

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 7712. A bill for the relief of Dan Hong Mar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7713. A bill for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

704. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of Mrs. Nora B. Powell, and 95 other citizens, of New Castle County, Del., urging enactment of legislation prohibiting alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

705. By Mr. ELLSWORTH: Petition of citizens of Albany, Oreg., urging Congress to restrict or prohibit the advertising by radio or television of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

706. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of residents of Colora and Rising Sun, Md., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

707. Also, petition of residents of Cecil County, Md., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

708. By Mr. VAN PELT: Petition of Mrs. Leonard J. Glebink, of Waupun, Wis., and 43 other residents of this community in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2188, to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television, and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

709. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Northeast Washington Citizens Association, Washington, D. C., protesting the reduction of the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 5, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 1, 1952)

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

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

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the new week and for the new day bathed in the glory of this flowering month of May; for the dawn orchestra of birds' songs, for the fragrance and tint of the tiniest flower, for the mystic beauty of lights and shadows weaving patterns of splendor across the verdant fields and templed hills. Through it all and in the laughter and tears of our fellow pilgrims, and in our own souls, tune our hearts to hear Thy voice, that we may know we are not alone.

Grant us vistas of the strength that waits to be added to our weakness, for the great enterprise of world brotherhood committed to our hands. So gird

the lives of Thy servants here in the ministry of public affairs that they may make decisions greatly, walk on the high levels of noble purpose and, with kindling sympathies as wide as human need, in all things quit themselves like men. In the Redeemer's blessed name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 1, 1952, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5652) authorizing the Oregon State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into north slough, Coos County, Oreg.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAVEZ was excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate until May 15.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing through May 17.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications

and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS (S. Doc. No. 124)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953, in the amount of \$3,500,000, for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 125)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953, in the amount of \$84,000, for the Department of Justice, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—  
WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Louie How or How Louie from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on August 1, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO HEADQUARTERS OF AIR POLICE IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

A letter from the Director, Legislation and Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TEMPORARY SUPPLEMENTAL AID FOR SCHOOLS IN CRITICAL DEFENSE AREAS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve and extend the duration of Public Law No. 874 of the Eighty-first Congress, to provide temporary supplementary aid for schools in critical defense housing areas, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NECESSARY OFFICE EXPENSES FOR CERTAIN UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that United States commissioners who are required to devote full time to the duties of the office may be allowed their necessary office expenses (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a dependent exemption even though the gross income of the dependent is \$600 or more, if the dependent is in full attendance at an approved school, college, or university, and further to provide an additional exemption or a deduction for a taxpayer who is in full attendance at an approved school, college, or university

"Whereas thousands of young men and women seek higher education in the schools, colleges, and universities of this country each year; and

"Whereas the costs of tuition, books, materials, and sustenance have advanced rapidly in the past few years, thereby making it more difficult for families of limited means to provide their children with the advantages of higher education; and

"Whereas in many cases students are required to extend their earning power to the maximum to assist their parents in providing the funds to meet the costs of higher education; and

"Whereas under existing inflationary conditions a student is often capable of earning by part-time employment sums in excess of \$600 annually, resulting, under present law, in the loss of his status as a dependent; and

"Whereas the loss of this dependent exemption results in a tax increase of at least \$133.20 annually, coming at a time when the family is hard pressed for every dollar to continue the child's education; and

"Whereas thousands of self-supporting students, in earning necessary funds to meet the costs of higher education, earn sums in excess of \$600 annually, resulting in a substantial tax on the excess; and

"Whereas higher education is one of the pillars of our democracy, and it is therefore desirable that all seeking to obtain the benefits thereof should be encouraged and assisted in every way possible to attain that end: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to amend the Internal Revenue Code by providing:

"(a) That a taxpayer shall not lose his right to claim an exemption for a dependent even though the gross income of the dependent is \$600 or more, provided the dependent is in full attendance upon a regular full-time program leading to a degree or diploma at an approved school, college, or university which meets the educational requirements of the State in which it is located; and

"(b) That a taxpayer who is a student enrolled on a full-time basis in an approved school, college, or university shall be entitled to an additional \$600 exemption or entitled to claim a deduction from gross income of the amount actually expended by him from his earnings for tuition, books, and materials, not exceeding, however, the sum of \$600.

"2. That the secretary of state is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this joint resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the respective Presiding Officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A resolution adopted by the Northeast Washington Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, favoring restoration of Federal payment to the District government to \$12,000,000 in the District of Columbia appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring restoration of necessary appropriations to the Department of Labor, relating to the consumers' price index; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition from the medical and dental officers of Rhein-main Air Base, Frankfurt, Germany, signed by W. E. Whelan, relating to the length of their service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the director, civil defense, State of Florida, Jacksonville, Fla., notifying the Senate that the State of Florida submits a duly authenticated copy of an interstate civil defense compact ratified by that State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Resolutions adopted by the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York State, New York, N. Y., relating to the Defense Production Act, and so forth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition from the Puerto Rico Railroad Brotherhood, San Juan, P. R., signed by Primitivo Melendez, president, and Mariano Ducret, secretary, praying for the prompt approval of the constitution of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5048. A bill relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal-revenue laws; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1507).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2690. A bill 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; with amendments (Rept. No. 1508).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3101. A bill for the relief of Inger Larson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3102. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to John Takes Gun sole heir of the estate of Marie Takes Enemy;

