommendations that would have the stature of public awards. The company, or the union, which resists an award of this kind would find itself unpopular and unwelcome in a democratic community which has learned over a period of 175 years to leave a maximum of elbow room for minorities while still holding the Nation together.

The ranks of labor know—and if they do not the railroad brotherhoods should soon be able to tell them from experience—that seizure is not a desirable solution. In fact it is no solution at all.

On the other hand, the Taft-Hartley procedures, which provide in the end for an employee vote only on the last management offer, do not bring to bear on a situation in which the public has a real and vital stake, an expression of that public feeling.

The unorthodox and questionable procedures the President used in the steel case have failed notoriously, for the Wage Stabilization Board has not had the confidence of management or the people generally. It was handed a job for which it was ill designed and ill equipped. The best motives in the world, on the part of its members, would probably not have sufficed to settle

the steel dispute. For the atmosphere, the setting was political and makeshift—whereas it should and must be judicial, disinterested, and solidly grounded in law.

Into such a picture, we need to introduce a way for an industry to continue with some resolution of the points at issue and without seizure and Government operation. This bill now introduced seeks to provide in the form of an arbitration subject to referendum.

The machinery comes into play when the President finds that the public welfare, public health, or public safety is endangered by a labor dispute and he finds that commerce is burdened or obstructed by such a dispute in a way that threatens the sovereignty of the Government or excessively threatens to injure the common welfare—and after, and only after, all private and Government efforts to effect voluntary settlements have proved unavailing.

A finding to this effect by the President will create an emergency commission to investigate and report on the dispute. The President determines the size of the commission, but its members are selected by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The selection is made from a permanent panel of 25 members previously appointed by the court for 5-year terms.

Members chosen to serve must not have, or have had within 5 years, any kind of interest in the parties to the dispute.

Within 30 days, the commission must report on the dispute and make recommendations on wages, hours, and working conditions, describing, also, if it chooses, any other factors in dispute. The report must be made public promptly by the President.

The recommendations become binding on both parties when accepted by them, when accepted by the employer and the representatives of the employees, or, thirdly, when accepted by a majority of the employees voting in an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board. Under the latter circumstances, the terms are binding for 6 months only.

During the 30-day period of the Commission's study and the 5 days allowed for an election, lock-outs, slow-downs, and strikes would be forbidden. Violation by an employer would be an unfair labor practice, subject to penalties of the National Labor Relations Act. Violation by an employee would result in him losing his status as an employee and the accompanying protections of the National Labor Relations Act.

Of course, if the election resulted in rejection of the Commission's recommendations, the procedures of the act would have been exhausted, and the Government would have to move on to something else—perhaps seizure. But if seizure is to come, I think it should come only after a public, disinterested award has been offered and rejected, and I think it should come by special act of Congress—not by Presidential edict, whether authorized by a law or not. Seizure should not be made easy, and it should not be made to appear attractive. For in the long run it will prove both hard and unpopular for the Government to try to operate this country's major industries.

We should seek to solve labor disputes by encouraging the parties to reach a solution of their points at issue. If they are unable to do so and public security is in danger, then we need some method to continue operations on the basis of an impartial award. That is what this bill seeks to provide.

EXAMINATION OF RECORDS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Subcommittee on Pri-

leges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I submit a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 316) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to authorize and direct the file clerk of the House to grant permission to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, or its counsel, to examine the records of the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AND HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes. The amendment would strike out all on page 10, after line 17, down to and including line 15 on page 167, being subsection (e) of section 273. I ask unanimous consent that a brief memorandum regarding the desirability of the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table, and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF AN AMENDMENT TO BE PROPOSED TO S. 2550, WHICH WOULD STRIKE SUBSECTION (E) OF SECTION 273

Section 273 (e) of S. 2550 revising the immigration, naturalization, and nationality

law imposes a penalty of \$500 on a vessel or aircraft for each alien stowaway on board when the vessel or aircraft arrives in the United States.

This subsection (e) is grossly unfair and unnecessary, since it applies a penalty to the principal sufferers rather than to the wrongdoer—the stowaway.

Under existing statutes, the carrier is now responsible for the safekeeping, detention, maintenance expenses, and return passage of an alien stowaway. In addition, carriers are subject to penalties of from \$200 to \$1,000 for bringing an alien stowaway into the United States and failing to prevent an unauthorized landing in the country.

Surely, these additional costs and penalties are sufficient to guarantee the exercise of due diligence without imposing a \$500 penalty on carriers who do exactly what they are required to do under existing statutes; that is, apprehend and detain stowaways for the immigration officials.

Rather than serve as a deterrent to the entry of alien stowaways, this section, in practice, could encourage carriers to avoid the detection and detention of such aliens in order to escape the penalty incurred in this case by the exercise of diligent effort.

This section of S. 2550 would actually put a penalty on honesty. That is, if the shipmaster detects a stowaway and turns him over to the authorities, he is fined for doing so. This is a preposterous situation. A similar case would be that when citizens who apprehend an intruder in their home and turn him over to the police they would be subject to a fine of \$500. This is an absolute absurdity, but this provision of the bill relating to stowaways means exactly that.

I am informed by the steamship industry that the shipmaster exercises every possible precaution within human means to prevent stowaways sneaking aboard his ship in foreign ports. Patrols are established at dockside day and night to stop this sort of thing, but occasionally a stowaway will slip through his guard. There are dozens of hiding places on a big ship. A person can hide within thousands of tons of cargo until hunger forces him to give himself up and then the master of the ship is stuck with him. The steamship line is put to the expense of repatriating the stowaway. To impose a fine on a ship officer because he is honest enough to turn over a person who stows away on his ship would be actually like fining any citizen who assists in the apprehension of a criminal on land.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Brian S. Odem, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas; and

Marshall E. Hanley, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Indiana, vice Matthew E. Welsh, resigned.

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

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

By Mr. MARTIN:

Radio address, Program No. 59, Happenings in Washington, delivered by him on May 10, 1952.

By Mr. TOEY:

Letter dated March 31, 1952, addressed by him to Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, New York, N. Y.

Letter dated April 3, 1952, addressed to him by Eleanor V. Morgan.

Chart entitled "General Funds and Research Funds Raised by Voluntary Health Agencies Interested in Specific Diseases."

By Mr. HOEY:

Editorial entitled "Get On With the Job," from the Greensboro Daily News of May 9, 1952; and an editorial entitled "Success at Roanoke Rapids Would Let Chapman's Camel Into the Tent," from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of May 9, 1952.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Letter on the subject Title to Tidelands, written to the editor of the New York Times by Amon G. Carter, publisher of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, and published in the New York Times on May 4, 1952.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Statement prepared by him and tabulations prepared by the Bureau of the Budget pertaining to comparison of military and Federal classified civilian compensation.

DEDICATION OF ANDREW W. MELLON MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on Friday, May 9, here in the Nation's Capital, there was dedicated with simple yet most impressive ceremonies a memorial to a great American statesman and patriot.

The memorial was erected by the friends and admirers of the late Andrew W. Mellon as a tribute to his honorable career and his distinguished achievements in the service of the people of the United States and the world.

It will be recalled that Andrew W. Mellon served with outstanding distinction as Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinets of three Presidents, and as Ambassador to Great Britain. He won a place of foremost importance in the affairs of the world, yet remained throughout his life a modest man of simple tastes and habits.

The Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain, in its beauty and simplicity, reflects the character of the man whose memory it honors. It stands near the National Gallery of Art which he gave to the Nation, with his priceless collection of art treasures, for the cultural enrichment of our people.

Mr. Mellon, perhaps more than anyone else, would appreciate the fact that the fountain was designed and constructed without expense to the Federal Government. Its entire cost, amounting to more than \$300,000, was raised

through private contributions. Its construction was authorized by the Eightieth Congress under a joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania, and by myself in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the text of House Joint Resolution 170, approved July 17, 1947.

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

Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to grant authority to the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Committee to erect a memorial fountain on public grounds in the vicinity of the intersection of Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, in the District of Columbia, such grounds being now owned by the United States; *Provided*, That the design and location of the memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this memorial: *Provided further*, That unless funds, which in the estimation of the Secretary of the Interior are sufficient to insure the completion of the memorial, are certified available, and the erection of this memorial begun within 5 years from and after the date of passage of this joint resolution, the authorization hereby granted is revoked.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the dedicatory program, and four brief addresses which were delivered during the ceremonies.

There being no objection, the dedicatory program and four addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION OF THE ANDREW W. MELLON MEMORIAL FOUNTAIN, MAY 9, 1952

PROGRAM

Presiding: Mr. J. Frank Drake, representing the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Committee.

Invocation——— The Reverend W. Sherman Skinner, D. D., East Liberty Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Remarks by the Chair— Mr. J. Frank Drake, man.

Address——— The Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Chief Justice of the United States.

Presentation of the Dr. John G. Bowman fountain. Dr. John G. Bowman, formerly chancellor, University of Pittsburgh (retired).

Acceptance of the gift. The Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, the Secretary of the Interior.

The National Anthem. United States Marine Band.

Benediction——— The Right Reverend Angus Dun, Bishop of Washington.

ADDRESS BY J. F. DRAKE, PRESIDING OFFICER

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Secretary, and friends, admirers of Andrew William Mellon have united to raise the fund which has made possible this beautiful memorial fountain, which we dedicate today. They felt it to be most fitting that a memorial of this nature should be erected as a lasting recognition of the great public service rendered by this modest man.

Through a joint resolution passed by the Eightieth Congress, the A. W. Mellon Memorial Committee was authorized to erect the foundation upon this site located, appropriately, close by the National Gallery of Art. I am sure that there will be universal approval of this memorial. In dedicating it we honor a great American. We honor him today not as a great financier and builder of an industrial empire, but rather as a public servant and national benefactor.

It was a deep sense of public duty that induced Mr. Mellon, in March 1921, to accept the office of Secretary of the Treasury. It was my good fortune to come to Washington with him at that time and to play a very modest part in assisting in the selection of key personnel of the Treasury Department. His passion for efficiency in public service is well illustrated by a statement which he made to me the first day of his administration. He said that his sole purpose was to develop the best possible organization and stated that, in order to accomplish this, he felt that he should retain in the service those in key positions who had shown outstanding efficiency, regardless of the party to which they belonged. That patriotic principle of seeking efficiency above all things guided him throughout his administration and was a most important factor in the success attained. To adhere to that principle required both courage and determination for his persistence caused a great deal of criticism from those who felt that the selection of personnel should be dictated by other considerations. So strong was this criticism that a vigorous protest was sent to the President demanding that Mr. Mellon change his policy. Happily, this protest was of no avail and Mr. Mellon continued to operate with a single purpose in mind; viz., to give the people of the United States the best possible administration of the Treasury.

During his years of public service, Mr. Mellon, laboring early and late, spared himself not at all in connection with the discharge of the duties of his office. However, in spite of the strain that was constantly upon him, he maintained a poise and serenity which were a wonderful example to all his associates. Those who were privileged to have daily contact with him had for him not only a high regard and respect but a real affection, born of the human kindness and sympathy which was so characteristic of this great man.

It was quite in keeping with his character that Mr. Mellon, having completed his public service as Secretary of the Treasury and Ambassador to Great Britain, should in the remaining years of his life devote himself to the creation and development of a plan to provide the Nation with a national gallery of art which would be everlasting in its benefit to mankind. Were he with us today to see the happy fruition of his thoughts and effort, he would well say that he "builded better than he knew." As we look at the building across the avenue [gesture], which we know as the National Gallery of Art, we are impressed not only by the beauty of the structure but by the thought that within are priceless treasures of art which, with those yet to be added, will be a source of enjoyment and education and inspiration to generations yet unborn.

ADDRESS BY MR. CHIEF JUSTICE VINSON

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, today we dedicate the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain, erected as a tribute from his friends. Pursuant to act of Congress, this fountain is appropriately located at the apex of the group of Government buildings along Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues in the planning and construction of which Mr. Mellon, as Secretary of the Treasury, played so large a part. We are further grateful to this planning for transforming the area eastward to the Capitol from an eyesore into a lovely vista.

More significantly, the fountain is located near the National Gallery of Art. Eleven years ago, Mr. Mellon gave to the people of the United States the magnificent building that we see before us, together with his own superb collection of painting and sculpture. Mr. Mellon guaranteed in advance that his donation of the finest possible gallery should be the beginning of a truly national gallery of art. At his request, his name does not appear except in connection with the works of art that he has given, as is done in the case of all donors who have given their treasures to the gallery. It was also provided by Mr. Mellon, and was written into statute by Congress, that the permanent collection of the gallery always be maintained at the same high standard of quality maintained in the Mellon collection. Congress, in accepting Mr. Mellon's gift to our people, pledged "the faith of the United States * * * for the upkeep of the National Gallery of Art." Of course, Congress has been prompt in the discharge of this obligation.

Largely because of these provisions, the founding of the National Gallery of Art has served as an invitation to other collectors of art. Mr. Kress, Mr. Widener, Mr. Dale, Mr. Rosenwald and many others have responded with magnificent gifts. Together with Mr. Mellon's collection, these gifts have provided the American people with one of the outstanding art galleries of the world.

As chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, I can speak of the increasing usefulness and importance of this great institution which Mr. Mellon and others have provided for their country. In this work I am associated with Mr. Mellon's son, Mr. Paul Mellon, who, as one of the gallery's trustees, is carrying on his father's traditions of public service, as is Mr. Mellon's daughter, Mrs. Bruce, who joins in this constant and generous support of the gallery's activities.

Since its opening, more than 20,000,000 visitors from all parts of the country have enjoyed the gallery and its works of art. In this way, the American people have shown their appreciation of Mr. Mellon's gift—not only by enjoying the material splendor of the building and the collection, but more significantly through the inspiration which is received from truly great art.

In providing inspiration transcending tangible beauty, the National Gallery of Art has become a great institution. Mr. Mellon realized the importance of such intangible values. In the lobby of the gallery, under the portrait of Mr. Mellon, is carved this apt statement: "[the story] of famous men * * * is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives." And, in accepting the National Gallery of Art and the Mellon collection on behalf of the people of the United States, President Roosevelt emphasized the fact that we were recipients of more than stone and glass, canvas and wood. The President spoke of Mr. Mellon's gift as a symbol "of our intention that the freedom of the human spirit shall go on."

And so today, looking back on 11 years of inspiration from the National Gallery of Art, and looking forward to its ever-increasing contribution to the Nation, we dedicate to Mr. Mellon a fountain that is a masterpiece among fountains both in engineering design and artistic proportion. Let us consider this fountain as another symbol of the inspiration and intangible values that have come to us through Mr. Mellon's contributions.

ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN G. BOWMAN, FORMERLY
CHANCELLOR, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

This memorial Mellon fountain is an outward flowing, a calm and steady giving away of itself. As such it is a particularly happy symbol of the life of the man it is designed to honor. Another good fact is here too: By Public Law 194, Eightieth Congress, unanimously passed, authority was given for the erection of this fountain on land in the District of Columbia owned by the United States. The vote, let me repeat, was unanimous and it rather implies that the District of Columbia and the United States own Andrew Mellon. All good—and yet in no quarrelsome mood let me say that the city of Pittsburgh lays special claim to the man and that it seems right on this occasion not to forget that claim.

This Pittsburgh started in 1731 around a military outpost at the edge of the world. For 60 years it remained a center of fighting at the edge of the world. There the English and the French contended for the possession of the land to the west; in fact, for the possession of most of the North American continent. There Indian warfare was usual, too, up to the time of the Revolution when the garrison stood against the advance of the British at Detroit.

In spite of this habit of war, however, the village, mainly of Scotch-Irish, soon became a busy manufacturing center. From home-made iron furnaces the villagers made iron kettles and rims for their wagon wheels. On home-made looms they wove cloth, and they made glass and jugs and other articles. So it was that those early Pittsburghers learned to get along with the wilderness. They developed simple tastes and rugged honesty. They knew danger and courage. They made a friend of loneliness.

But when Andrew Mellon began his career at age 18 in 1873 the old frontier was gone. No longer could a squirrel, as folk used to say in Pittsburgh, travel from the Allegheny to the Mississippi River without coming down out of the trees. A second frontier, however, was rising. Almost from day to day new discoveries were being made of the vast natural resources of the country: iron, coal, gas, oil, lumber and aluminum. Clearly these products together with the fertility of the soil were the elemental basis for the making of a great Nation. Fresh hope flared and new patriotism. These discoveries called for the advance of chemistry and for new inventions. They promised release from drudgery, promised a way of life beyond the fairest hope of the first frontiersmen. Especially was Andrew Mellon the personification of this frontier.

What we might call a third frontier was also under way. We were in the midst of the largest and the most expensive social experiment in the history of the world, the building of churches, schools, and colleges from coast to coast. By an emotional and unanimous judgment, as it seems, we were determined at any sacrifice to tie into the Nation forever both intelligence—science, philosophy, history, literature—and also spirituality in the everyday affairs of government and of business.

Three frontiers—and it happened about 1873 that by a program of reading aloud in

the evenings to his father, Judge Thomas Mellon, the three frontiers were brought vividly home to the young Andrew. The judge had lived through more than 50 years of changing Pittsburgh, and now for the reading aloud he would usually bring some book on philosophy, especially some work of the practical-minded Herbert Spencer. After the reading father and son often would talk. What had men striven for through the centuries? Had any one solved the riddle of the universe? In this perspective what had men lived for from time to time in Pittsburgh? What at this time was in their minds?

This heritage, however, with its questionings and all, does not explain the whole Andrew Mellon. It does not explain his extraordinary ability to pull a problem to pieces and to put it together again. It does not explain his tireless energy, or his sense of profound responsibility, or his way of winning the respect and then the utter trust and then the lasting and deep affection of his colleagues.

The man's record in business and industry, closely associated throughout with his brother, the late Richard B. Mellon, is evident in part from any hilltop in Pittsburgh.

In the winter of 1921 Andrew Mellon told me with evident delight about his hope to end his career in the service of his country. For 50 years Washington had been to him more than the Capital City, more than the most beautiful city in America. It had been a city of mystery, a center of national pride, a center of national honor, a center of national patriotism. The man never lost, it seems to me, that first glow in his mind about Washington. He would go with delight to that kind of a Washington. His record here will be told by history.

Further, the old questions about the riddle of the universe had stayed in Andrew Mellon's mind. Beginning about 1880 these questions became the more vivid as he looked at great paintings. What had strong minds through the centuries recorded in paintings as top values of being alive? Was there in the paintings any illumination of the great riddle? The man was never too tired to talk about the meanings of the pictures. A symbol of this long and steady love of art, here in his idealized Washington, his Washington of mystery and of patriotism, is the National Gallery of Art.

Let me conclude by saying that from 1873 to 1937 this Nation was singularly fortunate in the possession of Andrew William Mellon.

Mr. Secretary, on behalf of the friends of Andrew William Mellon, it is my privilege to convey to you and to your successors for safekeeping this Memorial Mellon Fountain.

ADDRESS BY HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to accept this Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain in behalf of the National Capital Park Service.

There is something especially fitting in the fact that this beautiful memorial stands here at the apex of the great Federal Triangle.

During his service as Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon also served as chairman of a committee to plan the development of this vast plot of ground and to direct the erection of buildings needed for the Government. Many of the imposing structures in this triangle were either built or designed during his tenure of office. In one sense, the triangle itself is a memorial to Mr. Mellon.

Now, situated where it can introduce the visitor to Washington to the utilitarian rank of buildings in which so much of the work of Government is carried on, we have this graceful fountain. It is a work of stone and

bronze and falling water, whose only utilitarian purpose is to rest the eye and the spirit—to provide a feeling of leisure and coolness and relaxation and a moment of unadorned beauty here in the heart of the Capital City.

There was a day when the only acceptable memorial to a famous man was supposed to be a statue. Washington is a city of statues—many of them splendid works of art, all of them testifying to the esteem which the country feels for men who have labored in its service. It seems to me a fine thing that Mr. Mellon's friends, seeking to build a fitting memorial to his name, should give us, instead of another statue, a fountain where hurrying people can pause in the day's round and refresh their spirits with the sight and sound of cool water and white spray.

Across the avenue the National Gallery of Art, with which Andrew Mellon's name will always be associated, stands as a permanent enrichment of our cultural life.

This fountain is a more personal memorial. In its own way it enriches us just as truly. Washington will be a more pleasant place because this fountain is here. No man could ask for a memorial more wholly charming than this.

I am most happy to see this splendid Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Fountain added to the list of beneficial public works in the care of our National Capital Park Service.

FOREIGN AID APPRAISAL

MR. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the New York Times of yesterday there appeared a very ably written editorial entitled "Foreign Aid Appraisal." Since we are shortly to consider the mutual assistance program for the current year, I commend the reading of this editorial to all Members of the Senate. I desire particularly to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the editorial recognizes that in undertaking this mutual-aid program, as in the case of most public expenditures, there is a place for wise economies. Because it bears directly on a part of the unfinished business of the Senate, I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

FOREIGN AID APPRAISAL

The discussion of what should or should not be cut from the proposed appropriation of \$7,900,000,000 for foreign aid makes it necessary to return to an appraisal of the whole mutual security plan and program. This is not, or should not be, a mere pork-barrel proposal from which given items or fixed percentages can be trimmed at will and at political convenience. This is a proposed appropriation designed to strengthen the United States in a time of strong international pressure. If that end is desirable the appropriation should be adequate.