S. 3103. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Wallace W. Pease;

S. 3104. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the heirs of the estate of Ray Bluebud, allotment 1671; and

S. 3105. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the heirs of the estate of Lee Bluebud, Allotment 1669; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CAIN, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. WELKER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SEATON, and Mr. DUFF):

S. 3106. A bill for the relief of the owners of certain steel plants, possession of which has been taken by the Government under Executive Order 10340; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3107. A bill for the relief of Owen Lowrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3108. A bill to extend national service life insurance benefits to certain members of the Armed Forces who died in combat with the Japanese forces prior to April 20, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 3109. A bill to authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3110. A bill for the relief of Nikolas Walteri; and

S. 3111. A bill for the relief of Eusebio Asia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3112. A bill for the relief of Kuniko Vicent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3113. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the use as a wildlife refuge of the area included in the Lower Souris Migratory Waterfowl Refuge in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3114. A bill for the relief of Hezron Moxey and Leeton Ambrister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3115. A bill to modify the comprehensive plans for flood control in the Missouri River Basin to provide for the inclusion in such plans of adequate elementary and high school facilities at Newton, N. D., to replace the facilities located in Sanish and Van Hook, N. D., which are to be abandoned as a result of the construction of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3116. A bill for the relief of L. R. Swarthout and the legal guardian of Harold Swarthout;

S. 3117. A bill for the relief of Lew Shee; and

S. 3118. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko Oda Hitesman and Maria Hitesman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND (by request):

S. 3119. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Gilpin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3120. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal financial participation for old-age assistance, and to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children;

S. 3121. A bill to increase the amount which old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits; and

S. 3122. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance to employees of institutions of higher education who are covered by State or local government retirement systems; to the Committee on Finance.

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



# RELIEF OF OWNERS OF CERTAIN STEEL PLANTS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of the owners of certain steel plants, possession of which has been taken by the Government under Executive Order 10340.

I am very hopeful that early and favorable consideration may be given to the proposed legislation, and that the steel dispute may be settled within the framework of the Labor-Management Relations Act. It is my belief that the bill sets forth an expedient method of overcoming the arbitrary seizure of the steel industry.

The bill (S. 3106) for the relief of the owners of certain steel plants, possession of which has been taken by the Government under Executive Order 10340, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

# HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

# 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. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by him at the Hungarian Freedom Day celebration, at Trenton, N. J., on April 27, 1952.

By Mr. GREEN:

Address delivered by him on acceptance of bust of John Paul Jones, in the Capitol.

By Mr. CAIN:

A sketch of Senator CAIN, published in Congressional Quarterly News Features of March 7, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorials commenting on address delivered by him before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 19, and address delivered by him before the Engineers Club of Lehigh Valley, Pa., on April 16, 1952.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Statement prepared by him, together with quotation from a recent book review by John Higgins Williams, published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of March 9, 1952, on the book, Eisenhower, the Man and the Symbol, written by John Gunther.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Address by Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane, United States Navy (retired), Chairman Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administrator, United States Department of Commerce, before Baltimore Association of Commerce, at Baltimore, Md., on April 9, 1952.

Article entitled "Church Honors Negro Mother: State-Born Mrs. Thomas is Catholic Mother of Year," published in the Baltimore Sun of May 5, 1952.

Letter from Baltimore Association of Commerce to him relating to proposed Federal Bureau of Accident Prevention.

By Mr. BENTON:

Address entitled "Why We Are Doing So Badly in the Ideological War," delivered at Georgetown University by Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion.

Letter addressed to him by Mr. Marion B. Folsom, chairman of the board of trustees, Committee for Economic Development.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "Immigration Omnibus," published in the Washington Post of April 30, 1952.

Editorial entitled "The New Immigration Bill," published in the New York Times of May 1, 1952.

By Mr. GEORGE:

Editorial entitled "Rule by Law at Stake," published in the New York Times of May 5, 1952.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "The Next 6 Months Will Decide," published in Christopher News Notes for May 1952.

By Mr. SCHOEPPPEL:

Article entitled "Fees at French Ports Cost United States \$2 to \$6 To Land Each Soldier," published in the Washington Evening Star of May 4, 1952.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Editorial entitled, "Facts, Not Words, on the Steel Seizure," written by C. P. Ives and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 28, 1952; also an editorial entitled "The Steel Case in the Supreme Court," written by C. P. Ives and published in the Baltimore Sun of May 5, 1952.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Statement regarding the national debt, written by Mr. Chandler Hovey, banker, of Boston, Mass.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address entitled "The Role of Sea Power in Modern War," delivered by Hon. Dan A. Kimball, Secretary of the Navy, at Detroit, Mich., April 25, 1952.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Letter entitled "POW's Must Be Protected," dated April 21, 1952, addressed to the editor of the Washington Post, and signed by nine citizens, including Representatives Judd, of Minnesota and Senator DOUGLAS.

Winning oration entitled "The Privileges and Responsibilities of the Individual Under the Constitution," delivered by Gerald Goldman, of Chicago, Ill., in the American Legion Department of Illinois oratorical contest.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "To Stop Wasting Our Ex-Presidents," published in the New York Times magazine section of April 27, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Office for Former Presidents," published in the Houston Chronicle of April 6, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Our Former Presidents Should Not Become Ghosts," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of April 2, 1952.

# ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement that will not take more than a minute and a half.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 3, all those who believe in freedom had the welcome opportunity to observe the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. This opportunity was taken advantage of in many communities throughout the free world, and especially by our many fine citizens of Polish origin and descent in Massachusetts. I want very much to take this moment or two today, since the Senate was not in session on May 3, to pay tribute briefly and modestly to the magnificent courage and devotion to freedom's cause which have characterized the history and the people of Poland since the tenth century.

In these terribly troubled times, when freedom everywhere is threatened as it has never been in all the world's history, we are grateful indeed for the example of fortitude and continuous aspiration toward freedom which has characterized Poland and her people for nearly a thousand years.

In those 10 turbulent centuries the Polish people have known grief and tragedy in many forms. They have seen their beautiful land partitioned four times, with many of their citizens ruthlessly killed and many thousands of others sent into permanent exile. However, throughout all their tribulations the Polish people have continued to pray and to speak and to work for that freedom without which life is not worth living. Their constitution of 1791 expresses wonderfully their firm determination in this vital regard.

We are grateful, as we observe the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, for this opportunity to pay tribute to the Polish people in Massachusetts, in all our 48 States, and throughout the world, but even more importantly to take heart ourselves from the example which they have so magnificently set for all of us, in freedom's name and in freedom's holy cause.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Saturday was Polish Constitution Day, of which some note was taken by the Senate last Thursday. Since the Senate was not in session on Saturday, I ask unanimous consent to speak briefly on this subject.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in times of misfortune, people's thoughts invariably turn back to happier and more inspiring days of the past. This is particularly true of the Polish people who, after all the sufferings they have endured and the sacrifices they have made for freedom, find themselves once again enslaved in their homeland by Soviet imperialism. Last Saturday, May 3, the anniversary of their first democratic constitution, the Polish people, in and out of Poland, joined in commemoration of this great national event. The adoption of the constitution in 1791 constitutes one of the brightest and most significant landmarks in Poland's entire history. The event came at a time when nearly all of the nation was parceled out among the three greedy monarchs of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Yet a small band of patriotic, farsighted, and dauntless Poles dared to draft and to present to the country this document of freedom.

That constitution made Poland a constitutional monarchy with a responsible, cabinet form of government. Ancient class distinctions and privileges were wiped out, and the government was strengthened by bringing the peasantry under the protection of the law. What is, perhaps, even more significant for those days and for that part of the world, was the fact that this constitution guaranteed absolute religious freedom. In this and in other ways, the Polish Constitution was in the vanguard of democracy's advance into central and eastern Europe.

In commemorating the one hundred and sixty-first anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, we are paying our respects to the memory of its creators—some of the most valiant figures in the heritage of western democracy.

Those figures are part of the American heritage today. The deeds and sacrifices, and the views and ideals, of men like Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and Chopin are, indeed, an integral part of our traditions. These men, and many others I could name, developed from the same ideological ferment that produced George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson in our own land.

The Polish Constitution of 1791, the French Constitution of 1792, and the American Constitution of 1787, are among the great landmarks in the growth and development of constitutional law the world over.

Throughout the years there have come to our land millions of men, women, and children of Polish birth. They have brought to this country the rich heritage of their own culture along with the passionate love of freedom and order under law which was their birthright. These traditions and qualities have been amalgamated into the tradition that we call American. America has been enriched and western civilization has been enriched by this process.

"In these dark days of challenge to the values of individual dignity and of government under law it is good for all people to recall the widespread origins and the deep-rooted foundations of these ideals and values.

Americans of Polish descent, in observing constitution day, knows that behind the iron curtain in Poland, millions of freedom-loving Poles are making mental note of this day. I know that the love of freedom still lives in that unhappy land. Such a love cannot be extinguished, not even by all the slave labor camps and repressive means of Soviet tyranny. Freedom will come again to Poland, and a new constitution, and a new government under law, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed, will one day be reestablished in the land of the Vistula. All Americans and all freedom-loving people everywhere join in hope and prayer for the speedy coming of that day.

Mr. O'CONOR subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today certain statements were made by several Senators in regard to Polish Constitution Day. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at that point a statement which I have prepared.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR  
POLAND

The Constitution of the United States means much to every loyal American, not only as a safeguard for his prized freedoms but because it is a symbol to all the world of the meaning of American citizenship. We can understand, therefore, the feelings of loyal citizens of Poland, and of their friends and relatives in this country, many of them of Polish birth, in connection with the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, May 3.

It has been my privilege on many happier occasions in the past to participate with that great group of Maryland citizens whose forefathers came from Poland and who naturally, therefore, take great pride in the contribution made by the people of that great land to world civilization in past years.

Today Poland suffers untold anguish at the hands of a godless world movement which knows not the meaning of justice or decency and which makes the practice of either a felony punishable by death. On the occasion of this 1952 celebration it is entirely appropriate to express, on behalf of our own State of Maryland, and, I am sure, on behalf of every patriotic resident of this country, our heartfelt sympathy at the unfortunate fate that has befallen them, and our sincere wishes for a brighter future free from the slavery which now oppresses them.