It is our national conviction that we are faced with the continuing threat of predatory Stalinist imperialism. To meet that threat we require strength in our own right. A major factor in that strength, as General Eisenhower pointed out, is our own solvency. It should not be imperiled. This solvency and strength can be used, however, to promote the solvency and strength of our important allies in the areas that are immediately threatened in both Europe and Asia. We do not need to stand alone, and it is doubtful if we could.

The immediate purpose of this whole program has been called the creation of positions of strength. From such positions, it is held, we can negotiate with more assurance that our proposals will receive respectful attention. Moreover, there is reason to believe that we stand in less danger of precipitate attack if it is plain that we are strong and are determined to remain so.

We are in the midst of the development of those positions of strength. We have made some substantial advances; there is still a long way to go. We cannot in safety change the general direction or the general scope of the program at this stage. If we fail, now, to follow through, a considerable part of the gain that has been made will be lost.

In this connection, General Eisenhower stressed two important factors. First, this is not a permanent program at a given level, but rather one whose obligations upon us will diminish as goals are reached. Second, an interruption at this stage will probably mean less strength at a far higher cost later on. There is, therefore, a vital element of timing to be considered in the present discussion.

It is probable that in this, as in most public expenditures, there is a place for wise economies. It can hardly be doubted that much of the congressional demand for cuts is based on the conviction that many of our spending programs have been wasteful. The drives to expose and eliminate waste are meritorious and should not be discouraged. Congress is right and wise to debate this proposal as fully as possible and to make every effort to find points at which spending can get better dollar-for-dollar results.

What is vitally important, however, is to make the distinction between the elimination of waste and the curtailment of a desirable program. Round-number slashes have not been, in the past, a good way to make this distinction. Those slashes are tempting because they are the easiest way to make cuts, because they pass the responsibility for thoughtful economies to someone else and because they make good headline capital in an election year. They do not, by any means, insure that we will get a dollars' worth of value for each remaining dollar that is appropriated.

In the case of our mutual security program, moreover, we require the assurance that such cuts as are made will not so change the total impact as to make a massive reorganization necessary to this stage. On that point Congress will be obliged to accept expert testimony. It has had such testimony from such persons as General Eisenhower and General Gruenthaler. Neither has insisted that there was any sacrosanctity in any given figure. They have suggested that the program as a whole should not be put in danger by economies that will change its basic tempo and its basic chance of success within a given and limited time.

This appraisal of the situation is realistic. It is founded on first-hand knowledge. Congress will be ill-advised if it disregards such judgments for the sake of a problematical economy and doubtful political capital.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement prepared by myself, together with a copy of a cablegram which I sent on May 5 to General Eisenhower respecting the mutual security bill as reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the text of General Eisenhower's reply to me, under date of May 5.

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

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN TOM CONNALLY

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,

May 8, 1952.

Attached hereto is a copy of a cablegram which I, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, sent to General Eisenhower requesting his comment upon the Mutual Security Act of 1952, and the text of the general's reply.

My own opinion, and I am sure that of the Foreign Relations Committee, is reinforced by General Eisenhower's position that reductions should not be made in excess of the \$1,000,000,000 cut which the committee approved.

General Eisenhower is on the ground, he has been living with this problem, and his views should carry great weight with the Senate and with the public generally. His message further serves to strengthen the nonpartisan spirit in which members of both parties on the Foreign Relations Committee have approached this matter.

In view of the Foreign Relations Committee's 12 to 0 vote on this bill, after 7 weeks of painstaking consideration, and in view of General Eisenhower's warning that a materially greater reduction "might endanger the proposed military build-up now visualized," those who advocate bigger cuts must take the responsibility for the consequences which might result from such actions.

TEXT OF CABLE FROM SENATOR TOM CONNALLY
TO GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

May 5, 1952.

To: Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, Paris, France.

Senate debate on mutual-security legislation starts today. As you know, Foreign Relations Committee, without objection, has reported bill making \$1,000,000,000 over-all cut in President's request, including reduction title I, military aid, from \$4,145,000,000 to approximately \$3,620,000,000, and reduction in title I, defense support, from approximately \$1,819,000,000 to approximately \$1,589,000,000. Some Members of Senate urging deeper cuts. In view of these facts would appreciate having your attitude particularly concerning effect further substantial reduction would have on development of necessary military build-up in Western Europe and on security of United States. I, of course, and all members of committee eager to keep cost of program as low as possible without impairing our structure for collective defense so painfully built up under North Atlantic Treaty. Believe Senate would attach great weight to your views with respect to probable effect proposed cuts would have on ability of our European allies to meet Lisbon goals and continue military build-up at desired rates after 1952. If you feel such cuts would materially retard necessary European military build-up, would appreciate your views on resulting effect on United States military security in light of your evaluation of Soviet aggressive threat.

TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on
Foreign Relations.

TEXT OF CABLE TO SENATOR TOM CONNALLY
FROM GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

From: General Eisenhower.

To: Hon. Tom CONNALLY, Chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: In response to your request, I furnish the following statement of views concerning the foreign assistance program as it applies to my com-

mand. You asked particularly for my views as to the amount proposed and the effects of possible cuts below that amount. This reply is essentially a summary of the conclusions presented to your committee by General Gruenthaler in March.

First, please permit me to draw attention to the fact that over the past several years I have publicly insisted on the importance of America's solvency to her own security. I am keenly aware that Congress has the onerous responsibility of weighing and balancing the obvious risks of attack against the equally obvious risks of ruinous spending.

As you know, my own headquarters does not compute the specific money figures for the various elements of the program, but we do recommend the composition of the military forces required and the essentials of expansion programs for developing collective security. In order to answer your request I must therefore make certain assumptions which cover matters outside my direct cognizance but which I nevertheless have every reason to believe are factual in their application to the program as actually prepared and submitted to the Congress. Specifically, these assumptions are: A. That the financial computations have been carefully and competently made on the basis of our military requirements. B. That strong efforts are being made to do this on an austerity basis, both as to design and quantity. C. That we are passing through what must be regarded as an emergency period. The free world and particularly the United States could not afford, indefinitely, to provide the sums for military purposes that are now being allocated. As quickly as a satisfactory defensive posture has been established in our vital areas we must pass to a maintenance condition in which each cooperating nation will be largely responsible for its own forces. D. That the mutual security program as proposed to the American Congress has been adjusted to provide for maximum effort on the part of cooperating nations.

Proceeding from these assumptions, it is apparent that any cut in the program would inevitably tend to curtail or retard the build-up of forces. Manifest, in calculations of this scope and magnitude, moderate sized cuts can be absorbed without critical damage. But substantial reductions in end-item aid would slow up the formation and impair the readiness of units. Reductions in defense support would have a peculiarly adverse effect, since available production facilities in Europe could not be put to use for lack of a critical fraction of their raw materials and other requirements. This would mean, of course, that nations depending upon receipt of scheduled end items or materials could not make maximum use of available manpower, manufacturing facilities, and training installations. While we here are not in position to compute in detail the effects of specific fund reductions, it is quite clear that in terms of impact on our military programs, an aggregate reduction of the order of a billion dollars would be heavily and seriously felt. Any cut materially greater than this would create such difficulties that a drastic revision of the whole program might well be indicated and might therefore endanger the proposed military build-up now visualized, and which I consider essential in the interest of United States security.

I believe the American approach must always be to weigh these questions in terms of the effects upon the security of the United States. At a time of such heavy costs as the United States is incurring it is more essential than ever that each dollar be made to count to the maximum. It is my understanding that our Mutual Security Program was adopted because of a conviction that there is no acceptable alternative. The de-

velopment of collective security through co-operation is obviously more efficient and less costly than for any one country to attempt to achieve it alone.

There can be little question but that our policy of aiding free nations in their own defense has been producing a gradually improving stability on the international scene. The situation is better than a year ago and the outlook for peace has improved markedly since the initial decision by the Congress more than 2 years ago to embark on a large-scale military-assistance program. The degree of this progress is perhaps best reflected in the redoubled efforts now being exerted by the iron-curtain world to weaken unity in the west and to block further constructive steps such as those relating to the European defense force and the integration of Germany into the Western European complex.

In the SHAPE annual report submitted about a month ago, we reviewed progress achieved in the European region well into 1952. If we are to achieve comparable and greater progress here during the remainder of this year and in 1953, it is manifest that unflagging joint efforts are required, and that the programs of aid in military and defense support must be buttressed by sufficient appropriations to enable the recommended build-up to go forward.

My final observation is that America—in partnership with others—is participating in a program that has the ultimate aim of security and peace. Attainment of this goal remains necessary regardless of the exact speed of progress in any one fiscal year period. My own belief is that this purpose will become more expensive if it is unnecessarily postponed, dragged out, and delayed. It seems to me to be in America's interest to attain as quickly as possible a satisfactory posture of defense in the free world so as to relieve us of the necessity of further build-up and place us substantially on a maintenance basis.

The foregoing statement is for such use, public or private, as you may deem desirable.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, the call of the calendar is now in order.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

The call of the calendar will now be proceeded with. The clerk will state the first bill in order.

ADJUSTMENT OF CONFLICTS IN DIVORCE DECREES IN VARIOUS STATES—BILL PASSED OVER TO NEXT CALL OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1331) to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution was announced as first in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that a Senator who is not present today has requested that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar. That is agreeable to the Senator from Florida, and he asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered at the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I make the same request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the bill will go over to the next call of the calendar, and it will be called at the beginning of the regular call of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That was my thought.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, when the call of the calendar began it was the impression of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from New Jersey that Calendar No. 1419 was being called.

I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1088, S. 1331, be passed over to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator's request has already been complied with.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wish the RECORD to be perfectly clear in that regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD is clear. The bill is passed over to the next call of the calendar.

INVESTIGATION BY TARIFF COMMISSION OF COST OF PRODUCTION OF CHINA AND OTHER PRODUCTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my attention has been called to Calendar 1045, Senate Resolution 253, offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. The Senator from North Carolina was not on the floor when this resolution was reached on the last call of the calendar, and it was passed over to the next call of the calendar. If there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Calendar No. 1045 will be called.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 253) requesting the Tariff Commission to make an investigation of cost of production of china and other products.

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

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

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment which clarifies the products to be examined.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the word "to", it is proposed to strike out "the china table and kitchen articles specified in paragraph 212 of the Tariff Act of 1930", and insert "tableware, kitchenware, and table and kitchen utensils described in the Tariff Commission's notice published on page 5961 of the Federal Register of June 22, 1951 (16 F. R. 5961)."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Tariff Commission is hereby requested to immediately initiate and carry out an investigation under the provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to tableware, kitchenware, and table and kitchen utensils described in the Tariff Commission's notice published on page 5961 of the Federal Register of June 22, 1951 (16 F. R. 5961).

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution requesting the Tariff Commission to make an investigation of the cost of production of tableware, kitchenware, and table and kitchen utensils and other products."

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TO NEEDY PERSONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2502) to provide public assistance to needy persons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order, and there being no objection, the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments on page 8, after line 3, to strike out:

CONFIDENTIAL CHARACTER OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECORDS

SEC. 12. The designated agency is authorized to make and enforce reasonable rules and regulations governing the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, files, and communications of the designated agency. Wherever, under provisions of law, names and addresses of recipients of public assistance are furnished to, or held by, any other agency or department of government, such agency or department of government shall adopt regulations to prevent the publication of lists thereof or their use for purposes not directly connected with the administration of public assistance.

MISUSE OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE LISTS AND RECORDS

SEC. 13. It shall be unlawful, except for purposes directly connected with the administration of public assistance, or of research in connection therewith, and in accordance with the rules and regulations of the designated agency, for any person or persons to disclose, receive, make use of, or to authorize, knowingly permit, participate in, or acquiesce in the use of, any list of or names of, or any information concerning persons applying for or receiving such assistance, directly or indirectly derived from the records, papers, files, or communications of the designated agency, or acquired in the course of the performance of official duties. Any person violating this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall

be sentenced to pay a fine of not more than \$500, or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

RECORDS

SEC. 12. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are directed to make rules and regulations governing the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, files, and communications of the designated agency relating to public assistance. Except as herein otherwise provided, such rules and regulations shall provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of public assistance to purposes directly connected with the administration of public assistance. The said Commissioners are authorized, in their discretion, to include in such rules and regulations provisions for the public to have access to the records of disbursements or payments of public assistance made after the effective date of this act.

(b) No person who obtains information by virtue of any regulation made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall use such information for commercial or political purposes.

(c) This section and section 13 of this act shall be construed as State legislation conforming to the requirements of section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (Public Law 183, 82d Cong.).

PENALTIES

SEC. 13. Any person violating the provisions of any regulation made pursuant to subsection (a) of section 12 or any person violating subsection (b) of section 12 shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$500, or by imprisonment of not more than 3 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Prosecutions for such violations shall be brought in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

On page 11, line 7, after the word "final", to strike out "The designated agency may, by regulation, provide that the findings of a committee or of an official designated to hold such hearing shall be final"; on page 15, line 12, after the word "be", to strike out "paid" and insert "disbursed"; and in line 13, after the word "are", to strike out "paid" and insert "disbursed"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the intent and purpose of this act to promote the general welfare and happiness of all the people of the District of Columbia by providing public assistance to needy aged persons, needy blind persons, dependent children, and other needy persons; that such assistance shall be administered promptly and humanely with due regard for the preservation of family life, and without discrimination on account of race, religion, or political affiliation; and that such assistance shall be administered in such a way as to encourage self-respect, self-dependency, and usefulness to society.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act, wherever the singular or the masculine is used, the plural or the feminine or both may be substituted unless such substitution would distort the meaning of the context; the term "designated agency" means the agent or agency designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer public assistance; the term "public assistance" means payments to, or for the benefit of, needy persons; the word "recipient" means a person to whom or on whose behalf public assistance is granted; the term "old-age assistance" means public assistance when granted to, or on behalf of, a recipient aged 65 years or

over; and the word "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

FUNCTIONS OF DESIGNATED AGENCY

SEC. 3. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall administer the public assistance functions of the District through the designated agency, which shall—

(a) administer public assistance to individuals who are in need;

(b) establish such categories of public assistance as it deems appropriate;

(c) cooperate with other agencies in the rehabilitation of recipients;

(d) establish and enforce such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this act;

(e) cooperate in all necessary respects with the Federal Security Agency of the United States Government in the administration of this act, and accept any sums payable to the District of Columbia under the provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended, for public assistance, or for any category of public assistance;

(f) enter into reciprocal agreements with any State relative to the provision of public assistance to residents and nonresidents;

(g) make such reports to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as they may from time to time require; and

(h) take such other action as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this act.

ELIGIBILITY FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 4. Public assistance shall be awarded to or on behalf of any needy individual who either (a) has resided in the District of Columbia for 1 year immediately preceding the date of filing his application for such assistance; or (b) is a child living with a relative or legal guardian and such relative or guardian has resided in the District for 1 year immediately preceding the date of filing such application; or (c) is a child residing in the District of Columbia on the date of the filing of the application and born within or without the District of Columbia within 1 year immediately preceding such filing, who is living with a relative or legal guardian and such relative or guardian has resided in the District for 1 year immediately preceding such birth; or (d) is a child, under 1 year of age, who was born in the District of Columbia and is living in the District of Columbia on the date of filing application; or (e) meets the requirements of a reciprocal agreement in effect between the District of Columbia and any State pursuant to section 3 (f). As used in this section, (a) the term "needy individual" means an individual who has not available sufficient income and resources to maintain a minimum standard of health and well-being, except that in determining the eligibility of a blind person for public assistance the designated agency shall, after July 1, 1952, exclude from consideration so much of his earned income as is not in excess of \$50 per month; (b) the term "child" means a child under the age of 18 years; and (c), the term "relative" includes a parent, stepparent, grandparent, brother, sister, stepbrother, stepsister, uncle, or aunt.

AMOUNT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 5. The amount of public assistance which any recipient shall receive shall be determined in accordance with the rules and regulations of the designated agency, with due regard to his requirements and the conditions existing in his case, and to the income and resources available to him from whatever source, and shall be sufficient, when added to the income and resources determined to be available to him, to provide him with a minimum subsistence compatible with health and well-being.

APPLICATION FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 6. Application for public assistance under this act shall be accepted from, or on behalf of, any person who believes himself eligible for public assistance. Such applica-

tion shall be made in the manner and form prescribed by the designated agency, and the application shall contain such information as the designated agency shall require.

INVESTIGATION OF APPLICATION

SEC. 7. Whenever the designated agency shall receive an application for public assistance under this act, it shall promptly make an investigation and record of the circumstances of the applicant in order to ascertain the facts supporting the application and to obtain such other information as it may require.

AWARD FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. Upon the completion of the investigation, the designated agency shall determine whether the applicant is eligible for public assistance under the provisions of this act, the type and amount of public assistance for which he is eligible, and the date from which such public assistance shall begin, and shall furnish public assistance with reasonable promptness to all eligible persons: *Provided*, That such date shall not be prior to the first day of the calendar month in which such determination is made. Public assistance payments shall be made by check. However, for the purpose of making cash payments in emergency cases, the Disbursing Officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance sums of money to an executive officer of the designated agency, upon requisition previously approved by the Auditor of the District of Columbia and upon such security as the Commissioners may require of such executive officer, such advancements not to exceed \$500 at any one time.

RECIPIENT INCAPACITATED

SEC. 9. If a recipient is found by the designated agency to be incapable of taking care of himself, his property, or his money, public assistance payments may be made for his benefit to any responsible person approved by the designated agency.

EMERGENCY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 10. The designated agency may grant emergency public assistance pending completion of investigation when residence eligibility has been established as required by section 4 of this act, and the information available indicates that an applicant is in need: *Provided*, That such assistance shall not be granted in any case for a period exceeding two calendar months.

REDETERMINATION OF GRANTS

SEC. 11. All public assistance grants made under this act shall be reconsidered by the designated agency as frequently as it may deem necessary. After such further investigations as the designated agency may deem necessary, the amount of public assistance may be changed, or may be entirely withdrawn, if the designated agency finds that any such grant has been made erroneously, or if the designated agency finds that the recipient's circumstances have altered sufficiently to warrant such action. If at any time during the continuance of public assistance the recipient thereof becomes possessed of income or resources in excess of the amount previously reported by him, or if other changes should occur in the circumstances previously reported by him which would alter either his need or his eligibility, it shall be his duty to notify the designated agency of this fact immediately on the receipt of possession of such additional income or resources, or on the change of circumstances.

RECORDS

SEC. 12. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are directed to make rules and regulations governing the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, files, and communications of the designated agency relating to public assistance. Except as herein otherwise provided, such rules and regulations shall provide safe-

guards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of public assistance to purposes directly connected with the administration of public assistance. The said Commissioners are authorized, in their discretion, to include in such rules and regulations provisions for the public to have access to the records of disbursements or payments of public assistance made after the effective date of this act.

(b) No person who obtains information by virtue of any regulation made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall use such information for commercial or political purposes.

(c) This section and section 13 of this act shall be construed as State legislation conforming to the requirements of section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (Public Law 183, 82d Cong.).

PENALTIES

SEC. 13. Any person violating the provisions of any regulation made pursuant to subsection (a) of section 12 or any person violating subsection (b) of section 12 shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$500, or by imprisonment of not more than 3 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Prosecutions for such violations shall be brought in the municipal court for the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

FUNERAL EXPENSES

SEC. 14. On the death of a recipient, reasonable funeral expenses may be paid, subject to the rules and regulations of the designated agency.

HEARINGS

SEC. 15. An applicant for, or recipient of, public assistance, aggrieved by the action or inaction of the designated agency, shall be entitled to a hearing. Each applicant or recipient shall be notified of his right to a hearing. Upon request for such hearing, reasonable notice of the time and place thereof shall be given to such applicant or recipient. Such hearing shall be conducted in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the designated agency. Such hearing shall be conducted either by such agency, or a committee or official thereof, designated by such agency: *Provided*, That such official shall be a person or persons other than a person participating in the determination that prompted the request for a hearing. The findings of the designated agency on any appeal shall be final.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE NOT ASSIGNABLE

SEC. 16. Public assistance awarded under this act shall not be transferable or assignable at law or in equity, and none of the money paid or payable under this act shall be subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process, or to the operation of any bankruptcy or insolvency law.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 17. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall include in their annual estimates of appropriations such sums as may be needed to carry out the provisions of this act.

FRAUD IN OBTAINING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 18. Any person who by means of false statement, failure to disclose information, or impersonation, or by other fraudulent device obtains or attempts to obtain (a) any grant or payment of public assistance to which he is not entitled; (b) a larger amount of public assistance than that to which he is entitled; or (c) payment of any forfeited grant of public assistance; or any person who with intent to defraud the District of Columbia aids or abets in the buying or in any way disposing of the real property of a recipient of public assistance,

shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be sentenced to pay a fine of not more than \$500, or imprisoned not to exceed 6 months, or both.