Though they are held captive now by the might of brute force, their thoughts and hopes, their culture and traditions are all linked inseparably with the ideologies and the principles which have been the basis of American hopes and progress from the very beginnings of this country.

Our people realize that the great masses of Polish people today are as firmly imbued with their age-old convictions, and are as deeply determined to regain their freedom at the first opportunity as their forebears ever were in all the turbulent history of bygone years.

Let us extend to them, therefore, assurances of our sympathetic interest in their welfare and our desire and decision to do anything within our power to assist them when the time comes when such assistance may be effective. They are living in a dark hour, but the Polish people have survived dark years in the past and have emerged stronger and with a deeper love for their freedoms and a firmer desire to realize to the fullest upon the wealth of culture and progress which has been handed down to them through the years.

May this be the last Constitutional Day anniversary that will find their territory occupied by a foreign conqueror. May they and all the suffering people of eastern Europe now ranged unwillingly with the U. S. S. R. awake some day soon to a happier day when they can be free from the sorrow that now overwhelms them.

Mr. MOODY subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with Polish Constitution Day, to which reference has been made by other Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a brief statement prepared by me.

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

The Polish people and the people of the United States are linked together in friendship by many bonds. None of these is of greater significance than the fact that we share a common belief in freedom and national independence. Even through the years of suffering under foreign oppression, the Poles have clung to these great ideas.

It was to give tangible form to them that they evolved and enacted the constitution of 1791, one of the great documents of the archives of world democracy. Had the Poles been permitted to develop their nation in peace under this constitution, their government might have led all Central and Eastern Europe into the camp of democracy. The constitution of 1791 was ideally suited to the conditions that then prevailed in that part of the world. It provided for government of ministerial responsibility. A host of ancient privileges and prerogatives, formerly enjoyed by a few, were abolished, and a rough equalitarianism was established along broadly democratic lines. Class distinctions were eliminated and the full protection of the government was extended to the peasants. Absolute religious freedom became the law of the land. Small wonder that this document won the admiration of the great English liberal, Edmund Burke, and brought upon the heads of its founding fathers the full fury of the autocratic powers that had partitioned Poland.

It is natural for Americans who share with Poles the ideals of freedom so ably expressed by their eighteenth century leaders to join with them in commemorating this anniversary.

MOTION PICTURE "MY SON, JOHN"

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one day last week, in the company of the Vice President, and others, it was my privilege to witness a private showing of a great motion picture which has just been released by Paramount Pictures Corp. The title of the picture is "My Son, John." Among other things, it marks the return to the screen, after 17 years of absence, of America's outstanding actress, Helen Hayes. This unusually important and impressive motion picture opens in Washington on May 7.

"My Son, John" was directed and produced by Leo McCarey, who ranks as one of our country's outstanding directors. In addition to Helen Hayes, it features such outstanding personalities of the American screen as Robert Walker, Van Heflin, Dean Jagger, and a number of other stars. I ask unanimous consent that the names of those associated with the production of the picture be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.



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

**MY SON, JOHN**

Producer and director. Leo McCarey.  
Adaptation by..... John Lee Mahin.  
Screen play by..... Myles Conolly and  
Leo McCarey.  
Story by..... Leo McCarey.  
Director of photog- Harry Stradling,  
raphy. A. S. C.  
Art direction..... Hal Pereira and Wil-  
Ham Flannery.  
Edited by..... Marvin Coll, A. C. E.  
Orchestrations by.... Robert Russell Ben-  
nett.  
Costumes..... Edith Head.  
Special photographic Gordon Jennings, A.  
effects. S. C.  
Process photography.. Parclot Edouart,  
A. S. C.  
Set decoration..... Sam Comer and  
Emile Kurl.  
Make-up supervision.. Wally Westmore.  
Sound recording by.. Gene Merritt and  
Gene Garvin.  
Music score by..... Robert Emmett Dolan.

**CAST**

Lucille Jefferson..... Helen Hayes.  
John Jefferson..... Robert Walker.  
Mr. Stedman..... Van Heflin.  
Dan Jefferson..... Dean Jagger.  
Dr. Carver..... Minor Watson.  
Father O'Dowd..... Frank McHugh.  
Ruth Carlin..... Irene Winston.  
Ben Jefferson..... James Young.  
Chuck Jefferson..... Richard Jaeckel.  
Bedford..... Tod Karns.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to add that this is a picture which I believe should be seen by the people of every American home. Not since the great screen picture *Birth of a Nation*, which was filmed during World War I, has there been a picture which has so stirred America patriotically as this production by Leo McCarey entitled "My Son, John." It has as its locale a typical American community, which happens to be Manassas, Va., but which could be any American city. It deals with the great global conflict between communism and godlessness on the one hand and the patriotic purposes and principles of our cherished American concepts on the other. We find woven into the plot of this exciting picture the background of the Alger Hiss espionage case, the background of the Judith Coplon spy case, and the background of the W. K. Remington disloyalty case.

Americans who have read about Hiss, Coplon, Remington, and others will recognize their prototype in *My Son, John*. The evil poisons of godless communism and the tragedies they cause are faithfully and feelingly depicted in this picture, which is undoubtedly the greatest, most stirring pro-American motion picture of the past decade.

It appeals to me that this is a picture which patriotic organizations throughout the country, parent-teachers' associations, churches, fraternal groups, and educational groups should join in bringing to the attention of their communities. It is magnificent entertainment, and a dramatic production of high patriotic motive. It should be seen by every American who has eagerly been waiting for Hollywood to produce a stirring and memorable drama portraying with patriotic overtones and motives the idealog-

ical clash which has become the major problem of our times.

May I also state, Mr. President, that Columbia's magnificent new picture, *Walk East on Beacon*, is another gripping and compelling picture on the same theme and demonstrating dramatically how America's great FBI is operating to penetrate and punish the conspiratorial Communist-spy apparatus in America. Hollywood is to be congratulated on these two new and intensely patriotic pictures. It is devoutly to be desired that they will be followed by many more of similar nature.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—  
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair reminds Senators that the Senate is now engaged in the transaction of routine business. The Chair will not recognize any Senator for a speech at this time, and will not do so until he has laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, to be read.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Chair also include a motion to rerefer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such a motion is in order under the rules at any time when a bill is before the Senate, but it is not now in order, while the Senate is engaged in the transaction of routine business.

**NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE—  
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT  
(H. DOC. NO. 453)**

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for national flood insurance, and for other purposes, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

**MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952**

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3086.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This bill was made the unfinished business on Thursday, but the bill itself was not reported to the Senate until Wednesday of last week, during the recess of the Senate, under a unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Monday, April 28. Therefore the Chair, without objection, will regard the first and the second readings of the bill, which are required under the rules of the Senate, as having been held.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the first two readings are considered as having been held, will a motion to refer the bill be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to refer is in order at any time while the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.  
Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to do so, provided I do not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the Senator from California may yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the light of the fact that we are now about to consider Senate bill 3086, which is a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, it

would be well for every Member of the Senate to ponder the thought-provoking article, entitled "United States Tries Too Hard To Teach Needy Countries Its Ways," which appeared in yesterday's issue of the New York Times. Mr. President, I now send this article to the desk and ask that it be printed in the body of the Record at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

UNITED STATES TRIES TOO HARD TO TEACH NEEDY COUNTRIES ITS WAYS—AMERICAN TECHNIQUES ARE NOT ALWAYS BEST UNDER OTHER CONDITIONS, U. N. EXPERTS FIND

GENEVA, May 3.—Experience gained over a period of several years in the field of technical assistance to underdeveloped Communist-threatened countries has convinced many western officials that the United States is getting too little done by trying to do too much.

These officials do not mean too much money is being put into the programs. There is no visible limit to the amount of help the underdeveloped areas of the world could use. What is meant is that the United States is trying to do too much of the helping by itself.

The United Nations Technical Assistance Board concluded one of its frequent meetings here today. It is the top body that guides and tries to coordinate the United Nations agencies in various kinds of technical-aid programs. Most of the problems reports to this group and discussions that of this kind of operation are reflected in arise within it.

#### UNITED STATES SPENDS FAR THE MOST

The United States is the largest financial contributor to the United Nations programs of technical assistance. It also has programs of its own administered by United States Government departments under the State Department's general supervision. At present more than 10 times as much is being spent by the United States on its unilateral programs as on those conducted through United Nations agencies.

Both United States and European officials in close touch with this work have been convinced for a long time that a United Nations agency can get more results for a dollar's expenditure in most underdeveloped areas than the United States can get operating alone. This is because a very large part of the problem is always to get the local governments to accept conditions that will make assistance effective. The United Nations body can afford to be much tougher about insisting on the right conditions than can the United States, which to an increasing extent is finding local governments unwilling to face the criticism that they are taking American dictation.

But the fundamental weakness of the present American approach as these officials see it is the result of a much more subtle factor than the choice of the machinery whereby technical assistance is proffered to underdeveloped countries.

The American tendency is to regard American techniques as the best for all parts of the world without much reflection or inquiry into what other countries with advanced industrial and scientific knowledge have to offer. When people are taken out of their countries and trained as agricultural economists, public administration officers or engineers the American tendency is to bring them to the United States for training. Similarly American technicians are automatically sent abroad under United States programs and the United States Government

usually puts forward American experts to work under the United Nations as well.

#### SUPREMACY ISN'T ENOUGH

No European or Asian officials would deny that United States industrial supremacy has many features that can be exported or that the United States is the best place for a technician to go for study in many lines of activity. But not in all.

If Korea ceases to be a battlefield and becomes a reconstruction area this problem will become very acute, technical-assistance officials believe. Will it be the wisest to try to teach Koreans American administrative methods, American farming methods, and American health-service procedures?

Trained Korean central bank officials who can understand and carry out monetary controls to stem inflation are desperately needed. Several are being trained now. But they are being trained in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, whose size, complexity, and policies give it hardly any resemblance to the kind of central banking operation the Koreans will need to know how to conduct.

Would it not be wiser, officials are asking, to train Korean central bankers in India or Siam, both of which have excellent central-bank staffs and where they would see how to deal with matters that resemble their own Korean problems?