PROPERTY

SEC. 19. (a) At the death of a person who has received old-age assistance, the total amount of such old-age assistance granted to such person, together with simple interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum from date of death of recipient to payment shall be deducted and allowed by the proper court out of the proceeds of his property as a preferred claim against the estate of such person, and refunded to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia, but such deduction and allowance shall not be made if the designated agency shall certify to such court that the allowance of such claim would deprive the spouse, a parent, or a child of such deceased person of shelter or subsistence needed to enable such spouse, parent, or child to maintain a minimum standard of health and well-being. If the District of Columbia collects from any recipient of public assistance or from his estate, or otherwise, any amount with respect to public assistance furnished him under this act, or under the acts repealed by section 27 of this act, the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled shall be paid to the United States in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended (title 42, U. S. C., secs. 303, 603, and 1203). The pro rata share due the District of Columbia shall be deposited as miscellaneous receipts to the credit of the District of Columbia.

(b) In addition to the remedy provided by subsection (a) of this section, or by any other provision of law, the designated agency may file a notice in the office of the Recorder of Deeds in any case where public assistance is granted to any person under this act, and such notice shall constitute and have the effect of a lien in favor of the District of Columbia against the real property of such person for the amount of the public assistance which theretofore has been granted or which may thereafter be granted to, or on behalf of, such person. Any such lien may be enforced by a proceeding filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The designated agency shall file in the office of the Recorder of Deeds a release of any such real property from the effect of such lien (a) whenever there has been repaid to the District of Columbia the amount of the public assistance theretofore granted to, or on behalf of, such person; or (b) whenever the designated agency shall find that the failure to so release such property would deprive the recipient, his spouse, parent, or child of shelter or subsistence needed to enable such recipient, spouse, parent, or child to maintain a minimum standard of health and well-being; or (c) whenever in the judgment of the designated agency it is in the best interest of the District of Columbia. Such notices and releases may be filed without the payment of fees.

RESPONSIBLE RELATIVES

SEC. 20. The kindred of any person entitled to public assistance under the provisions of this act, in line and degree of spouse, father, mother, or child, living in the District of Columbia and of sufficient ability so to do shall be bound to support such person, in the order above named and in proportion to their respective abilities. If at any time during the continuance of public assistance the designated agency has reason to believe that a spouse, father, mother, or child is reasonably able to contribute to the support of such person receiving public assistance, it shall be empowered to bring suit against such spouse, father, mother, or child, for the amount of public assistance granted to such person or so much thereof as such spouse, father, mother, or child is reasonably able to pay. The designated agency may also petition the court for an order requiring such spouse, father, mother, or child to pay to such person such sum or sums of money in such installments as the court in its discretion may direct, and such order may be enforced in the same manner as if it were an order for alimony in a divorce case. Actions and suits provided for by this section may be brought in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, irrespective of the amount or kind or relief sought.

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES

SEC. 21. All necessary expenses incurred by the District of Columbia in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be disbursed in the same manner as other expenses of the District of Columbia are disbursed.

RECOVERY

SEC. 22. There shall be no recovery of funds expended for public assistance by the District of Columbia from any disbursing, approving, or certifying officer, or other person heretofore or hereafter employed by the District of Columbia, who, in the judgment of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, has not acted dishonestly, in bad faith, or with gross negligence. This section shall apply to payments made prior to, as well as after, the enactment of this act.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 23. The designated agency is authorized to delegate the power to take any action or make any finding required by this act, to its employees, under rules and regulations which shall be prescribed by the designated agency.

VOLUNTARY SERVICES

SEC. 24. The designated agency is authorized to accept voluntary services in administering the provisions of this act, in accordance with rules and regulations approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Such voluntary services shall not create any obligation against the District of Columbia or the designated agency.

VALIDITY

SEC. 25. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 26. Unobligated balances of appropriations under the subheading "Agency services" under the caption "Public welfare" contained in District of Columbia appropriation acts are hereby made available for the purposes of this act.

REPEALER

SEC. 27. The following are hereby repealed: The act entitled "An act to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia," approved June 14, 1944 (58 Stat. 277); the act entitled "An act to amend the code of laws for the District of Columbia in relation to providing assistance against old-age want," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 747); and the act entitled "An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 744), as amended. Notwithstanding such repeal, all claims of the District of Columbia for recovery of amounts expended for aid or assistance granted under such repealed acts which it now has, or which would have accrued had said laws not been repealed, shall be recoverable in the same manner and to the same extent such claims would be recoverable had such aid or assistance been granted under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 28. This act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Public Assistance Act."

SEC. 29. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second month following the date of enactment.

The amendments of the Committee on the District of Columbia were agreed to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, after line 13, it is proposed to strike out:

RECOVERY

SEC. 22. There shall be no recovery of funds expended for public assistance by the District of Columbia from any disbursing, approving, or certifying officer, or other person heretofore or hereafter employed by the District of Columbia, who, in the judgment of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, has not acted dishonestly, in bad faith, or with gross negligence. This section shall apply to payments made prior to, as well as after, the enactment of this act.

And insert:

RELIEF FROM LIABILITY

SEC. 22. The Comptroller General may, in his discretion, relieve any disbursing, certifying, or approving officer of liability on account of any otherwise proper payment for public assistance made by the District of Columbia prior to the effective date of Public Law 84, Eighty-second Congress (65 Stat. 124), whenever he finds (1) that the disbursement, certification, or approval was based on official records and the responsible officer did not know, and by reasonable diligence and inquiry could not have ascertained, the actual facts, or (2) that the payment, certification or approval was made in good faith and that the payment was not contrary to any statutory provision specifically prohibiting payments of the character involved.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum explaining the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MEMORANDUM IN EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT TO S. 2502

This amendment is the result of a discussion between the minority committee on the calendar and the General Accounting Office with respect to section 22 of S. 2502, as reported from committee.

It would conform S. 2502 to the policy established by Congress for disbursements of the Government generally by the act of December 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 875), and prospectively, on and after October 1, 1951, for disbursements of the District of Columbia by Public Law 84 (82d Cong.), approved July 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 124), Public Law 84, effective October 1, 1951—designed to place the responsibility for District of Columbia expenditures on a basis consistent with that provided for the Government generally in the 1941 statute—authorizes the Comptroller General, in his discretion and upon appropriate findings, to grant relief from liability for District of Columbia payments of all kinds, including those for public assistance. The amendment would thus provide for relief of liability for public assistance payments made prior to October 1, 1951, on substantially the same basis.

Section 22 of S. 2502 as reported is apparently contrary to the policy established by the cited statutes and would authorize relief from liability for illegal payments to be granted by the heads of the agency itself, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, rather than by the Comptroller General, an agent of the Congress. Also, it would set up as a criterion for the granting of such relief a determination by the Commissioners that in their judgment the disbursing, certifying or approving officer had not acted dishonestly, in bad faith, or with gross negligence, a standard different and lower than that established for relief under the general statutes cited. It thus would restrict the present authority of the Comptroller General to protect the Government with respect to illegal or otherwise improper payments and in view of the general provisions referred to appears entirely unnecessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO FLORIDA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 556) authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the words "to the", to strike out "said"; in the same line, after the words "Education of", to insert "the State of"; in line 8, after the word "biology", to strike out "botony" and insert "botany"; on page 2, after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 5. In the event that all or any part of said property shall cease to be devoted to the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes title thereto shall thereupon revert to the United States.

And after line 24, to insert:

SEC. 5. Title to or control over the lands conveyed under the authority of this act may not be transferred by the grantee or its successor, except with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. The grantee or its successor may not change the use of the lands from the educational purposes specified in section 1 of this act to another or additional use, except with the consent of the Secretary. If at any time after the lands are conveyed under this act, 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 the educational purposes specified in section 1, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States. Such reversion shall be considered effective and established upon the mailing of notice thereof to the State Board of Education of Florida, or its successors, by the Secretary.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, subject to other applicable provisions of this act, to the State Board of Education of the State of Florida, for the use and benefit of the University of Florida for educational purposes primarily concerned with conservation of natural resources, land

utilization, forestry, biology, botany, and natural history, such portions of the area known as the Welaka Fish Hatchery, Putnam County, Fla., aggregating approximately 55 acres, as he may determine to be excess to the needs of the Department of the Interior, and available for the aforesaid purposes.

SEC. 2. The property to be conveyed shall include both the land and the improvements thereon: *Provided*, That the United States reserves the right to remove, at any time within a period of 2 years from the date of approval of this act, any of said improvements constructed by it or financed out of its funds.

SEC. 3. The use of said property shall be subject to all easements, rights-of-way, licenses, leases, and outstanding interests in, upon, across, or through said property which have heretofore been granted or reserved by the United States or its predecessors in title.

SEC. 4. The United States reserves the rights to all minerals upon or in said property, together with the usual mining rights, powers, and privileges, including the right of access to and use of such portions of the surface of said property as may be necessary for mining and removing said minerals.

SEC. 5. Title to or control over the lands conveyed under the authority of this act may not be transferred by the grantee or its successor, except with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. The grantee or its successor may not change the use of the lands from the educational purposes specified in section 1 of this act to another or additional use, except with the consent of the Secretary. If at any time after the lands are conveyed under this act, 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 the educational purposes specified in section 1, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States. Such reversion shall be considered effective and established upon the mailing of notice thereof to the State Board of Education of Florida, or its successor, by the Secretary.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to Calendar No. 1419, Senate bill 556. Apparently there is a misunderstanding regarding that bill, because it was agreed between the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from New Jersey that this measure would go over until the next calendar call and would be the first order of business on the next call.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey is correct. There may have been a misunderstanding at the desk, but the unanimous-consent agreement required that Calendar No. 1419, Senate bill 556, be the first item to be called at the next call of the calendar. I am sure that both the Senator from New Jersey and I were speaking of Senate bill 556 when the first item was called, because we understood that it was Calendar No. 1419.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is entirely correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill was called, and there was no objection, and the bill was passed.

Does the Senator from New Jersey wish to move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed is agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement which we invoked at the beginning of the calendar call be applied to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the meantime House bill 7230, Calendar No. 1421, has been taken up; and we shall not further interrupt the consideration of that bill for the purpose requested by the Senator from New Jersey, but shall take up his request later on.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1419, Senate bill 556, the measure referred to a moment ago by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and myself, be made an item for special call at the next call of the calendar.

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

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES FOR EXHIBITION

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 422) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State-Fair Eastern International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STAMP TAX ON CERTAIN DEPOSITS OF SECURITIES BY INSURANCE COMPANIES

The bill (H. R. 7230) to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to make nontaxable certain stock transfers made by insurance companies to secure the performance of obligations, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, is this Calendar No. 1421?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have amendments which I offer and send to the desk, on behalf of myself and a number of other Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to have the amendments read in full?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, I do not care to have them read in full.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to speak in regard to his amendments?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, Mr. President; unless there is objection, I do not care to speak on the amendments. They are the same as the ones the Senate adopted

last year for the benefit of the aged, the blind, and dependent children, except the amendments restore the increase to \$5.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President —

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object to the consideration of this matter during the calendar call, because I do not think it is a proper subject of consideration during the call of the calendar —

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well, Mr. President, then I shall wait until the end of the calendar call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill was announced, and the Senator from Arizona offered amendments to it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I respectfully invite the attention of the chairman of the Finance Committee to the bill which has just been passed over, Calendar 1421, House bill 7230. That is a House bill which relates to stock transfers made by insurance companies. I think the bill has been made a special order for consideration on Friday of this week, for the purpose of considering primarily a nine-page amendment which would amend the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. GEORGE. At the present time the bill has gone to the foot of the calendar, I may say to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is so; but I wish to invite the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee to the point that in my opinion every amendment to the Internal Revenue Code is a tax bill. That has repeatedly been held, regardless of whether the amendment affected taxes in fact or merely affected expenditures which must be met through taxes.

The amendments of the Senator from Arizona are prompted by a very worthy purpose; namely, to increase the Federal contribution to the aged and to children from three-fourths of \$20 to four-fifths of \$25, and then one-half of the remaining \$30. Last year similar amendments were estimated to cost \$250,000,000 or more.

I am not questioning the fact that the elderly people and the children affected need more assistance; but I call attention to the fact that the Senate attempted to do the same thing in connection with another bill last year; and after the Senate had voted to increase the Federal contribution for old-age assistance, the bill was recommitted—and properly so—to the Senate Finance Committee, for it to consider the tax feature. The Finance Committee reported the bill in a greatly modified form. The bill was passed and was sent to the House of Representatives, and, of course, there it was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, which did what it always has done, and what it always will do in the future; namely, bury any tax bill which originates on the Senate side of the Capitol so as to convince us

that when the Constitution says that tax measures must originate in the House of Representatives, the Constitution means just that.

Mr. President, I know that no Member of the Senate who sponsors these amendments—and some of the finest Members of the Senate favor them—deliberately wants the Senate to do an unconstitutional thing; yet, in my opinion, the proposal is both unconstitutional and futile.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield, because the distinguished Senator from Arizona is the leading patron of the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. There is no question that the Senate has a right to amend a revenue bill which comes from the House. That has been done heretofore. The last time those affected by the amendment received an increase, it was done in this manner; and the House accepted it. There is no question about the constitutionality of such action on the part of the Senate. If the Senator does not want to give the old people a chance to live, that is another proposition; but there can be no question about the constitutionality of the amendments. The Constitution is plain.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia stands corrected.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Constitution permits the Senate to amend revenue bills originating in the House, and the Senate has frequently done so. It often incorporates in revenue bills provisions which are not contained in the bills when they come to the Senate. We do that whenever a tax bill comes to the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Arizona is correct. The Senator from Virginia, whose attention had just been brought to this matter, had assumed the bill relating to a transfer of stock made by an insurance company was not in the nature of a revenue measure; but, by looking at the calendar, he finds that the bill in question was reported from the Senate Finance Committee. Evidently, as the Senator from Arizona says, it is a revenue bill, and therefore the Senate has the privilege of amending it in any way it chooses, with respect to the Internal Revenue Code. Therefore, the constitutional issue cannot be raised; but there is involved the issue whether we are going to increase the direct obligations of the Government at this time by \$250,000,000.

The Senator from Virginia realizes, of course, that the old people affected are entitled to have more money, because their pensions do not now have the same buying power they have had heretofore.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to continue for one more minute, I merely want to make one little comment on what this pension situation is.

The House did not appropriate the amount necessary in order to pay the pensions already due under the civil-service rules. The Senate committee is

now wrestling with the question of whether it will provide the additional money in a pending appropriation bill, or will merely say, "We know it is not enough, but we will let the House, next year, come up with a supplemental bill." However, it must be paid either this year or next year.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission told us that the accrued liabilities of the pension system for civil service employees were approximately \$5,000,000,000, that the accrued liabilities of the Railroad Retirement Act and represented approximately \$9,000,000,000; and he told us, as did another witness who had testified before another committee, the total accrued liabilities of all the pension plans of the Government, including civil service, veterans, and others, were approximately \$250,000,000,000.

That is a very sobering situation. I mention it now because I should like the Senate to be considering what it is going to do about this measure, before it comes up on Friday. I put the Senate on notice that, as a Member of the Appropriations Committee, if the Congress votes to increase the pensions for the aged and the children, I, as a Member of the Appropriations Committee, am going to vote to pay the bill when the bill is presented to us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has again expired.

FREE IMPORTATION OF OLYMPIC GAMES RACING SHELLS

The bill (H. R. 4902) to permit the importation free of duty of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1952 Olympic games was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TAX ON CERTAIN FIREARMS

The bill (H. R. 7189) to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to machine guns and short-barreled firearms, so as to impose a tax on the making of sawed-off shotguns and to extend such provisions to Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this measure, please?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the real purpose of this bill is to make subject to the registration provisions and transfer provisions of existing law all guns that have been sawed off and which fall within the category of sawed-off shotguns or sawed-off rifles, and also to apply the same provisions to Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands.

This bill has been passed by the House of Representatives. No objection was raised there to the bill, and none was raised to the bill in the Senate Finance Committee, from which the bill was unanimously reported.

The bill simply makes such guns which are sawed off by individuals subject to

the same transfer tax that applies in the case of manufacturers of like instruments.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7189) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN TAXES ON DOMESTIC RECTIFICATION OF VODKA

The bill (H. R. 5282) to amend section 2800 (a) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I understand this proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code applies entirely to vodka.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wonder whether we may have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this is a House bill. It was passed without objection by the House of Representatives, and came to the Senate, and was referred to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee approved the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to relieve from the rectification tax of 30 cents a proof gallon imposed by section 2800 (a) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code vodka produced by rectifiers by treating pure spirits in the same manner as such spirits are authorized to be treated in producing vodka at registered distilleries.

In other words, the purpose of the bill is to remove the discrimination against the rectifiers. Already the discrimination against vodka produced at registered distilleries has been removed by previous act of Congress.

No objection is made to this bill by the Alcohol Tax Unit or by the Treasury Department.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I understand that this bill applies only to vodka which is produced domestically.

Mr. GEORGE. That is entirely correct; the bill applies only to vodka produced in the United States.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5282) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCISE TAX ON PHOTOGRAPHIC APPARATUS

The bill (H. R. 5998) to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAR POWERS IN CONNECTION WITH DEFENSE CONTRACTS

The bill (S. 2421) to amend the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257), amending and extending title II of the First

War Powers Act, 1941, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. May we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, this bill would extend the powers of title II of the First War Powers Act. Its purpose is to give the military authorities another year within which to dispose of approximately 74 cases in one category, and approximately 60 in another category, which should be readjusted under the provisions of the act as it now exists. The act, however, will expire on June 30 unless we renew it.

The purpose of the renegotiation is dual: First, to protect the military sources of supply by keeping defense suppliers in business; and, second, to prevent the Government from doing a practical injustice to businesses which have made bids in good faith, but which have been adversely affected by changed economic conditions.

Mr. President, this bill applies primarily to fixed-price-bid contracts which were made before the Korean invasion. Testimony was taken extensively by the Small Business Subcommittee on Mobilization and Procurement, of which I happen to be the chairman, indicating that the increase in costs of material and labor, after Korea, played havoc with a number of small businesses which had entered bids in good faith and had then found that their costs rose rapidly.

The purpose of the original law, when enacted by the Congress, was twofold. It was, first, to prevent defense suppliers from being driven out of business, which would handicap the Government in the procurement of material; and, second, to see to it that no practical injustice was done to small businesses.

That is the only purpose of this bill. It is not put forward as a permanent policy of the Government. It is merely an extension for a limited period, because the evidence and testimony before our two committees indicated that such an extension should be made.

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

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. As I understand, this bill grew out of a series of hearings conducted by the junior Senator from Michigan, as chairman of the subcommittee, which indicated the existence of certain practices, or of certain restrictive interpretations which were placed on some of these contracts for the military. I gather that the bill is designed to liberalize the restrictive interpretation as it affects procurement contracts made with small business. Is that not true?

Mr. MOODY. When the Senator says this bill grew out of the hearings to which he refers that is not quite correct, because it is merely an extension of the present law. It is true that the Committee on Small Business has been very critical of the administration of this law by the Department of Defense. As my colleague on the Small Business

Committee and on the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Kansas well knows we conducted a rather extensive series of hearings which brought out the fact that the Department of Defense had promulgated regulations which took care of the situation from their own angle, that is, the angle which would protect their sources of supply. But they failed to take into account the question of practical justice to a small business, which should not have been penalized because of a change in economic conditions beyond its control.

In one case, in Massachusetts, for example, the evidence indicated that a small-business concern had trained other concerns in making the type of item it was furnishing to the Army through the Quartermaster Corps, and that, having done that, it was not the only supplier of this type of item. Since it was not the only supplier, it was no longer essential to the Department of Defense that this particular business remain in existence, and therefore, under the regulations and interpretations of the law by the Department of Defense, the business could receive no relief under the law. I am sure the Senator from Kansas read the report of the Small Business Committee, because we incorporated it as a part of the report of the Committee on Government Operations. Our purpose in that was to make very clear the legislative intent of the Congress. As we extend the present law, if it be the judgment of the Congress that it should be extended, we intend to take care of bidders who in good faith have made their bids and have then been penalized. We do not intend, of course, that the Government bail out firms which merely have miscalculated their bids. But those who have dealt in good faith, and have been hit by circumstances beyond their control, should be given consideration and action. For the benefit of my distinguished friend from Kansas, I should like to add that I have already written, as chairman of the subcommittee, to Mr. Lovett, the Secretary of Defense, and I am expecting a reply from him with reference to the future policy of the Department of Defense in implementing the law. I believe this action is in accord with the views of the Senator from Kansas.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2421) to amend the act of January 12, 1952 (64 Stat. 1257), amending and extending title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 2 of the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257), is hereby amended by striking out "1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953."

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

The bill (H. R. 6336) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee

for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research was announced as next in order.

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

MR. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand the bill involves approximately \$20,000,000. I wonder, therefore, if we might have an explanation of the bill.

MR. KNOWLAND. The Senator is quite correct.

MR. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me for a moment?

MR. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF TENNESSEE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER, MOUNTAIN HOME, TENN.