Many western officials are convinced that the United States would be politically and financially stronger if it deliberately adopted a policy of giving American aid through the medium of other democratic countries, technicians and institutions. The United Nations machinery is the most obvious but not the only way this policy could be applied.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is my intention to move to re-refer Senate bill 3086 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report to the Senate on or before May 15. I make this motion as one who has supported the North Atlantic Pact and the prior arms implementation bills. I expect to support an authorization bill this year, but I strongly believe there are valid and compelling reasons for the pending legislation to be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Of the \$6,900,000,000 involved in this bill, as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, approximately \$4,700,000,000 deal with military phases in a direct sense. In other words, 70 percent of the funds authorized relate to a field in which the Armed Services Committee has a direct and vital interest. I might also say, Mr. President, that when the arms implementation bill was before the Senate a year ago, it was considered by both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, sitting jointly. There was resistance to doing that this year by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Until Saturday, May 3, neither the committee report nor the hearings were available to the Members of the Senate or to the public. To claim that a part of a week end is sufficient to give study to this complex legislation is absurd.

A week or 10 days of hearings before the Armed Services Committee will permit Members of the Senate to study the report of the Foreign Relations Committee and the hearings that are now

available. The Armed Services Committee would undoubtedly concentrate on the military, rather than the economic phase of the bill.

Even with the \$1,000,000,000 reduction recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee, this bill still provides for \$6,900,000,000. This amount, while it may seem small to some who are used to dealing with astronomical figures, is nevertheless equivalent to the total Federal budget for the fiscal year 1938. It is larger by a billion seven hundred million dollars than our total budget receipts for the fiscal year 1940.

It is my judgment that if this bill passes in its present form any hope for a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year is impossible of realization. I call attention to page 79 of the hearings. On that page there appear some figures relative to the public debt of Belgium-Luxemburg, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, in contrast to our own debt now amounting to \$260,000,000,000.

Several of these nations are operating on balanced budgets and are to be commended for so doing. Based on the figures presented to us by the President of the United States, we will be operating with a \$14,000,000,000 deficiency. All of the \$6,900,000,000 authorized by this bill, if subsequently appropriated for by the Congress, will be from borrowed money and the result of deficit financing. I do not underestimate the serious financial problem facing our Nation, but that is not the only reason for my motion.

On my responsibility as a Senator and as a member of the Armed Services Committee, of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Services, and of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy I believe that we are taking a calculated risk with our national defenses, air, sea, and land, which, as the elected representatives of the American people, we should not take without further examination by the committee which is primarily responsible for our armed services.

The Constitution of the United States provides, in article I, section 8, that—

The Congress shall have power to . . .  
provide for the common defense . . .  
to raise and support armies . . . to  
provide and maintain a Navy—

And while, of course, the Constitution did not mention the Air Force the same responsibility rests with the Congress with respect to that branch of the Armed Forces. Partly because the President of the United States froze the funds provided by Congress in 1949 we have lost invaluable and never to be recaptured time in having an adequate Air Force in being.

Since June of 1950, we have been engaged in an undeclared war in Korea. Our ground forces there today are outnumbered more than 2 to 1. Our fighting planes are often outnumbered from 2 to 4 to 1.

Approximately one-half of our planes are obsolete or at least obsolescent.

It is my belief that men have unnecessarily died in obsolescent planes in Korea because this great Nation of ours, pioneer in the field of aviation, has not



the present capacity or available funds to give our Air Force planes which are second to none.

While our present limited aviation capacity and funds have been channeled to equip NATO countries with modern jet planes, we have, partly as a result of this concentration, temporarily lost superiority in jet commercial transportation to Great Britain as a recent flight from London to Johannesburg has indicated.

How much of the morale factor in the Air Force stems from our flyers being asked to fight the Korean war and if necessary world war III to a large extent in left-over planes from the last war? It may well be vital to the security of this Nation and to the ultimate defense of the free world to have from one to three modern carriers capable of striking and moving attacks along the periphery of the potential aggressor nations rather than to have all of our eggs in fixed bases which may or may not be available to us when the chips are down.

How much in port charges, mentioned by the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE] and taxes to foreign governments are we paying out of our mutual defense funds to our allies that should be going into planes, guns and ships?

In the committee hearings, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] properly raised the question as to the relative cost of equipping and maintaining a European Army compared to the cost of equipping and maintaining an American Army. The figures are most interesting. A chart is set forth on page 23 of the committee report. However, there is a significant omission. It does not show what it would cost to equip and maintain Asiatic forces who also believe in resisting communism. Such forces could be of tremendous help in holding the Pacific flank of the free world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, is the Senator from California willing to yield at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should prefer to finish my statement, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is one question I should like to ask in relation to the pending appropriation bill. I would be glad to have it placed at the end of the Senator's remarks. I may be unable to remain. I desire to remain, if possible, but the nomination of the Attorney General is to be considered by the Judiciary Committee, and that may require me to leave.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the circumstances, I am very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish today to call attention to the fact that the original act, namely, the National Security Act, authorizing the appropriation, was referred to the Armed Services Committee. Section 307, authorizing the appropriation, provides:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act—

Indicating that the Armed Services Committee has authority over appropri-

ations for the military. As I understand, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is a common defense instrumentality, so that it is really a part of our own Military Establishment. If that be true, should not this authorization go to the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In my opinion, the Senator is quite correct. I think every argument I have heard made before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services, on which the very able Senator from Michigan serves with me, indicates that our own Joint Chiefs of Staff have supported this program because it is a part of the common defense. While I quite agree that there are certain phases of the bill dealing with the economic factors involved which might properly go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I think the precedent which was established last year should have been followed by both committees, because under our system the responsibility, committee-wise, rests with the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Returning to the question of the relative costs of manpower mentioned in the committee report, that part of it which apparently is overlooked, some study should be made of what the cost and potentialities are of Asiatic forces from the Republic of Korea, the Republic of China, Japan, Thailand, the Philippines, and Pakistan, and any other Asiatic country that was willing to carry its fair share of the load in resisting Communist aggressions in that area of the world. Some very significant testimony was taken not long ago by the Senate Armed Services Committee relative to the progress made by the United States Military Mission on Formosa of the relative cost of equipping and maintaining the Nationalist forces there compared with other areas of the world.

Yet, on page 604 of the hearings, it is shown that when Formosa was being discussed only two members of the Foreign Relations Committee were present.

The arms aid bill needs to be integrated with our own defense requirements. I would like to get the frank opinions of our Joint Chiefs of Staff as to how they would divide the total defense figures of some \$60,000,000,000, including our own defense as well as military aid abroad, if that total sum was to be reduced and instructions given that no further jets were to be sent to other nations until the United States Air Force was completely equipped with modern planes.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I do not believe I would be discharging my obligation to the Senate if these facts were not now called to the attention of the Senate.

In Korea a hot war is now going on. We are supplying 90 percent of the Armed Forces and our 107,000 casualties are 93 percent of casualties suffered by United Nations members.

How many of the nations that are getting aid under this bill have abided by the letter and the spirit of section 511, A and B, and how many of them have been spoon-fed American dollars while

they fail to comply with the clear congressional intent?

We have heard the argument that we could not get better than a stalemate in Korea because we did not have the power to win the undeclared war there. A partial answer to that suggestion may be that we have in part an outnumbered and outmoded air force and we have not provided the modern planes and carriers for our naval air program. I am not in favor of Americans being asked to risk their lives in a second-best air force or with inferior land or sea equipment.

The Nation would be shocked if it knew the calculated risks we were taking with the security of this heartland of human freedom and with the lives of young men who may have to meet a Soviet air force outnumbering them materially. We are the elected representatives of this Nation. It is long past time for us to cease abdicating our responsibilities to the executive branch.

Mr. President, I move that Senate bill 3086 be rereferred to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report to the Senate on or before May 15.

Mr. CAIN and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Because of the obvious common sense and logic in the remarks of the Senator from California I should like to express my admiration for what my friend from California has said so clearly and to state that I am anxious to vote for the motion which has just been made by him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall vote with the Senator from California, but I should like to ask for his comments on two points I did not hear him mention in his speech.

He has referred to the mutual security bill which is the bill now before the Senate, which authorizes \$6,900,000,000. We have been hearing witnesses on the defense appropriation bill, and the issue is whether to cut down expenditures from \$52,000,000,000 to \$40,000,000,000 as was done in the House. I should like to ask the Senator from California if I am not correct in stating that last week the President sent to the Congress a message authorizing additional public works appropriations, of which \$2,600,000,000 would go to the armed services. I point out to the Senator that the House subcommittee dealing with defense appropriations cut out half of the appropriation required for public works in the fiscal year 1953. The whole question will come before the Armed Services Committee.

Another item is with reference to atomic energy. In the testimony it was stated very frankly that there would be another supplemental request for something over \$4,000,000,000 for additional atomic energy plants made necessary by the national defense.

All these items are concerned with the national defense and the building up of mutual aid abroad, together with the building up of our fighting forces in Korea.

I agree with the Senator from California that the bill should go to the Armed Services Committee for review, but am I not correct in stating that the other two items are an integral part of the whole question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I quite agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe they are closely integrated with the problem in the over-all defense picture. Under our rules, the Armed Services Committee has a very peculiar responsibility in the field of defense; and I might say, as one who serves not only on the Committee on Armed Services but on the Subcommittee on Appropriations and also on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that the problems are closely interrelated, because we obviously cannot deliver atomic weapons by jeep or by horseback. We must have modernized air equipment in order to make delivery. So the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts fits into the whole picture. If we are to reach a condition even of a reasonable balancing of the budget it is essential to review the whole defense picture in one big package. I think no Senator will disagree with the statement that it is highly unlikely that this Congress will pass additional tax legislation. We are already levying more taxes than we did at the height of World War II. There will have to be some reductions or some redistributions among the funds left. I do not believe that can intelligently be done unless it is tied in with the whole defense picture.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not the Senator's intention, if the bill is referred, not necessarily to go into the details which the Foreign Relations Committee has covered so thoroughly in its report, but to try to get an over-all look at the entire picture?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. I have supported the North Atlantic Pact because I do not believe it is in our national interest to permit communism to overrun what is left of the free world. Where I have differed with some aspects of our foreign policy is that we were closing the door to communism in Europe and leaving the door open in Asia.