MR. MCKELLAR. As the Senator from California knows, the Committee on Appropriations has a committee meeting at 1 o'clock this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of Calendar 1440, Senate bill 2959, authorizing the transfer to the State of Tennessee of certain lands in the Veterans' Administration Center, Mountain Home, Tenn.

MR. KNOWLAND. Since my distinguished colleague is chairman of the subcommittee on which I serve and I know he has to preside at the meeting, I shall be glad temporarily to postpone action on Calendar 1427, House bill 6336.

MR. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I dislike mightily to tell my distinguished colleague from Tennessee that by request I shall have to ask that the bill be passed over, but I should like to ask unanimous consent that it be considered at the next call of the calendar. I want the distinguished Senator to understand that the Senator from New Jersey has no objection.

MR. MCKELLAR. I understand that fully. I merely want to say that there are two amendments to the bill. I am quite sure that whoever asked the Senator from New Jersey to object will withdraw his objection at the proper time.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent has been requested that Senate bill 2959 be called at the next call of the calendar. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, again referring to House bill 6336 to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, the bill provides the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics with the authorization necessary to enable it to carry out its construction program planned for fiscal year 1953.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of a total of not to exceed \$19,700,000.

Of this aggregate sum approximately \$18,000,000 is for technical facilities. The remainder is for the housing of those facilities.

The major portion of the authorization—\$13,000,000—is for expenditure at the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory and involves the conversion of the 19-foot pressure tunnel for dynamic model testing and the equipping of a high-temperature structural research laboratory.

The remainder of the authorization—\$6,592,000—is for construction at the Lewis Propulsion Laboratory and involves the expansion of the high-pressure air supply and distributing system and the facilities for full scale jet engine research.

There is a committee amendment to the bill which rewrites section 3 in such a manner as to limit the authorization to not to exceed the definite dollar amount of \$19,700,000.

Section 2 contains authorization to be exercised at the discretion of the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to vary upward in the amount of 10 percent, the approximate costs enumerated for the two locations and by such further amounts as may be concurred in by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget so long as such transfer of funds is to meet unusual costs variations and does not exceed the aggregate of \$19,700,000 as authorized by the bill.

Hearings were held on the bill before a subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] with the senior Senator from California as a member.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. It was recommended by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and has the concurrence of the executive branch of the Government as is shown by the letter appearing on page 4 of the committee report.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I may say that I think all the Members of the Senate, particularly those who are members of the Armed Services Committee and who are familiar with the developments in aviation and the importance of keeping abreast and ahead of developments, feel that this Nation must not be caught in a second-best position. The only way to avoid that situation is to continue as rapidly as possible research and development work.

MR. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his explanation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6336) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, line 14, after the word "appropriated," to strike out "such sums of money as

may be necessary," and insert "not to exceed \$19,700,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from California will answer a question for me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to. Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is with respect to House bill 6336. Does this bill have anything to do with commercial aviation, or is it strictly military?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It relates to basic research. While it is essential that we keep ahead of the procession in connection with military aviation, I think that out of this basic research will come information which undoubtedly will be of value to commercial aviation. But primarily, I would say, in answer to the Senator's question, that it is to keep us in a position where we shall not be second best in our air power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am surprised that the bill was not referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which handles aviation questions. I notice that it is reported from the Committee on Armed Services. I wonder why that is the case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator, who is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that a similar bill last year was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I offer an objection, and ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar and that it be considered on the next call of the calendar, so that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have an opportunity to study its implications.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that, of course, he is entirely within his rights and it is perfectly proper to make the request which he has made, but I hope, in the interest of advancing our own air position and particularly in view of the situation in the field of military air power, when we know that the Soviet Union has made tremendous progress, there will be no unnecessary delay and that prompt action will be taken by the Senate. I hope that at the next call of the calendar the Senate will be prepared to consider the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from California.

Is it a fact that the authorization is needed in order to protect appropriations for the purposes described in the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator from South Dakota is correct.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that projects of this type have been proposed to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, but action on them has been prevented on the ground that there was no authorization?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I am not able to give him a categorical answer to that question.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the reason for my raising the reservation of objec-

tion is that in times past we have found that proposals have been presented to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, but that committee lacks appropriations for certain projects. I certainly join with the Senator from California in hoping that expeditious consideration can be given to the bill. I think it is important that research continue and that it be not delayed. Therefore, I hope consideration of the bill will not be delayed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from South Dakota is correct in his general premise that authorization legislation is needed, for I believe that without it such a provision would be subject to a point of order in an appropriation bill. The question I cannot answer is whether the point was made in the House, and for that reason the appropriation was stricken.

Mr. CASE. As to specific projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the inclusion of the bill in the next call of the calendar? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, ILL.—RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION

The bill (H. R. 1949) to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over 154.2 acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 4511) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property of Kahulani, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, inasmuch as considerable property is involved, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this bill would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey without reimbursement to the Territory of Hawaii a naval air station located on the Island of Maui.

The station comprises approximately 1,300 acres. The land on which it is located was acquired at an original cost of \$500,000. The improvements cost \$28,000,000.

A great share of the improvements are temporary. Many have been removed, and the entire station has suffered considerable deterioration.

The situation with regard to this particular piece of property is unique in that the property is surplus to the present needs of the Defense Department and other Federal departments, but would be necessary in case important naval operations were to be carried on in the Pacific Ocean area.

The problem therefore is how to assure the best interim use and maintenance of the station at a minimum cost to the Federal Government. The bill seeks to accomplish this objective by incorporating three specific conditions in its provisions. First, the Territory shall not

alienate its title to the property conveyed nor lease any part of it, except for public airport purposes.

Second, the Territory is required to maintain, or cause to be maintained in a condition suitable for public airport purposes, the improvements now existing on the land as well as those which may hereafter be constructed thereon.

Third—and perhaps most significant—right of recapture for use by the United States in time of war or in time of national emergency is provided, and, in addition, the Federal Government may, after 30 days' notice in writing, repossess title to property including all or any part of the improvements erected thereon by the Territory.

Under the bill as amended, the United States would make compensation only for the acquisition of title to any personal property erected by the Territory without Federal aid. No payment would be required for the use of any of the installations in the event of recapture of title by the United States.

The normal method of disposing of surplus airports is through the Surplus Airport Act. This procedure is not feasible in this particular case because the property is only temporarily surplus, and a definite mobilization need for its recapture exists in the event of certain eventualities in the Pacific area.

Furthermore, experience has shown that in making disposals under the Surplus Airport Act, very serious difficulty is encountered in cases where the Federal Government desires to reenter the property and erect permanent construction thereon. There is no legal means by which fee title can be recaptured without outright purchase.

It is to meet this difficulty that the bill contains specific provision that all right of reentry both for use and ownership can be revested in the Federal Government without payment, except for realty construction thereon subsequent to the conveyance of the Territory.

The committee has been informed that the provisions of H. R. 1949 are within the purview of the criteria prescribed by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with respect to such conveyances.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 2, line 12, after the word "condition", to insert "which the Secretary of the Navy may deem to be", and on page 3, line 2, after "Provided, however", to strike out "That the United States shall make just compensation for the use or acquisition of any improvements or personal property made or acquired without Federal aid" and insert "That the United States shall make just compensation for the acquisition of title to any personal property acquired by the Territory without Federal aid and for any new facilities provided by the Territory without Federal aid which are not in the nature of improvements to or replacements of existing structures."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SPECIAL-INDUCEMENT PAY TO DOCTORS AND DENTISTS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

The bill (S. 3019) to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to doctors and dentists, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, because of the deep interest of the author of the bill, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I wonder if the Senator from Colorado will withhold his objection until I can offer a brief explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the principle purpose of the bill is to extend from September 1, 1952, to July 1, 1953, the time limitation for eligibility to qualify for special pay of \$100 per month authorized for medical and dental officers of the uniformed services while serving on active duty.

This special pay was originally authorized by the Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947. It was continued by the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and broadened somewhat by the act of September 9, 1950.

I would point out that this bill in no sense provides a general pay raise for physicians and dentists. I make this comment because it is widely believed that under existing law the special pay for physicians and dentists will terminate on September 1 of this year. That is not the situation. The special pay for officers on duty September 1 will continue for as long as they remain on active duty. However, those entering active duty subsequent to September 1 could not qualify, with the result that there would be a marked differential in treatment of officers doing identical types of work.

It was this difference the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] sought to eradicate in this bill.

The bill does extend the coverage of the existing statute to include a small group of retired officers who were ordered back to active duty subsequent to their retirement. This correction is of very limited application, and is necessary and justifiable because it was never intended that these individuals should not be covered by the original statute.

Mr. President, I shall not discuss the reason why Congress has found it sound policy to authorize special pay for physicians and dentists. That subject has been discussed repeatedly on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and is a well recognized necessity. The committee report contains a fairly detailed analysis of the problem.

This bill was recommended by the Department of Defense with the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy extended by the Senator from Colorado in temporarily withholding his objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will go over.

WAREHOUSES FOR CIVILIAN DEFENSE PURPOSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2726) to authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to acquire by lease or license, warehouse space for civil defense purposes at Sikeston, Mo.; Zanesville, Ohio; Downingtown, Pa., and Paw Paw, W. Va., respectively, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in accordance with the provisions of subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1249; 50 U. S. C. App. 2281), the Federal Civil Defense Administrator is hereby authorized to acquire by lease or license, for civil defense purposes, not to exceed a total of 314,000 gross square feet of warehouse space situated in or near the following places: Sikeston, Mo.; Zanesville, Ohio; Downingtown, Pa., and Paw Paw, W. Va.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair observes that Calendar No. 1437, H. R. 5990, is on the same subject matter, and it would be in order for the Senate to proceed to consider that bill, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the language of Senate bill 2726. Is there objection to that course being pursued?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, would the action which the Chair has just recommended be the same as for me to move that all after the enacting clause of H. R. 5990 be stricken, and the language of S. 2726 substituted in lieu thereof?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 5990?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I now move that all after the enacting clause be stricken out and that Senate bill 2726 be substituted in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2726 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I notice that the titles of the two bills are considerably different. Is it not in order to amend the title, so that the record may be clear?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's point is well taken. Is there objection to the amendment of the title to conform to the subject matter of the Senate bill? Without objection, the title will be appropriately amended.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the Federal Civil

Defense Administrator to acquire, by lease or license, warehouse space for civil defense purposes at Sikeston, Mo.; Zanesville, Ohio; Downingtown, Pa.; and Paw Paw, W. Va., respectively."

OLEOMARGARINE IN NAVY RATION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2083) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LOAN OF CERTAIN DEFENSE EQUIPMENT TO BOY SCOUTS

The bill (S. 3100) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Third National Jamboree for the Boy Scouts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I certainly have no intention of objecting—I should like to offer a brief statement on this bill, because of the interest taken in it by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYEL], who is not at present in the Chamber.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America at their Third National Jamboree.

I should like to point out that the bill is almost identical in terminology with Senate bill 2151, which was introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYEL] and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Senate bill 2151 was not acted upon by the Senate because an identical companion bill, House bill 5432, was passed and enacted into law.

The pending bill, Senate bill 3100, originated with Senate bill 2483, which was introduced on January 22 by the senior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Alabama. There were certain technical and noncontroversial amendments to the original language recommended by the Department of Defense. No objection to the new language was interposed by the authors of the bill, or by the representatives of the Boy Scouts of America. As a matter of committee procedure in this particular instance, the Committee on Armed Services reported a committee bill so as to avoid reprinting the language of the original bill with the various amendments.

I wish to point out that page 2 of the committee report attempts to explain the relationship of the pending bill, Senate bill 3100, to the original bill as introduced by the distinguished Senator from

Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from Alabama, whose continued interest in this extremely worthy cause is well known to all Members of the Senate.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Boy Scouts of America, a corporation created under the act of June 15, 1916, for the use and accommodation of the approximately 50,000 Scouts and officials who are to attend the Third National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts to be held during the period beginning in June 1953, and ending in July 1953 at Irvine Ranch, Irvine, Orange County, Calif., such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the national council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

INTERNAL REVENUE OFFENSES— STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS—BILL PASSED OVER TO NEXT CALL OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 5048) relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal revenue laws was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have discussed this bill with the chairman of the Finance Committee. I ask that the bill be passed over, and included in the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the inclusion of this bill in the next call of the calendar? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The bill will be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES IN SALE OF AIR TRANSPORTATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2690) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

Sec. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to enlarge or extend the juris-

diction of the Civil Aeronautics Board over transportation not subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

And on page 3, after line 13, to insert: Sec. 5. This act shall be effective upon enactment.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by renumbering paragraph (32) as paragraph (33) and by inserting therein a new paragraph (32) reading as follows:

"(32) 'Ticket agent' means any person, not an air carrier or a foreign air carrier and not a bona fide employee of an air carrier or foreign air carrier, who, as principal or agent, sells or offers for sale any air transportation, or negotiates for, or holds himself out by solicitation, advertisement, or otherwise as one who sells, provides, furnishes, contracts or arranges for, such transportation."

Sec. 2. Section 411 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"METHODS OF COMPETITION"

"Sec. 411. The Board may, upon its own initiative or upon complaint by any air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent, if it considers that such action by it would be in the interest of the public, investigate and determine whether any air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent has been or is engaged in unfair or deceptive practices or unfair methods of competition in air transportation or the sale thereof. If the Board shall find, after notice and hearing, that such air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent is engaged in such unfair or deceptive practices or unfair methods of competition, it shall order such air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent to cease and desist from such practices or methods of competition."

Sec. 3. Section 902 (d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"GRANTING REBATES"

"(d) Any air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent, or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof, who shall, knowingly and willfully, offer, grant, or give, or cause to be offered, granted, or given, any rebate or other concession in violation of the provisions of this act, or who, by any device or means, shall, knowingly and willfully, assist, or shall willingly suffer or permit, any person to obtain transportation or services subject to this act at less than the rates, fares, or charges lawfully in effect, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be subject for each offense to a fine of not less than \$100 and not more than \$5,000."

Sec. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to enlarge or extend the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board over transportation not subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

Sec. 5. This act shall be effective upon enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY—AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1973) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with reference to the building and construction industry, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with

amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "States", to insert "or of any State or Territory"; in line 9, after the word "employer", to insert "primarily"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "engaged", to insert "(or who, upon their employment, will be engaged)"; in line 7, after the word "which", to insert "at the time the agreement was executed or within the preceding 12 months has received from the Board a notice that it"; in line 14, after the word "act", to strike out "nor shall an election be required under any of" and insert "solely because no election has been held under", and after line 19, to insert:

(b) Before the semicolon at the end of section 9 (c) (1) (A) (II) insert a comma and the following: "or (iii) who are covered by an agreement between their employer and a labor organization made pursuant to the third proviso to section 9 (a) wish to be represented by a labor organization other than the labor organization which is currently representing them under such agreement".

(c) Before the period at the end of section 9 (c) (1) insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That in a proceeding arising under section 9 (c) (1) (A) (iii), the director of the regional office in which such a petition is filed shall investigate such petition and if he has reasonable cause to believe that a question of representation affecting commerce exists shall provide for an appropriate hearing upon due notice, which hearing may be conducted by an officer or employee of the regional office who may make recommendations in writing with respect thereto, and the report of the hearing officer shall be served upon the parties to the proceeding. If, in any such proceeding, the regional director finds upon the record of such hearing that such a question of representation exists, he shall, notwithstanding the existence of any agreement, direct an election by secret ballot and shall certify the results thereof: Provided further, That petitions under 9 (c) (1) (A) (iii) shall have the highest priority over all other cases, except cases of like character, notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 (1) of this act, and the procedure prescribed herein, up to and including the issuance of a certificate, shall be completed within 10 calendar days after the filing of the petition except in rare cases which require additional time".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) At the end of section 9 (a) insert the following: "Provided further, That nothing in this section or any other section of this act or of any other statute or law of the United States or of any State or Territory shall preclude an employer primarily engaged in the building and construction industry from making an agreement covering employees engaged (or who, upon their employment, will be engaged) in the construction, alteration, or repair of buildings, or other structures and improvements, on which building and construction trade workmen are employed, with a labor organization (not established, maintained, or assisted by any action defined in section 8 (a) of this act as an unfair labor practice and which at the time the agreement was executed or within the preceding 12 months has received from the Board a notice that it has complied with all the requirements imposed by section 9 (f) (g) (h)) to require, as a condition of employment, membership in such organization on or after the seventh day following the beginning of such employment, and no such agreement shall be considered an unfair labor practice under section 8 of this act, solely because no election

has been held under the provisions of section 9 of this act prior to the making of such agreement: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall set aside the final proviso to section 8 (a) (3) of this act."

(b) Before the semicolon at the end of section 9 (c) (1) (A) (ii) insert a comma and the following: "or (iii) who are covered by an agreement between their employer and a labor organization made pursuant to the third proviso to section 9 (a) wish to be represented by a labor organization other than the labor organization which is currently representing them under such agreement."

(c) Before the period at the end of section 9 (c) (1) insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That in a proceeding arising under section 9 (c) (1) (A) (iii), the Director of the Regional Office in which such a petition is filed shall investigate such petition and if he has reasonable cause to believe that a question of representation affecting commerce exists shall provide for an appropriate hearing upon due notice, which hearing may be conducted by an officer or employee of the Regional Office who may make recommendations in writing with respect thereto, and the report of the hearing officer shall be served upon the parties to the proceeding. If, in any such proceeding, the Regional Director finds upon the record of such hearing that such a question of representation exists, he shall, notwithstanding the existence of any agreement, direct an election by secret ballot and shall certify the results thereof: *Provided further*, That petitions under 9 (c) (1) (A) (iii) shall have the highest priority over all other cases, except cases of like character, notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 (1) of this act, and the procedure prescribed herein, up to and including the issuance of a certificate, shall be completed within 10 calendar days after the filing of the petition except in rare cases which require additional time."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

ACQUISITION OF SITE FOR FEDERAL BUILDING IN NEWNAN, GA.

The bill (H. R. 4551) to provide for the acquisition of a site for the new Federal building in Newnan, Ga., adjoining the existing Federal building there as an economy measure before land value has increased as a result of land improvement was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AT EL PASO, TEX.

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

ADDITIONAL AID FOR THE AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

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 was announced as next in order.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives, and unanimously reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It would increase the authorization for appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind from \$115,000 to \$250,000.

I wish to emphasize the fact that increasing the authorization does not necessarily mean that the full appropriation of \$250,000 will be made. The \$115,000 authorization was made in 1937. By increasing the authorization today we would have the future in mind, and it would not be necessary each year to fix the authorized amount of the appropriation.

Making appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind carries out the policy of Congress, established in 1789, giving help to the American Printing House for the Blind in the manufacture and distribution to blind children in the public schools of braille books and educational apparatus and equipment. None of the money would be used for any purpose whatever except to provide such books and apparatus.

The Senator from New Jersey will recognize that an increase in cost has occurred since 1937. In fact, the increase in the cost of the materials per unit is now approximately 105 percent more than it was in 1942. Does the Senator from New Jersey desire to ask any questions?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I know that he has remained on the floor to give this explanation when he had other official business to attend to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there is no other cause in which the Senator from New Jersey and I could be associated which would be worthier than helping the blind children in our public schools throughout the country.

AUSTRIA AS A FREE AND INDEPENDENT NATION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to exercise my privilege under the 5-minute rule to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, that the Austrian Government and its heroic people have not been accorded full freedom and have not been encompassed in the world of nations as a free and independent people pursuant to the Moscow declaration and subsequent promises of a solemn nature, constitutes one of the glaring sins of our foreign policy stemming from Yalta, is a fact which no one will dare deny. And yet we do nothing about it.

In view of the fact that a heroic and patriotic Austrian, the Hon. Dr. Leopold Figl, the present chancellor of Austria, is now a visitor upon our shores, it would be well for every Member of this dis-

tinguished body to read an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday entitled "For a Free Austria." After reading it, I would implore each of my colleagues to weigh its implications with profound thought.

To that end, Mr. President, I ask that the editorial appear in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FOR A FREE AUSTRIA

The scheduled arrival here this morning of Dr. Leopold Figl, chancellor of Austria, comes at a time when that small but important nation is again in the international spotlight. Last Friday the United States, Great Britain and France jointly reminded the Soviet Government that almost 2 months ago, on March 13, they had suggested adoption of a short state treaty with Austria which would permit the restoration of Austria's full freedom and independence along with the withdrawal of occupation troops there now. To date no Soviet reply has been received to that proposal, but this latest note reaffirms once again the Western desire to see a free Austria.

Any study of the history of Austria's relations with the four occupying powers over the past years shows immediately that a State Department spokesman was uttering nothing but the literal truth last Friday when he declared that the U. S. S. R.'s role in the Austrian negotiations has been "a classic study of Soviet obstructionism and procrastination." If there is a Stalin prize for ingenuity in preventing diplomatic agreements, it must surely long since have gone to those in the Kremlin who direct policy on Austrian affairs. In hundreds of meetings over the past 7 years the three Western powers' representatives have tried in every way to get Soviet agreement to an Austrian treaty, but at every point they have been met by evasions, pretexts, new demands and vituperation.

The short-range factors which motivate this Kremlin attitude are clear: the opportunity to continue exploiting Eastern Austria's economy, the ability to maintain Soviet troops in Austria as well as in the satellite countries along the Soviet line of communications with the homeland, and the like. Yet even to the Kremlin it should be clear that at the present time its Austrian policy makes more difficult than ever the realization of its new German policy. Stalin and his colleagues must surely realize that the West can place no faith in the sincerity of Soviet proposals for a German peace treaty when so little progress has been achieved on the far simpler questions regarding Austria.

Speaking in the Austrian Parliament last April 2, Chancellor Figl appealed to the conscience of the world for a treaty which would free his country. He said, "We raise our voice against the injustice that is being perpetuated against the Austrian people and against the nonfulfillment of the solemn promise given in the Moscow declaration of the year 1943 and reiterated in 1945. It is the voice of a people who 7 years after the end of the war have earned through their suffering and exemplary behavior the right to be treated as the civilized nation of Europe with its century-old tradition which they embody." As he arrives in our country, we Americans can be proud that we stand with this leader and his people in their fight for the restoration of their justly deserved freedom.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as one who has spent many long, hard months in Austria during the early days of its reconstruction, I would like to say briefly that we cannot take action too

quickly in recognition of the voice of these fine people who have earned through their suffering and exemplary behavior the right to be treated as a civilized nation of Europe.

Mr. President, the editorial says that we Americans can be proud that we stand with Chancellor Figl and his people in their fight for the restoration of their justly deserved freedom. I would urge less lip service and more positive and dynamic action.

ADDITIONAL AID FOR THE AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

STAMP TAX ON CERTAIN DEPOSITS OF SECURITIES BY INSURANCE COMPANIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into previously today the Senate will proceed to the consideration of calendar 1421 (H. R. 7230), which the clerk will state by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7230) to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to make nontaxable certain stock transfers made by insurance companies to secure the performance of obligations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, during this Eighty-second Congress we have been concerned with crucial matters affecting the welfare of our Nation and the very survival of the free world. No one can say that we have failed to give thorough consideration to the great problems which have developed out of the turmoil between our democratic ideals and the dictatorial philosophy of communism. This conflict—call it a cold war, if you like—has caused unprecedented spending for defense, with consequent belt-tightening on the domestic front.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader whether he is calling this bill on the call of the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I do not intend to call it up as part of the calendar call. If the Senator from New Jersey will bear with me I shall make an explanation of the amendments.

But despite our recognition of the crying need for restriction of nonessential expenditures, we have managed to sandwich in some relief for the Americans on fixed incomes—the Armed Forces, veterans, and Federal employees, to name a few. These bills were favored by a ma-

jority of the Congress because we recognized that despite the imposition of economic controls the wages of many thousands of our citizens had fallen behind, and that they desperately needed added pay to meet the advanced cost of living.

In the Senate we voted to give similar increases to persons dependent upon the Federal-State public assistance program of aid to the aged, to the blind and disabled, and to dependent children. Last spring I offered an amendment which, for the most part, was identical to the one which I offer today. It would give the States an additional \$5 per month to raise the pensions of the aged, blind, and disabled, and dependent children would receive \$3 more. There was an objection to my amendment last year on the ground that it would cost too much and that it had not been considered by the Finance Committee. In view of this objection, I agreed to its being referred to the committee, and when it was reported the amount of the increase had been reduced to \$3 for the first three categories and to \$2 for the children. In this curtailed form my amendment passed the Senate and went to the Ways and Means Committee of the House. The reason I am reintroducing my original amendment is that the provisions of H. R. 2416 as passed by the House were incorporated in the tax bill.

In the meantime these needy people continue to live in a state of deprivation. The last time the Federal share was increased was in 1948.

Mr. President, you and I know that these people do not even have the everyday things which most of us consider necessities. They have no money to buy luxuries. In fact, they consider themselves fortunate if they have a roof over their heads and enough to eat. I am personally acquainted with many of them in my home State, and I know how proud they are and how reluctant to ask for help. They have no organized lobby and they are dependent on us and their State officials to do the right thing by them. The majority of these aged, blind, and infirm people do not write; they just pray that somehow the suffering of their remaining years will be alleviated.

Oh, yes; we hear from them occasionally. I would like to read a few poignant sentences from letters I have received in recent months.

This one is from an elderly widow whose insurance benefit has been augmented by old-age assistance:

I got \$38 social security until the State started to pay me \$60. Then social security was cut to \$20 and the State check to \$56. That only pays rent, \$12; lights, \$2.50; groceries, about \$45. Wood costs me about \$15 per year. I use an electric plate in the summer and the bill is often \$3.50. Then I haven't had shoes or clothes in 4 years.

Mr. President, just imagine, if you can, the living circumstances of this lady. And she is better off than most. In my State, the average old-age assistance recipient got \$49.24 for the month of February. This is \$5 more than the average for the Nation, which was \$44.77.

Here is another letter, from one of the pioneers who helped to make Arizona the thriving, modern State it is today:

My wife and I have been struggling along on the \$60 grant allotted to me for more than 4 years. I don't see how we can keep on if we are forced to economize any more.

And another letter from a man who himself barely makes ends meet, but who is more concerned for some of his fellow pensioners:

I know an old man and old lady drawing a \$60 pension. They are neither one well. The old man hasn't but a few months to live at the very most and is not able to afford a doctor. He can't go to the country doctor and stand in line all that time, so he just makes the best of it that he can.

I am not going to take the time to read any more; each of us has received letters like these and each of us knows how heartbreaking they are. I would like to point out, though, Mr. President, that we seldom get any telegrams from these old folks. No, telegrams are not within the reach of their budgets. They sometimes have to make sacrifices just to pay for stationary and a 3-cent stamp.

This amendment is not going to be the salvation of these needy people. In the average case, this \$5 increase will not even give them back the buying power they had in 1948. Since that time, as we all know, the Consumers' Price Index has moved up 17.2 points—from 171.2 to 188.4—while the Federal contribution for public assistance has remained virtually the same. Since we adopted the amendment a year ago, the over-all cost of living has increased 1.9 percent.

Mr. President, these amendments make no new requirements of the States, except that they prohibit them from reducing their share of the load. In other words, if the States do not continue to aid these people to the extent that the States now are aiding them, and also give them the additional increase, the States will not receive the benefit of the increase which we vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. There are questions about the proposed amendments, with which I know many persons are seriously concerned. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether the amendments in effect establish a new principle in respect to welfare appropriations, and whether in a sense they constitute an escalator clause in relation to a cost-of-living clause. If that is the case, has this matter been gone over carefully, and has the committee passed on it, and what yardstick will be used?

I ask these questions because I know they are in the minds of many persons, for I understand that the entire amendment involves an additional expenditure of \$175,000,000 or \$200,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, these amendments are similar to one

which has been adopted twice before. A moment ago I said that since 1948 the Federal contribution for public assistance of this sort has remained virtually the same. I say virtually the same because, in fairness, I should point out that some States have been able to improve their programs so that they are qualified for more Federal aid. Moreover, in 1950 we extended the program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled, which has added some 130,000 persons to those who receive this indirect Federal aid.

The increase I am asking the Senate to support is certainly not a king's ransom. Federal contributions would be raised by approximately 20 percent; but since the Federal Government pays only 53 percent of the total amounts paid to those in these four assistance categories, the direct effect of this amendment would be to increase the average recipient's payment by only a little more than 10 percent. Also included in the classification of public assistance is general assistance, which is financed entirely by State and local funds, and which gives aid to some 336,000 persons per month. If we take this into consideration, the Federal share of all public assistance is reduced to 46.6 percent.

This amendment makes no new requirement of the States, except to prohibit them from reducing their share of the load. We certainly would not want to give them added Federal funds, only to have them cut down their own contributions. The amendment also stipulates that, in determining need, the States need not take into consideration the first \$50 per month earned by a recipient in agricultural or nursing pursuits. This provision would apply only for 1 year, and is designed to encourage public assistance recipients to seek part-time work in these fields, where there is a critical shortage of personnel. Both these provisions were added to my amendment on the floor last year, and they were accepted by the Senate.

Of course we hope the States will match this additional money with funds of their own, thus giving the aged, blind, and disabled \$10 more. But to require them to do so would be to deny the immediate benefits to tens of thousands of those who need them most.

There should be no need for protracted debate on this amendment. Twice before we have raised the Federal share of public assistance by the same method; namely, by revising the matching formula under which the grants are computed and raising by \$5 the limit to which the Federal Government participates in the State programs. Briefly, the effect of this amendment would be as follows:

For individuals receiving aid to the aged, blind, and disabled, the Federal Government would put up four-fifths—\$20—of the first \$25 per month, rather than three-fourths—\$15—of the first \$20, as at present. Thereafter, the Federal Government would provide one-half of the amount in excess of \$25, and up to \$55, per individual per month. At present, the Federal share is one-half of the amount in excess of \$20 and up to \$50.

With regard to dependent children, the Federal Government would be directed to put up four-fifths—\$12—of the first \$15 per month, rather than three-fourths—\$9—of the first \$12, for each dependent child. Thereafter, the Federal Government would pay half the amount in excess of \$15, up to a maximum of \$30 per child per month, where there is only one child in a home receiving assistance, and to a maximum of \$21 each for additional children in the same home.

I have here a chart which shows a few pertinent statistics regarding the Fed-

eral-State public-assistance program and the effects of my amendment. The figures given are the latest available from the Federal Security Agency. I shall request that this chart be printed in the RECORD in conjunction with my remarks, so that my colleagues can see at a glance what the effect of the amendment would be.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this chart published at this point in the RECORD.

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

Public-assistance amendment to H. R. 7230

[Amounts in thousands]

Category of aid	Current number of recipients (February 1952)	Amount annually paid by Federal Government (fiscal year ending June 30, 1951)	Federal portion of total paid to recipients (percent for fiscal year)	Increase proposed by this amendment			
				Per individual per month	Federal cost per year	Percent increase in Federal share	Percent increase to recipients
Old age.....	2,685	\$794,013	54	\$5	\$161,100	20	10.8
Blind.....	97	24,453	45	5	5,820	24	10.8
Permanently and totally disabled.....	132	114,944	46	5	7,920	153	124.4
Dependent children (individuals).....	1,531	288,794	51	3	55,116	19	9.7
Total.....	3,445	1,122,204	53	229,956	20	10.6

¹ These figures are not representative because the program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled did not go into operation until October 1950.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, in response to the questions asked by my friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], let me say that I do not think this amendment constitutes any yardstick in respect to the cost of living. Certainly if we were to adopt a yardstick, it would provide for assistance far greater in amount than that provided by this amendment. The amendment provides for a very meager sum to enable these people to eke out a bare existence. We could not properly regard an amendment of this sort, providing for such a small increase in assistance, as a yardstick.

Mr. President, there is another amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not yet adopted the first amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that objection has been raised to the amendment. Since I have brought up this matter, the leadership of the House of Representatives has informed me that in the very near future they are going to give consideration to some social security legislation. I realize that it would be better to amend for this purpose a social security bill, rather than to amend for the same purpose any type of internal revenue bill. For that reason, I am willing to wait until the social security bill reaches the Senate from the House of Representatives, because I am hopeful that at that time some definite action will be taken in this connection.

I care nothing about the authorship of this measure, and I know that those who have joined with me in submitting the amendment do not care anything about the authorship of it. What we want are some results in the way of additional as-

sistance to the needy persons who would be affected.

Personally, and I believe all Members of the Senate share the same view, I would prefer to have such a measure originate in the House of Representatives. We do not like to bring up such an amendment in this manner, although I call attention to the fact that the last two increases of this kind were brought about in just this manner.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Arizona has raised a good point, namely, that these elderly persons are "up against it." There is no question about that, and something should be done. However, does not the Senator from Arizona agree with me that one assistance we could give them would be to check some of the administration's reckless spending policies which are deflating every dollar and are putting these elderly people "behind the eight ball"? We must not forget that those who are not covered by social security are likewise suffering, and would get no assistance from this amendment.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware can make his own interpretations of the expenditures of the Government. I do not care to inject an argument based on Government expenditures into the consideration of a matter which means almost life or death to the aged and blind persons and dependent children who are affected. If we are to consider expenditures, let me say that I think the Government of the United States should be willing to do its duty by these needy people, regardless of what other expenditures may be.

So I regret very much that this necessary increase in assistance has been delayed so long, because these needy aged and blind persons and dependent children should certainly be given the small increase now proposed. How anyone could object to it, I cannot understand.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. I certainly hope he will find some way to give the Senate an opportunity to act on such a proposal as he has made, so as to afford some relief to the aged and blind and dependent children, insofar as it is possible for the Senate to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the Senate is still operating during the calendar call, and the available time has been exhausted.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed sufficient additional time to permit me to complete my remarks; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much additional time does the Senator from Arizona request?

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask for 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona requests unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes for this purpose. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arizona may proceed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, Mr. President, earlier today this bill went to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one point I had in mind at the time when I raised my question was—and I think the Senator from Arizona will agree with me—that during the past 18 months, since the war in Korea began, and during which time the elderly people of our country have been suffering from inflation which resulted in an increase in the cost of living, the United States Government has been destroying large amounts of good edible food which these needy people could have used. For instance since the outbreak of the Korean war the Government has destroyed more than 58,000,000 bushels of potatoes. This is enough to make a solid trainload of potatoes over 500 miles long. Today the housewife cannot find potatoes. That has occurred since the outbreak of the war in Korea. Many of these elderly people need potatoes.

At the same time, more than 300 million dozen eggs have been destroyed, at a cost of millions of dollars to the American taxpayers. It is wrong.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the potato program in connection with the present proposal for a small increase in the amount of \$5 a month in the assistance rendered the aged and blind persons, and a small increase of \$3 a month in the assistance afforded dependent children.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, those who do not wish to have the Federal Government take care of these needy persons can always find some excuse, and usually do so; but I call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that before this session ends he will have an opportunity to show by his vote whether he is willing to have the Federal Government take care of the aged and blind persons and dependent children in his State.

Now I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Arizona agrees with some of us who desire to add an additional \$5 to the aid given elderly and blind persons and dependent children; but we do not desire to feed them rotten Irish potatoes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Louisiana does not mean to say that the Government has spent \$60,000,000 in buying rotten Irish potatoes. If so, it is even more of a scandal than I thought.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware is opposed to having the Congress take steps to care for these needy persons, he is at liberty to vote in that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say I would vote against this measure. I said in the beginning that I felt that some action was due, but I want to help these persons by doing more than just make speeches. If Senators are ashamed of some of these food destruction programs they should help stop them. Certainly it is nonsensical for the Federal Government to destroy food, when the Nation is at war and when many of our people need the food. What I am pointing out is that this amendment alone will not correct the situation. Let us go further and remove the causes of inflation.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am very sorry the Senator from Delaware wishes to object to such a small increase as \$5 in the assistance given to these persons.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I understand that the Senator from Arizona has suggested that inasmuch as a measure of this sort is to come to the Senate from the House of Representatives, it would be more in keeping with the nature of the amendment he has been discussing to have that matter handled in connection with the bill which is to reach us from the House of Representatives.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. Let me correct the Senator on one point: I do not know whether the House of Representatives will include in that bill an amendment of this sort. However, I am told that such a bill is about to be introduced in the House of Representatives, and will be introduced there either today or tomorrow. It will be a social-security bill. I am hopeful that this amendment will be included in it. If such an amendment is not included in the bill by the House of Representatives, we shall offer the amendment when that bill reaches the Senate. That bill will be a more

appropriate vehicle for such an amendment than the bill which is now before us.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am very glad to hear the distinguished majority leader say that, because when that measure reaches the Senate we shall have an opportunity to meet the situation in a proper way and to adopt a necessary amendment in the event the bill as passed by the House of Representatives is not satisfactory for the purpose the Senator from Arizona has in mind.

On the other hand, I am glad the present procedure has been followed, because the other approach might have resulted in long delay and might later have resulted in the pigeonholing of the bill in the House of Representatives, simply because the amendment did not originate there.

Mr. McFARLAND. I appreciate my friend's suggestion. He is always very helpful.

Mr. President, when the time comes, if the bill as passed by the House of Representatives does not include the amendment providing for a \$5 increase in the assistance rendered these needy persons, I hope the Senator from Kansas will join me in offering the amendment when the bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in full, at this point in the RECORD, the amendments I have offered, which are submitted in behalf of myself and a number of other Senators.

There being no objection, the amendments proposed by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. YOUNG) to the bill (H. R. 7230) to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to make nontaxable certain stock transfers made by insurance companies to secure the performance of obligations, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 14, strike out "act" and insert in lieu thereof "section."

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

Sec. 2. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$55—

"(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of \$25 multiplied by the total number of

such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month; plus

"(B) one-half the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$30, and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose."

(b) Section 403 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to dependent children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds \$30, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds \$30 with respect to one such dependent child and \$21 with respect to each of the other dependent children, and not counting so much of such expenditure for any month with respect to a relative with whom any dependent child is living as exceeds \$30—

"(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of the expenditures with respect to any month as exceeds the product of \$15 multiplied by the total number of dependent children and other individuals with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds \$18, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds \$18 with respect to one such dependent child and \$12 with respect to each of the other dependent children; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to dependent children, or both, and for no other purpose."

(c) Section 1003 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1003. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the blind, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to the sum of the following proportions of

the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$55—

"(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of \$25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the blind for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the blind, or both, and for no other purpose."

(d) Section 1403 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the permanently and totally disabled, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$50 per month arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, or income and resources from performance of service as a nurse as an employee, or in connection with the care of the sick or confined persons as an employee, shall not be the basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

"(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of \$25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month, plus

"(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the permanently and totally disabled, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds \$30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, or both, and for no other purpose."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall become effective October 1, 1952.

SEC. 3. (a) Title XI of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 1108 the following new section:

"MINIMUM STATE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE EXPENDITURES

"SEC. 1109. (a) If during any calendar year the total State expenditures (as defined in subsection (b)) for any State under titles I, IV, X, and XIV are less than the total

State expenditures for such State under such titles during the base period, the total amount payable to such State for such year under such titles shall not exceed the total amount payable during the base period.

"(b) As used in subsection (a), the term 'total State expenditures' means the difference between (1) the sum of the expenditures under State plans approved under titles I, IV, X, or XIV of this act with respect to which amounts are payable to the State under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), 1003 (a), and 1403 (a), respectively, and (2) the sum of the amounts so payable to the State; and the term 'base period', with respect to any calendar year, means the calendar year preceding such year."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective only with respect to payments to States under sections 3, 403, 1003, and 1403 of the Social Security Act for the period beginning January 1, 1953, and ending with the close of December 31, 1954.

Sec. 4. For a period of 1 year commencing October 1, 1952, notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not more than \$5 in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of September 1952, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual not in excess of \$50 per month arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, or income and resources from performance of service as a nurse as an employee, or in connection with the care of the sick or confined persons as an employee, shall not be the basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I now withdraw the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments submitted by the Senator from Arizona have been withdrawn.

The question now is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, is the Presiding Officer referring to Calendar 1421, House bill 7230?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MFARLAND. Yes, Mr. President, I point out that I have withdrawn my amendments; and House bill 7230, without amendment, is now before the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think there is no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7230) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

E. J. ALBRECHT CO.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the notice heretofore given

by me, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1414, Calendar No. 450.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1414) for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable during the morning hour. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the E. J. Albrecht Co., an Illinois corporation, the sum of \$142,007.75, in full satisfaction of the claim of such corporation against the United States for reimbursement for actual losses sustained by it in performing its contract with the United States for the construction of the outlet works for Sardis Dam on the Little Tallahatchie River, near Sardis, Miss., which losses were occasioned by an innocent misinterpretation of the contract by the corporation and by an extended delay in approving materials by the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not think there was much objection to this bill. It would authorize payment of \$142,007.75 to a contracting company for losses sustained in the construction of outlet structures for a dam in Mississippi under a Government contract. The losses were sustained by reason of the fact that the Government, acting through the Army engineers, caused an unreasonable and unnecessarily long delay in the construction work. The way the Army engineers caused the delay was by failing to approve certain change orders for the use of materials in the construction. Had the claimant been permitted to use the alternative materials earlier, much of the loss occasioned by the delay would not have occurred. The committee was of the opinion that because the delay was unreasonable the claimant should be reimbursed for the actual amount of loss occasioned thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to be recorded as voting in the negative on the question of the passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks he had better put the question on the passage of the bill. The question is, Shall the bill pass? [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I dislike very much to have a quorum

call for this bill. I understand that all the Senator from New Jersey wanted was to be recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct, Mr. President. But there may be other Members who want to be recorded.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the passage of Senate bill 1414.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this bill, if enacted, would be very bad legislation. It has been under consideration almost from the time I became a member of the Judiciary Committee. It was not unanimously reported from the committee. It involves a gift to a contractor who did not properly estimate the cost of the work for which he contracted. I think that to establish a precedent of this kind would jeopardize the whole future of the country. We cry about economy and about excessive expenditures, but here is a case which is being settled on a basis of so-called equity which affects both. The whole question has been before the Court of Claims. It was litigated before that court by consent of the Congress, and the court rejected the claim on strictly legal grounds.

I shall not go into the details of the bill, but I may say, Mr. President, that unless we stop this business of allowing private claims the way we are doing, Congress is going to be subject to serious charges on the part of the American people. We established the Court of Claims for one purpose; namely, to determine claims on a basis of not only law but equity as well. I say, Mr. President, that we should not legislate indiscriminately and without proper consideration in connection with private claims.

The Judiciary Committee is unable to go into the question and determine all the facts as a court of law would do or as the Court of Claims would do. If the Court of Claims cannot do its job properly, it is up to the Congress to establish a judicial arm of government which can adjudicate questions which involve principles of law and equity.

I realize that in this crucial day, when the world is on fire, and billions of dollars are being appropriated, it seems small to raise a question concerning the comparatively minor sum of approximately \$142,000; but there is a great principle involved. I voted in the committee on that principle, and I want to be recorded this afternoon on that principle. I should like to be recorded through a yea-and-nay vote, if possible, because I think that in determining this seemingly small question we are passing upon countless thousands and millions

of dollars as the years come and go, because we are continuing a very unwise principle which has been followed much too long, at least, so far as the junior Senator from New Jersey is concerned.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I wonder if the Senator can tell us the amount of the total contract in the first place.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The total contract was \$864,470.50.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Was the contract let on a bid basis?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. President, we are living in a country of free enterprise. We have so far succeeded because of our free-enterprise system. If we are going to subsidize persons because they are not careful in the first place, we are headed for real trouble.

I hope the Senate will defeat the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there is no member of the Committee on the Judiciary at present on the floor of the Senate, I ask that the bill go over until some other day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the request is granted, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, was the Senator referring to the bill just under consideration?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished majority leader. The postponement will give us all an opportunity to study the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill which went over was Senate bill 1414.

INCREASES IN FOREIGN SERVICE ANNUITIES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, was Calendar No. 1154, House bill 3401, considered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That measure has not been called.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3401) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to allow to about 300 retired Foreign Service employees the increase of \$300 which was granted in 1948, under the Langer-Stevenson Act, to all civil-service employees. Military and public-health personnel have received or will receive a similar increase. As I have said, House bill 3401 provides for the same increase for about 300 retired Foreign Service employees, who will not otherwise get the increase. The bill puts them on the same basis with the others. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will not object.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe that covers the bills which were to be called up today under the notice given Friday.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, notified the Senate that Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, vice Mr. WIGGLESWORTH excused.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2672) for the relief of Elisabeth Mueller (also known as Elizabeth Philbrick).

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4262) relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

WHY COMMUNISTS DO NOT WANT A TRUCE IN KOREA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey may yield to me, to permit me to make an insertion in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I must leave the chamber within a short time, and I appreciate the Senator's indulgence.

Mr. President, in the issue of the U. S. News & World Report of May 16 there appears a very excellent report from Tokyo. It is entitled "Why Communists Don't Want Truce—They Are Winning the War at Bargain Rates."

Mr. President, it is a very powerful and thought-provoking article on what to me is the manifest failure of our policies in Korea, militarily and otherwise. Without taking further time of the Senate I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing at pages 24 and 26 of the U. S. News & World Report be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

WHY COMMUNISTS DON'T WANT TRUCE—THEY ARE WINNING THE WAR AT BARGAIN RATES

TOKYO.—Any chance of a truce in Korea now appears to be gone. If war is to end, short of defeat for western nations, it will come only through a great new military offensive or as part of an over-all world settlement with Communists.

Top military commanders at last have arrived at this conclusion. It is a conclusion that has seemed logical to a good many observers on the ground for a long time. Cold logic, not sentiment or theory, lies back of the apparent Communist decision not to agree to a truce.

Truce talks, it finally is clear to United States negotiators, were a Communist ruse and stalling tactic from the start.

Talk induced United States to end military pressure on Communist armies when they were hard pressed. Talk led United States officials to announce that they no longer intended to try for a military victory. Through talk, Communists divided United Nations allies and caused United States to slow down its effort to get strong. While talk went on for nearly a year, Communists increased their military strength in Korea by at least 50 percent and probably by more. Truce talks, it turns out, have paid off in a big way for the Communist forces of the world.

Logic, from the first, was on the side of failure for any attempt to arrange a truce in Korea separate from any world settlement with Communists. The chart on page 26 gives you the line of Communist reasoning. It is the reasoning that governs at this time.

What the Communists tried, as the negotiators see it now, was one of the greatest tricks of all time, a variation on the old Trojan horse technique. Communist troops last spring were being driven back and cut to pieces by a big U. N. counteroffensive. So they offered an easy peace, an offering that American and other U. N. officials seized without suspecting what was afoot. Then, with the pressure off, Communists began to do tricks with their "wooden horse" at Kaesong and Panmunjom. They rebuilt their hard-hit armies from 600,000 up to 900,000 or more men. They moved in great quantities of supplies. They built up airfields and brought in about 1,400 planes. They trained their pilots in combat from safe bases, perfected interceptor techniques, and set up radar-guided antiaircraft networks. They brought in about 1,000 tanks and large amounts of artillery. And they constructed a "Siegfried line" of defenses all across the 155-mile front, in a depth of 30 miles or more.

Talks, meanwhile, were turned on and off in an effort to gain the maximum time without coming to any real agreement. At one stage, last autumn, they were turned off for 2 months until it looked as though the U. N. was ready to resume full-scale war. Then talks resumed in an air of optimism. Concessions were made, one after another, by western officials. Then new demands were added by the Communists. When agreement finally seemed near, Communists inserted a demand that they knew the West could never agree to—that Russia be named as a neutral observer to see that the Communists carried out terms of a truce.

Truth about the Communist "Trojan horse," suspected by many United States military men all along, finally became apparent to all when Communists turned down the final United States offer. By that time, the West had offered every concession it was able to make, short of complete surrender. Communists were handed a blank check to build airfields in North Korea, reduce the neutral inspection system to what military men considered a farce, run North Korea as they liked, and to build up freely for a future

offensive. Communist negotiators thus indicated that they did not want peace even as a gift, that they wanted talks to continue instead.

Behind this ruse are the hard facts of the Communist world, of events outside Korea that brought about the Communist decision to keep war simmering rather than accept a favorable peace.

Basic facts, from the Communist viewpoint, are these: As long as war can be kept dragging along in Korea, important amounts of Western military strength can be kept tied down there—strength that otherwise would be available in Europe. United States now has about 20 percent of its total military strength, and the bulk of its actual combat forces, engaged in or near Korea. A third of its combat divisions are there. Most of its new jet aircraft are involved there. A large share of its naval strength is in the Far East. Allied strength in Korea also represents a large part of defensive strength of United States allies available for overseas use. It is worth a great deal to the Communist high command to keep these forces involved in an out-of-the-way peninsula halfway around the world.

Other facts add to this basic advantage to the Communist of keeping things stirred up in Korea. For example:

War, kept going, can be used to cause dissension in the West, and to put down dissension in Communist Asia. The steady drain of United States casualties, adding up to about 29,000 since truce talks began, feeds American impatience to get the war over with. That leads to bickering with United States allies about what to do, what policy to follow for getting a peace in Korea while doing other things in Europe. At the same time, war gives Chinese Communists an opportunity and an excuse to liquidate groups in China that oppose the regime.

Costs of even a simmering war in far-off Korea, meanwhile, are kept high for the United States, while war costs are relatively small for the Communists. War in Korea actually costs Russia nothing. It costs China little more than the cost of keeping its armies at home. But it is costing United States from five to ten billions a year, plus the much larger costs of maintaining the larger armed forces required for Korea in the first place. That is certain to impress Communist planners, who know well the Marxist doctrine of trying to drain the enemy white with a minimum outlay of effort.

Communists, as a result, figure that they have much to gain and little to lose by keeping war stirred up in Korea.

Even if western patience ends and U. N. forces resume full-scale military pressure, the risk now is not too great. Communist strength, after a build-up of nearly a year, is far better situated to meet a major offensive than it was last spring. The drain on the West, meanwhile, will be greatly increased in any military offensive, while the drain on Communist forces would be largely in expendable Chinese manpower.

It all adds up to the conclusion, as military men see it, that the Communists brought a Moscow-style Trojan horse to the conference tents at Panmunjom, and that United States hopes for a negotiated truce for Korea, except as part of a world-wide deal, are dead.

SECURITY THROUGH ECONOMY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I propose to address myself briefly to the subject of the domestic military budget.

On Monday last I voted to refer the mutual-security bill to the Armed Services Committee for their consideration before we start the debate of the bill on the floor.

I understand the bill will probably come up shortly and will be debated later this week.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, which had considered and reported the bill, I might have been open to some criticism for not insisting that sufficient committee consideration had been given to this proposed legislation. My reasons, however, for supporting the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to refer the matter to the Armed Services Committee can be briefly summarized.

First, it seemed to me that the legislation authorizing military aid to our European and other allies is closely connected with our over-all military program, which is under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. That committee, or some other committee, certainly should consider these two programs together in order to give us a complete picture of what our over-all military commitments for fiscal 1953 will be.

My second reason for voting to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee was that I felt that the members of that committee who have responsibility for our military expenditures should be enabled, if they so desired, to get first-hand evidence with regard to world requirements outside the United States.

My third reason is that I feel a special burden of responsibility personally for voting the authorization of these enormous amounts of money. I therefore welcome the further study and scrutiny by any of my colleagues in the Senate who feel able to give time and attention to these problems. As this only involved a matter of 10 days I felt that probable results would fully justify the delay.

Prior to the opening of the debate on the mutual security bill, which will probably come up in the Senate the latter part of this week, I want to make some observations to my colleagues on our over-all fiscal situation. First of all, it is my conviction that it would be extremely dangerous, uneconomical and unwise to make any further cuts in the mutual security bill beyond those recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee. Our carefully considered recommendations contemplate a total cut of \$1,000,000,000, which is 12.6 percent of the amounts originally asked for. The House has recommended a similar cut. The recent message from General Eisenhower to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, fully confirms our position.

In light of my conviction that the Mutual Security Program cannot safely be cut any further, I have undertaken a study of our \$52,000,000,000 budget for the Department of Defense, and I desire to submit to my colleagues certain tentative suggestions with regard to the reduction of our military budget, which I sincerely hope the Committee on Armed Services will consider, as well as the Department of Defense. I also hope, of course, that these suggestions will be explored by the Appropriations Committee before the final appropriations for fiscal 1953 are made.

I make no claim to be an authority in the field of budgeting or military planning. However, I have had these studies of our domestic military program made. I feel that the information which has been supplied offers room for hope that we can reduce our domestic military budget without imperiling our national security and without further cutting the Mutual Security Program.

I wish to make it very clear that I oppose the approach which was taken in the House where a \$46,000,000,000 ceiling was placed on Defense Department expenditures for the fiscal year 1953.

I should like to say, parenthetically, that when I refer to expenditures upon which the House put a ceiling, I have in mind the attack in that body on the appropriations already provided. As fast as essential articles can come off production lines, I am in favor of that money being paid out during the coming year in order to get the end items we need for our military operations both here and abroad. For this reason I object to the \$46,000,000,000 ceiling which the House has placed on such expenditures.

Secretary Lovett's objections to this move are most legitimate. I am not proposing a limit on funds already appropriated. I am suggesting that we need not grant the full amounts asked for in the present budget request. This matter is complicated. Unless we distinguish between authorizations, appropriations, and expenditures we become confused. Lack of distinction between these processes has caused a great deal of trouble in our thinking. Let me submit, therefore, my suggestions of various approaches which may be explored with the end in view of materially reducing the domestic military budget for fiscal 1953.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Economy and Wisdom," published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 7, 1952. I think this excellent editorial points out the particular distinction I am trying to make in my remarks.

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

ECONOMY AND WISDOM

We are not wholly persuaded by the objections of military leaders to congressional attempts to cut defense expenditures. But we think Congress should exercise far more wisdom in its economizing.

The main complaint is against a ceiling of \$46,000,000,000 on defense costs for the fiscal year of 1953, slicing planned payments by \$6,000,000,000. This came on top of a cut of \$4,000,000,000 in the budget made by the House of Representatives. The services plead eloquently that meat-ax cuts are endangering the defense program, and beg the Senate to repair the damage.

The military leaders aim most of their shafts at the ceiling on dollar outlay in the coming year. They declare the House action would stop payment on equipment already ordered and force perilous delays. They declare it would cut 3,000 tanks and 20 air wings from defense forces. The Navy not only sees its program greatly delayed but has a special grievance—the House not only required savings but refused to let the Navy make them in weapons it considers least essential.

We have a notion that the services have not underestimated the damage these cuts would do. Moreover, their arguments fail to take into consideration a feeling that lay behind much of the House action. There is a kind of frustration in efforts to economize on specific military demands while convinced that waste or fat still remains in military spending. The figures offered by the services seem to assume that there is no fat left to sacrifice and that cuts must come out of muscle.

We are not convinced. Yet the House did use a meat ax. Too many Congressmen have behaved as if they were far more interested in making a show of economy in an election year than in strengthening national defenses with as little waste as possible. A good deal of careful committee work went into the cuts proposed in the budget. But the ceiling on expenditures came out of a last-minute floor stampede.

Comptroller General Warren has pointed out that this plan does not reduce expenditures; it only postpones the day when payment must be made. Also the date of delivery of needed weapons. The Air Force says it means putting off until 1957 its modernized 126-wing program. (It figures Russia will be modernized by 1954.) Allowing for some leeway in such figuring, does Congress want to take responsibility for whatever delay is involved?

Almost an excess of responsibility appears to be involved in the House's decision to bar the Navy from building another flush-deck carrier. The Navy put this big ship at the top of its priority list. It offered to make cuts elsewhere in order to get money for the carrier. The admirals do not inevitably know best what they need to fight with, but Congress should think twice before assuming that on technical matters its judgment is superior.

We hope the Senate will insist on economy, but mix in more wisdom.

LIMITED MOBILIZATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 21, 1952, the President sent to the Congress his budget message for the fiscal year 1953. In this message he estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1953 at \$85,400,000,000. Under existing tax laws receipts for 1953 have been estimated at \$71,000,000,000. Later estimates suggest that receipts may be as low as \$65,000,000,000. No less an authority than our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] told the Committee on Foreign Relations that our tax receipts this coming year probably would not exceed \$65,000,000,000.

This means that, barring a change in our tax legislation, a deficit of between \$14,000,000,000 and \$20,000,000,000 for 1953 is in prospect if the Congress were to appropriate and expend the full sum requested.

Few, if any, Members of this body have either the time or the staff to make a detailed analysis of the President's budget and the justifications behind it. This need not mean, however, that the Congress must relinquish its right and duty to maintain proper control over the expenditures of the executive branch of the Government. We can establish much-needed guidelines for action. It is just such guidelines that I am suggesting in these remarks today.

There is a tendency in periods of emergency, such as that of the present, to flinch from making budget cuts for fear of being charged with having

jeopardized the national security. But it is in just such periods of emergency that the responsibility of the legislative branch is greatest. We would be most derelict in our duty were we to stand idly by while our economy was destroyed under the stress of military preparation. A healthy economy is our greatest source of strength. Military preparedness we need; but not at the price of economic suicide.

When, following the outbreak of war in Korea, we undertook the present program of defense build-up the President and other leaders of the administration repeatedly stated that the plan was one of partial or limited mobilization.

Parenthetically, I wish to say that I recall talking with Secretary Marshall on this point. He was in favor of having our industries prepared, but he felt that we should move along the line of partial or limited mobilization.

It was argued that we faced a long-time challenge of Communist aggression and that we would be in a safer position both militarily and economically if we concentrated upon building our industrial capacity rather than weapons alone. The proposal was to aim for a production plateau in armaments at which point we would level off and attempt to hold this "readiness" position.

I wish to make it clear that I am in general agreement with the limited mobilization approach to the threat which faces us. I am convinced that we must be prepared to face probes and pressures from the Soviet world for many years to come. Since the challenge facing us may extend over decades we cannot afford to dissipate our energies in too rapid mobilization. All-out mobilization at this time would not only cause ruinous inflation but would most likely produce arms many of which would very soon become obsolete. The sound approach is to concentrate upon increasing industrial capacity and building a readiness plateau from which we could quickly move to all-out mobilization should that prove necessary.

Mr. President, it is precisely because I believe in the essential soundness of the limited mobilization approach that I am worried about the direction in which we now appear to be going. I do not believe that we would be true to the partial mobilization concept if we were to commit this country to a \$14,000,000,000 deficit or more in the next fiscal year.

If this Congress is going to appropriate the sum the President has requested it should face the full implications of such a budget. The chief implication we must face is that a deficit of this size would set in motion tremendous new forces of inflation. We know that the full pressure from funds already appropriated is still to come. The only way that this inflation could be averted would be to impose rigid new controls, both direct and indirect.

Mr. President, we cannot have it both ways. Either we stick to the partial mobilization concept, limiting both our expenditures and our controls and maintaining a relatively balanced and healthy economy; or we increase further our

Government expenditures, incur new pressures of inflation, and necessitate rigid economic controls. The President's program appears to be an attempt to run a suicidal middle road. It is neither partial mobilization nor all-out mobilization. Being neither one thing nor the other, it brings us the benefits of neither. Such a program would bring us neither the economic stability of limited mobilization nor the quick preparedness of all-out mobilization. It will bring us the inflationary pressures of full mobilization without the anti-inflation controls. It will not bring us our money's worth in armament, because the dollar will be continually inflated. This is to say nothing of the danger of investing in arms, many of which may soon become obsolete.

I realize that my critics will hasten to answer my argument by declaring that everything would be rosy if the Congress would only agree to the President's request for a tax increase. Now I am not adverse to considering ways in which our tax structure might be improved. But I would remind my critics that there is a point of diminishing returns in any tax system, and we may soon be approaching that point. We must not risk destroying investment if we are to continue to base our preparedness program upon increasing our industrial potential. Furthermore, I might ask a realistic question. What chance is there of this Congress raising taxes further, no matter what the arguments? We all know that there is very little chance of Congress raising taxes further; and that is a sound position for the Congress to take at this time.

Mr. President, I wish to confine the remainder of my remarks to a general discussion of the areas of the budget in which I believe that we should concentrate our attention. In this connection let me say that I believe we must face the fact that if we are to avoid a substantial deficit we must make large cuts in the domestic military budget. Seventy-three percent of the proposed budget, the over-all budget, is to go either directly to the military services or to our international programs, the major part of which is for military defense. Excluding veterans' benefits and interest on the debt, only 15 percent of the budget goes for other expenditures. Therefore, we must recognize the hard truth that we cannot avoid further inflation merely by attacking non-defense spending. Of course, I favor attacking nondefense spending, but that alone is not sufficient.

My remarks will attempt to show that savings can be made in two ways: (a) by cutting waste and duplication in the Defense Department and (b) by limiting the growth of unexpended balances. I emphasize particularly the second point, which I shall develop further in a moment.

WASTE AND DUPLICATION

Mr. President, probably the greatest source of waste in our defense program lies in the fact that we have still not achieved unification within the Department of Defense. When the President's

budget was being prepared for the fiscal year 1952, a year ago, the budgets of each of the services were prepared entirely separately. Each was prepared and sealed in a vacuum, no service having a clear picture of the program of its sister services. The result was that when the three budgets were added up by the Secretary of Defense they were found to come to the astonishing total of more than \$100,000,000,000. It was not until the combined staffs of the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the Secretary of Defense went over the budgets again that the total was brought down to about \$60,000,000,000.

I am relating this story because I believe that it illustrates a situation in the Department of Defense which is conducive to extreme waste. Recent investigations have brought forth examples of duplication of purchases and price discrepancies which could be greatly remedied were there real unification and an effective single procurement system for the Department of Defense as a whole.

This lack of integration and coordination has also produced wasteful expenditures in the construction field. I am advised of more than one example of where construction projects have been proposed which would be unnecessary were the services to share utilities and various recreation and other facilities.

The Preparedness Investigating Committee of the Senate Armed Services Committee—that is, the Lyndon Johnson committee—has recently brought out much evidence of waste and lack of adequate control in construction projects. Perhaps the most startling examples are the cases of the air bases in North Africa and Greenland. In the case of the Blue Jay project in Greenland, near the North Pole, one estimate was made during the hearings that the project would ultimately cost \$1,000,000,000. Here we have an air base built in an area with just about the worst weather conditions imaginable. The Department of Defense should certainly give some justification for building an air base in an area with such weather conditions, at a cost of this magnitude.

Mr. President, I recognize the fact that there may have been good reason for undertaking the building of the project. I do not question the wisdom of our Joint Chiefs of Staff in determining the matter, but it seems to me that a project so startling as this one, which the subcommittee under the able leadership of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has pointed out, it certainly calls for some explanation.

Mr. President, the wastes stemming from duplication are obvious. At a time when manpower is scarce we find each of the services employing thousands of people to perform parallel functions. Where we had two separate services prior to unification we now have the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the expanding Office of the Secretary of Defense. This system has brought to the Washington area some 160,000 military and civilian personnel.

At the height of World War II, we had only about—and I emphasize the fact—200,000 people working for the services in this area. This was when we had almost four times as many men under arms. The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services—and I again refer to the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Texas—in its annual report dated March 20, 1952, stated that its study had "disclosed the astonishing fact that the United States is operating a military machine of about 3,500,000 with nearly the same number of generals, admirals, and civilian employees in Washington that it had on VE-day, when the total number in uniform was well over 12,000,000."

Many who visit the Pentagon report that they are impressed at the extremely large number of field-grade officers to be seen there. Not only are we overbalanced with generals and admirals; we also have myriads of majors and lieutenant colonels who are often doing work of a largely clerical nature. Many of these officers are doing work that is comparable to that being done by civil servants who are paid \$3,000 or \$4,000 less.

This brings me to my next point, Mr. President. I am convinced that we could save a great deal of the taxpayers' money by a more careful screening of the positions that are being held by people in uniform. Representatives of the Department of Defense have maintained that they have been hampered by the ceilings that have been placed upon the number of civilians which they might employ. This may be true. I am not yet convinced that these ceilings have to be raised. But we certainly should not be putting people in uniform to fill positions that could more cheaply be handled by civilians. It is generally admitted that it is less expensive in most cases to fill a position with a civilian than a military person. This is particularly true in the lower and middle grade positions. I do not know why the taxpayer should spend money to recruit, outfit, and train Wacs who are then sent to Washington to drive military automobiles around the city. This is an example of the point which I am trying to bring out.

I should like also to say something on the subject of automobiles. Last year the Congress, if I remember correctly, attached a rider to the appropriations bill which prevented the civilian departments of the Government from hiring chauffeurs. I do not know how much money was saved by this provision, but any saving these days is important. This provision, however, did not touch the military. While civilian officials of relatively high rank are forced to take busses and streetcars, officers at the Pentagon can get automobiles and drivers without difficulty. Anyone who has ever been to the Pentagon must have noticed the scores of military vehicles with military drivers sitting outside waiting for passengers. Mr. President, if we are going to cut civilian transportation we certainly should cut this ex-

travagance on the part of the military. It is unjust and unhealthy to permit a practice to continue at a vastly larger scale, in the military departments, when we forbid the same practice within important areas of our civil government.

Mr. President, it is my belief that we could save thousands of dollars by attacking some of the problems which I have set forth. Certainly it is the duty of the Congress constantly to press for a closer integration of the military services. I am convinced that a greater vigilance on our part in overseeing these huge military programs could cut out wasteful duplication and extravagance.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES

Mr. President, I now turn to my other point, namely, the huge unexpended balances which are on hand. In that connection I should like to submit three exhibits relating to the unexpended balances, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. They are identified as exhibits A, B, and C.

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

EXHIBIT A

Estimated unexpended balances for Department of Defense

[Millions of dollars]

Unexpended balances, June 30, 1950	10.7
New obligation authority, 1951	51.1
Total available, 1951	61.8
Expenditures, 1951	19.7
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1951	42.1
New obligation authority, 1952	61.0
Total available, 1952	103.1
Estimated expenditures, 1952	39.0
Unexpended balance, June 20, 1952	64.1
New obligation authority, 1953	52.1
Total available, 1953	116.2
Estimated expenditures, 1953	50.0
Unexpended balance, June 20, 1953	66.2

EXHIBIT B

Monthly expenditure rates, Department of Defense

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year and month	Monthly rate	Percent of previous figure
Average monthly rate 1951	1,619	—
Average monthly rate 1952 to date	2,996	85
Average monthly rate remainder of 1952:		
To meet budget goals	3,758	25
To meet revised budget goals	4,088	36
To meet Department of Defense goals	3,633	21
Average monthly rate next 16 months:		
To meet budget goals for 1953	4,066	36
To meet revised budget goals	4,033	35
To meet Department of Defense goals	4,271	43
To make up 1952 slippage	4,064	36

EXHIBIT C

Defense expenditures of Department of Defense

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year and month	1951	1952
July	960	2,885
August	1,104	2,919
September	1,002	2,510
October	1,304	3,113
November	1,396	2,978
December	1,462	3,047
January	1,595	3,363
February	1,594	3,155
March	1,986	2,835
April	2,080	2,919
May	2,324	2,510
June	2,617	3,113
		23,969

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, exhibit A begins with June 30, 1950, and runs up through June 30, 1953, a period of 3 years. It adds the new obligation authority given to the Department of Defense and subtracts expenditures made each year. From this exhibit it can be seen that as of June 30, 1952, there will remain an unexpended balance for the Department of Defense of \$64,100,000. I will repeat that figure. The unexpended balance in the Department of Defense will be \$64,100,000 as of June 30, 1952. If we project these figures into 1953 on the basis of the funds requested by the Department of Defense, we find that on June 30, 1953, on the basis of expected expenditures, there would remain an unexpended balance of \$66,200,000. I may say that the last figures are derived on the basis of what the military departments expect their expenditures to be. I have had these figures very carefully checked, and they were discussed with the Department of Defense. So far as we can ascertain, the figures are correct. In the past the military have generally overestimated their rates of expenditures, because our production lines are not bringing forth the items as rapidly as we had expected, and it is probable that the \$66,200,000 unexpended figure which I have given would be even higher if we were to grant all of the funds requested.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield, or would he rather not be interrupted at this point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would prefer to proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask a question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask whether the Senator from New Jersey is covering air expenditures in his statement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The figures I gave are for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, as reflected in the budget of

the Department of Defense which the President has submitted to Congress.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely wished to call the Senator's attention to certain figures, but he has probably covered them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as I said, in the past the Department of Defense has generally overestimated its rate of expenditures, and it is probable that the \$66,200,000,000 unexpended figure which I have given would be even higher if we were to grant all the funds requested.

(In the RECORD of May 16, 1952, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey made the following correction of Exhibit A, above, and of his remarks in connection therewith:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in connection with the address which I made last Monday on the subject of the military budget I inserted a chart marked exhibit A. I have been advised that an error was made in the preparation of that chart and I wish at this time to insert a corrected version of that exhibit. The corrected exhibit shows that as of June 30, 1953, the Department of Defense will have an unexpended balance of \$61,200,000,000, instead of sixty-six and two tenths as first calculated.

My revised calculations are that this large unexpended balance would permit us to make the same percentage cut in the military budget as the Foreign Relations Committee made in the Mutual security bill. A cut of 12.6 percent in the \$52,000,000,000 military budget would give us a savings of \$6,600,000,000. When this is added to the billion dollar reduction in the mutual-security bill it would give us a total saving of seven and six-tenths billion.

I wish to point out that in addition to the Department of Defense and mutual security budgets we are to be presented with two additional budgets which are an integral part of our defense program. There are the \$2,600,000,000 military construction budget and the \$4,000,000,000 atomic energy expansion program. It should be clear that all of these programs should be looked at as one package. If we do this it may be possible to approach a balanced budget without jeopardizing our national security.

Mr. President, I make this brief statement to correct my speech of last Monday, and also as a forerunner to the debate on the mutual security bill, which I assume will be before us next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

(The corrected chart submitted by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:)

EXHIBIT A

Estimated unexpended balances for Department of Defense

[Billions of dollars]

Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1950	9.0
New obligation authority, 1951	47.8
Total available, 1951	56.8
Expenditures, 1951	19.7
Total available, 1952	37.1

Unexpended balance June 30, 1951	37.1
New obligation authority, 1952	61.0

Total available, 1952	98.1
-----------------------	------

Estimated expenditures, 1952	39.0
Unexpended balance June 30, 1952	59.1
New obligation authority, 1953	52.1
Total available, 1953	111.2
Estimated expenditures, 1953	50.0
Unexpended balance June 30, 1953	61.2

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In exhibit B an entirely different approach is taken. Exhibit B is a comparison of monthly expenditure rates, and shows the extent to which expenditures would be increased if the past slippage was to be made up and budget goals reached. By slippage I mean the extent to which actual production and expenditures for production have fallen behind the estimated goals.

A study of this exhibit makes evident the fact that expenditures would have to be increased 36 percent over the present rate to justify the 1952 appropriation. Again, the average monthly expenditure rate would have to increase at least 36 percent to meet 1953 budget goals for the Department of Defense.

Exhibit C gives defense expenditures for fiscal years 1951 and 1952 by months.

The conclusion to be drawn from these figures is obvious.

In other words, Mr. President, assuming this budget and the appropriations in accordance with it, the Defense Department would have to increase its expenditures at least 30 percent, in order to reach these goals. The military have not been able to spend the funds which they have received at anywhere near the rate which they have predicted that they would spend them. Secretary Lovett has pointed out that the production of long-lead-time items could not be increased in the fiscal year 1953 no matter how much money was appropriated in the 1953 budget. Yet the Department of Defense is making a request for over \$50,000,000,000 for fiscal 1953, when it has an unexpended balance in the neighborhood of \$40,000,000,000. I realize that these figures are a little difficult to grasp, but I have had them carefully prepared, so that all Members of the Senate can study them in detail.

Mr. President, I know what the answer of the Department of Defense will be to these statements. It will argue that certain production bottlenecks have held down its expenditure rates, and that those rates will increase very much in the future. It is certainly true that production difficulties have delayed deliveries of military end items, and thus, have retarded expenditures. It is also probably true that production will go up and expenditure rates will increase. But the big question is whether we can expect expenditures to increase as much as 30 to 40 percent. I submit, Mr. President, that to rely on increases in expenditures of such dimensions within the next year or two would be unjustified. We cannot afford to base our appropriations upon such doubtful estimates.

Mr. President, the Defense Department probably will also argue that funds must be available to enable it to make obligations on long lead-time items. I agree entirely that this is true. But I

ask the Senate, is not an unexpended balance of forty to fifty billion dollars enough to take care of such lead-time requirements? I realize that the financing of long-lead-time items and the making of production schedules is a rather complicated process. I am willing to admit that I am not a specialist in this field. I do, however, suggest that the evidence appears to be heavily against making such a big appropriation for 1953.

So I come to the general conclusion that in my judgment a cut of \$10,000,000,000 could be made, from the Department of Defense budget and, on the basis of the Department's own expenditure rates, it would still have an unexpended balance of \$56,200,000,000 on June 30, 1953.

Mr. President, I have been told—and this observation is a very important one; I have had it checked carefully, and I am told it is accurate—that early in the budget season the National Security Council established a budget ceiling of \$45,000,000,000 for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1953. This figure was largely the result of fiscal and economic considerations as to what our economy could stand. The Secretary of Defense then set certain bench marks for the military services, and established guidelines under which the Army, Navy, and Air Force were to draw up their budgets. The three budgets were then carefully reviewed by the combined staffs of the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The final figure for the Department of Defense which the combined staffs recommended totaled \$42,700,000,000. It will be noted that this figure was \$8,200,000,000 less than that which appeared in the President's budget. I believe it is significant that this combined staff apparently felt it safe to propose a military budget so much lower than that finally submitted to us.

Mr. President, I believe strongly that the very life of our economic system may depend upon how well this Congress maintains its control over Government expenditures. The responsibility for maintaining these controls cannot be delegated. The responsibility of the Department of Defense is to protect this Nation in the military field. It is of course to be expected—and, in fact, it is the duty of the Defense Department to do so—that all other considerations will be subordinated to the building of our military might. We, therefore, are presented with these requests for enormous funds. As I have said, I believe it is the duty of the Defense Department to present us with what it believes to be the correct figures regarding the needs for the total over-all national defense.

However, we in the Congress also have a duty to perform. Mr. President, it is the duty of this body to consider the larger picture. It is we, the Congress, who must weigh the need for these appropriations against the need to protect our economic system.

Because any department of the executive branch naturally tends to make its requests in terms of its own particular problems, it is imperative that this body give these requests the closest scrutiny.

We cannot afford to permit the future of our economy to be determined by any chance result of pressures from various individual departments of Government. In this connection, I suggest that it may be a very questionable policy to allow any department of Government to build up as large a backlog of unexpended balances as has been done by the Department of Defense. As exhibit A shows, this backlog has grown regularly over the years. With funds of this dimension in reserve, any department, no matter how great the integrity of its officers, will find waste more difficult to control. Mr. President, I consider reserves of this size dangerous; and I believe that we are neglecting our responsibilities when we permit a situation of this sort to continue. We cannot abandon our control over the purse strings of the Nation. I believe this matter deserves the most earnest study and consideration of the departments concerned, and especially of the Appropriations Committees.

Therefore, Mr. President, for the reasons I have outlined, I suggest that we should aim toward cutting from eight to ten billion dollars from the request of the Department of Defense this year. From such evidence as I have received, I believe that such a cut might safely be made without in any way impairing the defenses of the Nation. I submit that such a cut would do much to stabilize our economy and to protect us in the long-range struggle which faces us.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, with the greatest respect, which I have, for the directing heads of the Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and our entire military, naval, and air personnel, I submit the foregoing suggestions in the hope that they will be fully explored, to the end that vitally important reductions will be made in our defense appropriations. I feel that the taxpayers of the United States and the Members of the Congress, who represent those taxpayers, are entitled to a full and clear explanation of the reasons why these suggested economies cannot be effected this year.

RECESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 13, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12, 1952:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Thomas Chalmers Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1957. (Reappointment.)

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James H. Flanagan, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1952. (Reappointment.)

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Craig B. Aalyson	William D. Bourne	Albert G. Cohen	Robert J. Eustace
Emile W. Achee	William W. Bowers	William M. Coldwell	Merton R. Fallon
Francis M. Adams, Jr.	Rhodes Boykin, Jr.	Leonor L. Collins	Robert E. Fellowes
Richard D. Adams	William J. D. Bradford III	Robert S. Collins	Leslie K. Fenlon, Jr.
Edward C. Adkins	Robert E. Brady	William D. Collins, Jr.	Harvey Ferer
Richard S. Agnew	Walter J. Brajdich	Oliver D. Colvin, Jr.	James V. Ferrero, Jr.
Hugh W. Albers	Delbert Brandenburg	Richard R. Colvin	Stanley S. Fine
Edward L. Alderman	William W. Brandfon	Robert N. Congdon	William A. Flinlay, Jr.
Robert B. Aljoe	Paul A. Brandorff	Harvey Conover, Jr.	John E. Fishburn III
Robert E. Allard	Carl R. Brandt	Karl F. Cook	Raymond R. Fletcher, Jr.
Lawrence R. Allen	John W. Brannon, Jr.	Robert J. Coontz	George D. Florence
Milton N. Allen	Charles B. Breaux, Jr.	Stanley G. Cooper	Henry P. Forbes
Richard R. Allmann	Edward S. Briggs	Stanley T. Counts	Arthur B. Forrest, Jr.
John H. Alvis	George G. Brooker	Sidney S. Cox	Sydney E. Foscato, Jr.
John M. Andersen	William R. Broughton, Jr.	Thomas E. Cox	James R. Foster
Gerald B. Anderson	Coleman T. Brown, Jr.	Frank W. Craddock	John B. Foster
Robert J. Anderson	Ernest B. Brown	Donald E. Craig	Wynn F. Foster
Robert G. Anderson	Frank P. Brown, Jr.	Edgar A. Cruise, Jr.	Albert J. Frainier, Jr.
Ted M. Annenberg	James B. Brown	John B. Culp, Jr.	Joyce M. Frazee
Robert H. Ardinger	Marvin N. Brown	George W. Cummings	Warren J. Fredericks
Junius H. Arnold, Jr.	Robert A. Brown	Theodore A. Curtin	Richard A. Frost
A. J. Martin Atkins	Robert C. Brown, Jr.	Stanley W. Curtis, Jr.	Peter L. Fullinwider
Edward Auerswald	William E. Brown	Donald A. Dahlman	James L. Furrh, Jr.
Wilfred A. Bacchus	Gerald F. Brummitt	John M. Dalrymple	Donald A. Gairing
Winston T. Bachmann	William L. Bryan	John F. Danis	Richard E. Galloway
Allan F. Bacon.	Harry F. Bryant, Jr.	Theodore E. Daum	Loyd F. Galyean
John A. Bacon, Jr.	Benjamin J. Brzenski, Jr.	Vincent A. Dauvo	Channing Gardner
Herman M. Bading	Robert A. Buck	William W. Davenport	James R. Garner
Talmadge S. Baggett	Winfred L. Bucking- ham	Chester G. Davis	John P. Gartland
Robert F. Bahlman	Albert T. Buckmaster	Roger E. Davis	David E. Gates
William M. Bailey	Robert W. Bulmer	Whittier G. Davis	Matthew J. Gauss, Jr.
Richard T. Bailey	William L. Burgess, Jr.	Edward R. Day, Jr.	Ralph M. Ghormley
Orlie G. Baird	Gerald L. Burk	David E. Dearolph	Wilmer R. Gilbert
John C. Bajus	John F. Burke	Anthony P. DeFalco	Claude F. Giles
Robert F. Baker	James V. Burton	John A. Demasters	Omni L. Gillette
Allen H. Balch	Barksdale A. Bush, Jr.	Jules H. Demytten- aere	Gordon B. Gish
William J. Balko	Herman J. Bushman, Jr.	Edwin L. Dennis, Jr.	Beaumont Glass, Jr.
Stanford Balmforth	Dempsey Butler, Jr.	Lawrence H. Derby, Jr.	Stephen S. Glass
Jack E. Baltar	James D. Butler	Arthur C. Derrick	Frank S. Glendinning
Robert Barden	Kenneth L. Butler	William E. Dewey	William I. Goeway
Douglas L. Barker	Thomas O. Butler, Jr.	William W. DeWolf	Milton D. Goldberg
Henry B. Barkley, Jr.	William M. Callaghan, Jr.	James D. Dickson	Roy E. Goldman
Ralph R. Barnard	David O. Campbell	Joe A. Dickson	Russell F. Goodacre, Jr.
John C. Barrow	Donald H. Campbell	Edward O. Dietrich	Robert W. Goodman
John F. Barrow	Charles J. Bauman, Jr.	Benjamin Dillahunt	Roy R. Grayson
Joseph J. Barrow	Lucien Capone, Jr.	Louis W. Dillman	James H. Green
Byron S. Bartholomew, Jr.	Fred G. Baur	Horace E. Dismukes	John W. Green
Bernard E. Bassing	Reaves H. Baysinger, Jr.	John C. Dixon, Jr.	John L. Greene
Lee P. Bauerlein	Raymond W. Bean	Stephen A. Dobbins	Richard G. Greenwood
Charles J. Bauman, Jr.	Reynolds Beckwith	William C. Dobyn	Stanley J. Greif
Francis J. Bauman, Jr.	Lawrence E. Beecher	John F. Docherty, Jr.	Jesse F. Griffith
Edward S. Carver	James W. Beeler	Harry J. Donahue	David O. Gudal
George M. Benas, Jr.	George M. Benas, Jr.	John M. Donlon	Michael B. Guild
Cedric E. Bennett	Earl L. Carter	James A. Donovan	David L. Gunckel
Francis W. Benson, Jr.	Robert H. Cartmill	Furt F. Dorenkamp	Milton Gussow
George A. Benson	Edward S. Carver	William C. Dotson	Douglas B. Guthe
Richard H. Benson	John F. Carver	Albert S. Douglass	William S. Guthrie
Richard H. Berby	Harold D. Case	Robert M. Douglass	Robert A. Guyer
David W. Berger	Charles W. Cates	Barton M. Downes	Donald H. Hagge
Melvin Berngard	Donald M. Cherno	Leslie R. Downs	James V. Haley
Robert B. Bernhardt	Samuel R. Chessman	Richard B. Doyle	Hughen Halliburton
Karl J. Bernstein	Edmond A. Chevalier	John E. Draim	Harold E. Hamilton
William E. Biro	Milton J. Chewning	Royce C. Dreyer	Kennard R. Hamilton
Robert J. Bixler	Raymond G. Chote	James R. Dughi	William H. Hamilton, Jr.
Robert S. Blake	Louis G. Churchill, Jr.	William E. Duke, Jr.	Theodore J. Hammer, Jr.
David H. Blalock, Jr.	Glenwood Clark, Jr.	Valerio M. Duronio	Robert L. Haney
Frederick J. Blodgett	Robert S. Clark	Behrend J. DuWaldt	James W. Hanson
Thomas E. Bloom	Willard H. Clark, Jr.	Gerald W. Dyer	Norton D. Harding, Jr.
Rollin W. Bloomfield	Horace D. Clarke, Jr.	Nelson W. Eaton	William N. Harkness, Jr.
Paul R. Boggs, Jr.	Wade E. Clarke	William T. Eaton	Donald M. Harlan
Roger M. Boh, Jr.	Charles J. Clarkson, Jr.	James E. Edmundson	William L. Harris, Jr.
Leon T. Bonner, Jr.	Jean S. Clauzel	Devon E. Edrington	Charles P. Harry, Jr.
Joseph E. Bores	Thomas C. Clay	John R. Edson	William C. Haskell
Waldo L. Born	Richard A. Clayton	Howard R. Edwards, Jr.	John B. Hawkins, Jr.
Donald B. Bosley	Richard C. Clinite		Dale A. Hawley
Edward N. Bouffard	David G. Cluett		John W. Healy
Alfred C. Boughton III	Warrington C. Cobb		Donald M. Hegart
			Walter L. Heilig, Jr.
			Dale P. Helmer
			John W. Hemann
			Milburn K. Hemnick
			Donald Henderson
			Jimmie C. Hendricks
			Robert C. Hendrick- son, Jr.
			Robert C. Hennekens

Harvey S. Henning, Jr.	Robert G. Kuhne
Frederick W. Herbine	Merrill E. LaBonte
Jr.	Michael K. Lake
Frederick D. Hesley	William G. Laroy, Jr.
Jr.	Chris W. Lamb
Francis R. Hibbard	John G. Landers
Charles F. Hickey	Charles E. Langton, Jr.
Robert W. Hiebert	John S. Lansill, Jr.
Jackson D. Hill	Paul H. Laric
Joseph E. Hodder, Jr.	David C. Larish
William E. Hoff	Norman O. Larson
John L. Hofford	Theodore J. Larson
John H. Hoganson	Robert M. Laske
Henry E. Hohn	Lloyd K. Lauderdale
Charles R. Holman	Robert L. Lawler, Jr.
Allan F. Holmgren	William G. Lawler, Jr.
Donald P. Holt	Russell J. Lear
John C. Holz	Mark B. Lechleiter, Jr.
Bertie G. Homan	Thomas F. Lechner
Lloyd N. Hoover	Leon D. Lewis
Frederick G. Horan	John F. Leyerle
Charles A. Hotchkiss	Theodore E. Lide, Jr.
II	James B. Linder
Charles B. House, Jr.	Wesley E. Lindsey, Jr.
James A. Howe	Thomas D. Linton, Jr.
William F. Hubbard, Jr.	Donald Lister
Vern K. Hugus	Steven M. Little
Eugene S. Ince, Jr.	Hiram P. Llewellyn
James E. Inskip, Jr.	Bruce B. Lloyd
Gilbert Jacobsen	Richard H. Lockey
Robert C. Jacobson	Joseph H. Logomasini
Robert C. James	Francis J. Long
David L. Jarvis	Hugh E. Longino, Jr.
Albert L. Jenks, Jr.	Donald J. Loudon
Shepherd M. Jensk	John D. Lund
William E. Jennings	John H. Lurz, Jr.
Whitney Jennison	John M. Luykx
John E. Jensen	William H. Lynch
John A. Jepson	Clinton D. MacDonald
Charles F. Jesson	Reginald M. Machell
Downing L. Jewell	Daniel P. MacLean, Jr.
Theodore N. Johnsen, Jr.	Jack E. Magee
Dallas D. Johnson	Edward J. Maguire, Jr.
Neal J. Johnson	Timothy R. Mahoney
Robert N. Johnson	Charles W. Maier, Jr.
Gerald R. Jones	John E. Majesky
Herman W. Jones	John B. Mallard, Jr.
John V. Josephson	Frank S. Malm
Charles E. Kaessinger	Halford E. Maninger
Daniel H. Kahn	George P. Markovits
Joseph N. Kanevsky	Harold L. Marr
Thomas M. Kastner	William F. Marr
Martin J. Katcher	Charles E. Martin
John H. Keane	William L. Martin III
Keatinge Keays	James W. Matheney
James K. Keihner	James E. May
Richard W. Kelly	Robert L. May
Wade C. Kemerer	Joseph C. Mayer
David S. Kendrick	Stanwix G. Mayfield
Richard A. Kennedy, Jr.	III
Robert W. Kennedy	Donald H. Mayo
Thomas J. Kilcline	William H. Mayo
Richard W. Kincade	Charles H. Mays
Herbert J. Kindl	Robert M. McAnulty, Jr.
Robert R. King, Jr.	Kenneth V. McArthur
William C. King	Ralph W. McArthur
John R. Kint	Jeremiah R. McBride
Gilbert J. Kirk, Jr.	Gerry M. McCabe
Joseph O. Kirkbride, Jr.	John C. McCoy
Charles A. Kiselyak	Donald W. McCracken
Leroy Klein	Major I. McCreight 3d
Peter F. Klein	Carlos D. McCullough
Vernon P. Klemm	Ewing R. McDonald, Jr.
George M. Kling	Thomas E. McDonald
James E. Kneale	William D. McFarlane, Jr.
Wallace J. Knetz, Jr.	Thomas P. McGinnis
Arthur K. Knotzen	Roy W. McLain, Jr.
John H. Koach	William C. McMurray
Philip J. Koehler	James A. McQuilling
George Kramer	Edward I. McQuiston, Jr.
Walter J. Kraus	John A. McTammany
Stephen R. Krause	James L. McVoy
Dale W. F. Krehmeyer	William H. Meanix, Jr.
Alfred G. Kreinberg	Gilbert D. Melio
William S. Kremidas	Victor E. Menefee, Jr.
Otto E. Krueger	Richard A. Mergl
Albert Kuehnnapf	Carlyle C. Merkley, Jr.

Warren H. Merrill	Milton O. Paul
Frank Messenger 3d	David B. Pendley
Edward J. Messere	Otis G. Pennington
John T. Metcalf, Jr.	John H. Perkins, Jr.
Harry B. Meyer	Charles H. Peters
Charles W. Meyrick	Oren A. Peterson
John D. Middleton	Richard J. Peterson
Arthur H. Mikles	William C. Peterson
Adair Miller	Malcolm E. Phares
Byron H. Miller	Thomas J. Piazza
Conrad C. Miller, Jr.	Paul P. Pierson, Jr.
David B. Miller	William M. Place
Dean W. Miller	Richard B. Plank
Edmund A. Miller	Harold R. Podorson
Gerlous G. Miller, Jr.	Richard E. Pond
John R. Miller	Kenneth A. Porter
Raymond L. Miller	Thomas N. Porter
Roger J. Miller	Harry J. Post
Robert O. Minter, Jr.	Robert S. Pottsiger
Arthur L. Moberly	William W. Potter
Donald O. Moeven	Bobby L. Potts
George L. Moffett, Jr.	Edwin S. Pratt
Charles H. Mohr	Wayne N. Pressler
Robain F. Mohrhardt	Robert D. Provost
Oliver S. Mollison	Gerrie P. Putnam
Donald E. Moore	Lee S. Pyles
Lundi A. Moore	William F. Quarg
Robert S. Moore	Calvin E. Rakes
Alfred J. Morency	Lee M. Ramsey
George E. Morgan, Jr.	George C. Rann
Harry W. Morgan, Jr.	William M. Ratliff
Joseph R. Morgan	Edgar A. Rawsthorne
William T. Morgan	Gordon E. Raymer
James B. Morin	William L. Read
Julius E. Morris	William G. Read, Jr.
Paul H. Mozley	James P. Reddick, Jr.
Donald F. Munday	William J. Reed
Richard J. Munroe	Charles E. Reid, Jr.
James F. Murphy	Eugene J. Reiher
James D. Murray, Jr.	David R. Rice
Bert Myatt, Jr.	Homer K. Richards, Jr.
Paul J. Myatt, Jr.	John T. Rigsbee
Charles E. Myers, Jr.	Jack D. Riley
William A. Myers III	Robert K. Ripley
Donald A. Nadig	James B. Risser
Henry J. Nawoj	Franklin O. Ritter
Guy M. Neely, Jr.	Gerald G. Roberts
Frederick W. Nehring, Jr.	Frank A. Rockwell
John B. Nelms	James H. Rogers
Andrew G. Nelson	Thomas M. Rogers
Edwin B. Nelson	Paul D. Roman
Harry J. Nelson, Jr.	Richard M. Romley
Philip S. Nelson	James R. Roney
Harold Nemer	William T. Roos
Jerome E. Nicholson	Robert E. Rowe
Meredith W. Nicholson	David M. Rowlands
John M. Nickell, Jr.	Richard O. Rudd
Lionel M. Noel	Jack W. Rupe
Calvin C. Norman	William H. Russ 3d
George L. Norman, Jr.	David E. Russell
Lowry W. Norris	David Rust
William J. Norris	William N. Rutledge
Curtis R. Norton, Jr.	Merwin Sacarob
Bruce A. Nystrom	Frithiof N. Sagerholm, Jr.
John Oesterreicher	Frank C. Sain
William A. O'Flaherty	Robert J. Salomon
Patrick G. O'Keefe	Wilbur H. Sample
David W. Olmstead	Richard E. Sander
Robert B. Ooghe	Ernest D. Sanders
Charles C. O'Reilly, Jr.	William C. Sandlin, Jr.
James S. Orloff	Peter J. Saraceni
John J. O'Rourke	John C. Sargent
William E. Orr	Peter J. Sarris
Johnny W. Orrill	William J. Sawtelle
Edward J. Otth, Jr.	Vale H. Schaeffer, Jr.
Dean T. Ousterhout	Albert A. Schaufelberger, Jr.
Leonard J. Owen	Frank P. Schlosser
Andrew J. Owens	Donald R. Schmidt
Edward W. Page	Bernard Schniebold
George L. Page	Richard A. Schnorf
James R. Page	Paul L. Schoos
Anthony L. Palazzolo	Walter A. Schriefer
Courtland A. Palmer, Jr.	George S. Schuchart
Harry M. Parker, Jr.	Elliott P. Schuman
Howard B. Parker, Jr.	James H. Scott
Warren S. Parr, Jr.	Jack Scoville
James E. Patton	Carl H. Sebenius, Jr.
	Thomas T. Seelye, Jr.

Herold Seligmiller	Malcolm H. Thiele
Angelo P. Semeraro	Philip H. Thom, Jr.
Louis M. Serrile	Bernard K. Thomas, Jr.
Richard H. Seth	Wallace J. Thomas
Harry E. Shacklett	Alexander D. Thomson
William M. Shanhouse	James Thrash
Sumner Shapiro	Harry R. Thurber, Jr.
Lewis A. Shea, Jr.	John A. Tinkham
Oscar C. Shealy, Jr.	Harold F. Tipton, Jr.
Byron M. Shepard	Robert W. Titus
Frank E. Sherman	Robert R. Tolbert
Eugene F. Shine, Jr.	Leif O. Torkelson
John W. Shook, Jr.	Harry D. Train 2d
Earl R. Short	Fred Troescher, Jr.
Richard Shrewsbury	Clinton R. Vall
Charles E. Shumaker	Wallace Valencia
Martin J. Signorelli, Jr.	Jack D. Venable
Francis M. Simmons	Elias Venning, Jr.
Harvey K. Sims	Philip Viadessa
Arnold N. Singer	William A. Vogel
George L. Siri, Jr.	Leonard F. Vogt, Jr.
Robert E. Sivinski	Robert L. Volz
Glenn E. Skinner, Jr.	Warren P. Vosseler
Stephen A. Skomsky	Charles M. Walker
Richard C. Slusser	John R. Walker
Alan Y. Smith	Joseph K. Walker
Allan R. Smith	Edward C. Waller III
Carl R. Smith, Jr.	Edward W. Waller
Chandler G. Smith	Robert L. Walters
Charles R. Smith, Jr.	Thomas J. Walters
David K. Smith	John A. Wamsley
Donald A. Smith	Marvin H. Warner
Frederic W. Smith	Peter Q. Waterloo
Gerald F. Smith	Frank T. Watkins, Jr.
Homer L. Smith	James D. Watkins
James H. B. Smith	James H. Webber
Paul E. Smith	William D. Weir
Robert M. Smith	Donald A. Weiss
Robert L. Smith	Leo A. Welcker
Robert F. Smith, Jr.	Henry C. White
Robert P. Smith	James A. White
Wayne F. Smith	Robert C. White
Wayne O. Smith	Walter A. White
Wayne D. Smith	Richard E. Whiteside
Cornelius S. Snodgrass, Jr.	James D. Whyte
William Somerville	Eugene J. Wielki
Harris Southworth	Fred J. Wilder
Wayne J. Spence	Kirk C. Wilkins
Ralph G. Spencer	Edwin E. Williams
Felix S. Spielmann	James E. Williams
David J. Spowart, Jr.	Ralph P. Williams
David H. Sprague	Rodney G. Williams
Edgerton T. Sprague	James R. Williford III
Harold H. Sproull	Lisle R. Wills, Jr.
Dennis C. Stanfill	Stuckey D. Willson
Walter D. Stapleton	Carl B. Wilson
Paul V. Steffan	James H. Wilson
Leland Stegemerten	James J. Wilson, Jr.
Earl M. Stein	James C. Wilson
Joe D. Stell	Ralph E. Wilson, Jr.
Thomas Stephenson	Robert E. Wilson
Robert E. Stewart	Russell F. Wilson
Daniel B. Stiegman	Thomas H. Wilson
Charles L. Stiles	John M. Wolff
Lester L. Stokes	Richard S. Wolford
Clarence W. Stoddard, Jr.	George P. Wood, Jr.
George B. Stone	John W. Wood
Edward F. Striegel	Thomas B. Wood, Jr.
Reid Stringfellow	David J. Woodard
Herman A. Stromberg, Jr.	Edwin E. Woods, Jr.
James A. Stubstad	Charles Woodworth
William C. Stutt	Jack L. Worden
Phillip B. Suhr	Jeremy F. Worden
John H. Sullivan	William W. Wright
Robert G. Sullivan	James H. Wynne III
Donald A. Sumner	Vern M. Yates
George W. Sumner, Jr.	Abbie R. Yingling, Jr.
Charles O. Swanson	Joseph K. Yochum
Peter S. Swanson	Duane C. Young, Jr.
Harry F. Sweitzer, Jr.	Randall W. Young
Gerald E. Synhorst	Charles Youngblade
Andrew G. Szymanski	John R. Zech
Richard W. Taylor	Charles J. Zekan
Stuart N. Templeton	Marcus A. Zettel
Bernard Tesch, Jr.	Frank G. Ziegler
John H. Thayer	Alfonz Zimm
	Edward F. Zimmerman, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Norman Altman Bernard C. Hogan
 William B. Anderson, Jr. John C. Huenerberg, Jr.
 William A. Armstrong Thomas J. Ingram III
 Joseph R. Audino John F. Ivers
 Erwin L. Aufdenkamp James R. Juncker
 Robert C. Austin George H. Kapp
 Lee R. Balderston Robert D. Keppler
 Erling O. Barsness John F. Knudson
 Carl N. Beatty Edward M. Kocher
 William W. Bennett Robert P. Kopotic
 Harry Birchard Alfred S. Kulczycki
 Richard B. Blackwell Stanley J. Kulikowski
 David A. Bowdoin Roy W. Lankau
 Glenn S. Brooks Alan Y. Levine
 Everett T. Brown, Jr. Robert W. Maxwell
 Robert M. Brown Joseph A. Mayo, Jr.
 Frederick B. Bunke Robert T. Mayo
 Herbert F. Butler, Jr. John E. McEneaney
 Walter J. Buzby 2d Malcolm L. McQuiston
 II
 John J. Campanile Burton J. Miller
 Robert T. Carter Ralph F. Murphy, Jr.
 Dominic V. Cefalu Richard A. Nemeth
 William A. Chadwick Robert G. Nicol
 Danforth Clement Donald C. Pantle
 William W. Coons Sumner Parker
 Rex S. Coryell Eugene H. Pillsbury
 Charles L. Culwell Joel Rabinowitz
 Charles D. Curriden Jack M. Ratzlaff
 Dorsey W. Daniel John F. Rawls
 Edward G. Dauchess William F. Reiser
 Harold R. Davis Robert R. Reiss
 Jimmy P. Dearing Lee O. Rensberger
 Charles Dibenedetto Richard W. Ridenour
 Holton C. Dickson, Jr. Robert J. Riger
 Chester L. Ditto Philip T. Riley
 Thomas J. Donoher Calvin W. Roberts
 Andrew M. Durham Gerald E. Roberts
 Stephen R. Edson Ivan L. Roenick
 Henry D. Elichalt Loveman F. Rolen
 William T. Emery William Sandkuhler, Jr.
 George D. Fisher, Jr. Alvis D. Sartor
 Horace P. Fishman Harold K. Scott
 Joseph L. Forehand Alfred F. Simech
 Dick H. Francisco Earl G. Slemmons, Jr.
 James J. Garibaldi Charles M. Smith
 William L. Gary Charles W. Smith
 Thomas M. Gill Warren H. Stark
 Ephraim P. Glassman Robert J. Stevens
 Richard Glickman Howard M. Stuart, Jr.
 Harold E. Haas Thomas W. Tift, Jr.
 Jack H. Haberthier Elvin L. VanZee
 Don C. Haeske John H. Vice
 Richard W. Haley James B. Way, Jr.
 William G. Hall Howard W. Whitaker
 Mark H. Hanna John C. Wilson
 Neil K. Hansen Anton L. Witte

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Howard I. Bacon Louis E. V. Jackson
 David R. Bird, Jr. Varne M. Kimmick
 Philip S. Birnbaum, Jr. Lemond D. Lang
 Louis E. Brown Paul G. LeGros
 Irving Bobrick Walter E. Marquardt, Jr.
 Warren F. Brown Robert H. Nelson
 Wesley A. Brown John E. Parsons, Jr.
 Neal W. Clements Stephen B. Proflet
 William L. Collins Claude J. Quillen, Jr.
 Rudolph F. Dambra Chester T. Radecki
 John F. Dobson Richard H. Schreiber
 Wallace F. Forbes Claude E. Swecker, Jr.
 James E. Galloway James G. Tapp
 Stephen A. Gilles Kenneth E. Thorp
 Albert C. Gillespie Jerome E. Toffler
 William C. Hall Donald R. Trueblood
 Gordon W. Hamilton Donald W. Wittschiebe
 Reinhold M. Hen-dricks Roger G. Tweel
 Robert L. Herman Benjamin E. Weeks
 Charles M. Howe William E. Wynne

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Travis W. Drummond
 Ray F. Paige

NURSE CORPS

Charlotte A. Allen Helen M. Balashak
 Doris M. Allen Ella Barber
 Mary A. Ayars Myrtis R. Beaudrot

Cleo D. Best Iris E. Johnson
 Dorothy E. Blackmore Margaret A. Kane
 Willidean Blazier Mary T. Kelly
 Jeanne B. Boyce Marie J. Kirkwood
 Margaret E. Brooks Lorraine A. Lane
 Virginia B. Brown Betty J. Lanier
 Mary A. Brunner Margaret L. LeCroy
 Lola C. Bull Betty J. Lewis
 Dolores T. Burns Katherine M. M. McGovern
 Mattie L. Chandler Katherine M. Merrill
 Gertrude A. Christ Verna L. Miller
 Irene M. Chulack Onis S. Milligan
 Florence M. Conner Rose M. Mooney
 Clare P. Cooney Mary A. Pandora
 Bobbie L. Crumley Judith K. Paretsky
 Frances R. Crump Lillian A. Patsel
 Charlotte L. Day Marie A. Petrovitch
 Audrey M. Devaney Ruth M. Pojeky
 Harriet M. Dimick Martha A. Price
 Roberta F. Dorsett Lois A. Prothero
 Grace C. Dugan May L. Reid
 Mary T. Duhamel Evelyn L. Rhodes
 Stella M. Edgecomb Shirley M. Riggan
 Hope M. Estey Agnes Sarna
 Virginia C. Faeth Shirley E. Sauvage
 Mary E. Farber Louise K. Scanlon
 Bernice E. Fenn Lorraine C. Schubliske
 Barbara Frazier Audrey J. Sharafinski
 Anita A. Gagne Joan D. Sibley
 Frieda C. Galipp Faye J. Slate
 Sophia H. Gormish Arlene E. Sousa
 Eileen Hanes Alice L. Spence
 Marchetta Harper Mary Stefanick
 Martha E. Hesson Lolita D. Surprenant
 Bertha K. Hiers Nadean M. Swoboda
 Jana V. Hilaire Esther M. Thomson
 Mary N. Hill Barbara Touchette
 Shirley M. Huston Mabel H. Tyler
 Dolores G. Irion Mary M. Wentzel
 Helen E. Jarvi Marjorie R. Wilson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 12, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great God of our hearts, our homes, and our beloved country, we thank Thee for that sacred day in the calendar of church and state, called Mothers' Day, which we were again privileged to observe and which we are beginning to realize is so full of eternal significance in helping us to achieve national and individual greatness of character.

We rejoice that in obedience to a noble and tender instinct we were joyously constrained to pay honor and tribute to the blessed memory of mothers no longer with us in the flesh and to render gratitude and reverence for the glorious ministry of mothers who are still here to share with us their love and companionship.

Grant that the observance of Mothers' Day may hallow our minds and hearts with a prayerful longing to make every heart and home in our Republic a sacred shrine of God-fearing righteousness.

May all our citizens be inspired to cultivate the noblest ideals and be strengthened to meet the duties and responsibilities of life with that mastery which can only be gained in homes that fear the Lord.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 8, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution relative to the reenrollment of S. 2307 for the relief of Holger Kubischke.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1365. An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation; and
 S. 1772. An act for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4387. An act to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents, and to preclude exclusions in determining annual income for purposes of such limitations; and

H. R. 4394. An act to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1739) entitled "An act to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Long, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. ECTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEREES ON H. R. 6947, THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] be excused from serving as a member of committee of conference on the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] be substituted for the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. The Senate will be notified thereof.

ELISABETH MUELLER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2672) for the relief of Elisabeth Mueller, also known as Elizabeth Philbrick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.