I wish to say to the able Senator from Iowa so as to indicate that there will be no chance of great delay in getting the bill out of committee, that my motion itself provides that the Committee on Armed Services shall report back to the Senate on or before the 15th of May.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from California, as he has analyzed the report, realize that the Committee on Foreign Relations, in its wisdom, has put into the report and the bill new elements of flexibility, and that the transitions made between economic and military aid are tied into the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I am familiar with what the committee did.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two questions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. My first question is, Does the Senator from California believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations was in any way lax or derelict in its duty to investigate thoroughly?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, I will say to the able Senator from Iowa. I think he knows me well enough to understand that I have a very high regard for him and for the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think it has its field of jurisdiction, and I am not suggesting for a moment that it was not entirely proper for the Committee on Foreign Relations to give this subject a thorough hearing and to make its report to the Senate from the point of view of the Committee on Foreign Relations. But I am suggesting, most respectfully, in view of the precedent of last year, that both committees should sit jointly, and in view of the very direct responsibility the Committee on Armed Services has with the national defense, it is also just as proper and just as necessary, in my judgment, for the Committee on Armed Services to have an opportunity to consider the facts and develop some questions which perhaps the Committee on Foreign Relations did not have either the background or the knowledge to develop.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator, and shall now propound my other question. I hope the Senator from California will not deduce from my questions any imputation of improper action, but I wish to ask him if in making the motion he has now submitted he is acting under his undoubted right and responsibility as an individual Senator, or whether he is acting by direction of the Committee on Armed Services or its chairman.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am acting on my own responsibility as a United States Senator and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I am not acting under instructions of the Committee on Armed Services.

While I was recently in California, on a very brief visit, I understand some discussion of the subject took place in the Armed Services Committee. Prior to the time I had left for California, and at the time the bill was originally referred, it had been the unanimous judgment of the Armed Services Committee that they should either sit in with the Committee on Foreign Relations or have the bill re-referred to the Armed Services Committee. I understand there has been some change of mind on the part of some members of the committee since that time, but today I am acting on my own responsibility as a Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask the Senator from California if he could give us an estimate of the time it might require for the Committee on Armed Services to go into this matter thoroughly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Perhaps the Senator from Michigan was not in the Chamber when I began my remarks, but my motion itself provides that the Committee on Armed Services shall report back to the Senate on or before May 15. That represents a period of 10 days. As I judge the situation, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, it would not be our purpose to duplicate all the testimony which has been taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or to send for many of the same witnesses, some of whom may now be in Europe, or to deal particularly with the economic phases of the bill.

However, with the knowledge we have, I feel that there are certain aspects, tying in with our own defense and affecting American aviators who are flying obsolete and obsolescent planes in Korea, which at least need to be integrated and gone into by the Committee on Armed Services.

Of course, I fully appreciate that the Senate in its wisdom may determine that it does not desire to rerefer the bill, but, as I have pointed out in my remarks, I feel I would be derelict in my responsibility if I did not suggest some of the very real problems which exist in our national defense, and say where I believe we are taking certain calculated risks which are not in the interest of the security of our own Nation or, indeed, the security of the free world.

If the Senate, with those facts in mind, wishes to deprive the Committee on Armed Services, which has the responsibility in this field, of this opportunity, then the responsibility rests upon the Senate.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator from California whether he remembers that at the time the mutual security bill was before the Senate, many of us, including possibly the Senator from California—though my memory is not clear about that—felt that military features should be referred to the Army, and that point 4 features should go to the State Department. Without asking the Senator from California how he felt about it, I will say that I felt very strongly that way.

I feel that the time has arrived when our unwisdom in putting these two disparate projects under one heading is beginning to show itself. Point 4 should have come through the State Department, or some other agency equipped to speak on that subject, to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Armament matters relating to NATO in Europe normally belong in the Committee on Armed Services. It seems to me that we are simply reaping the results of our own unwisdom. I can see no other way of handling the situation than along the lines suggested in the motion made by the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I may say to him, since he raised the question, that my own feeling consistently has been that the arms and armament features which are



very definitely related to our own defense should be considered by the Committee on Armed Services. As I understand the Senator from Vermont, I do not believe I can join him in suggesting that there should be two bills. However, time has shown that there may have been a good deal of wisdom in the suggestion the Senator has made, which would have avoided a situation of the kind in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator will recall that this year, as also last year, I was one of those who favored a joint meeting of the two committees because of the danger of the interrelation of different jurisdictions. Therefore I should like to ask the Senator if his motion contemplates that the Committee on Armed Services shall take a new look at the situation and probably suggest recommendations different from those made by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or amend the recommendations which have been made? Where are we going to be after the Committee on Armed Services acts, if it does act?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from New Jersey that his question covers one of the very reasons why some of us suggested originally that we should follow the precedent of last year, and get the viewpoint of both committees.

As I stated earlier, it is not my intention to delay the bill unnecessarily. I am as interested in carrying out our NATO obligations as is any other Senator, but I also feel that when Americans flying in Korea are being out-numbered 3 or 4 to 1, when American aviators are flying obsolescent and obsolete planes which are being shot down in flames, we do have the responsibility of reviewing our own actions whenever we have doubt.

I may say to the Senator that so far as the defense features are concerned, if the bill is referred to the Committee on Armed Services under the instructions I have included in my motion, that committee will have to report back to the Senate on or before the 15th of May. I would assume they could make such recommendations as to the bill as a legislative committee might properly make. However, though I have no control over what the committee may do, it would be my idea that they should not go into the economic phases of the bill, but rather that they would concentrate on the military phases, and the effects of the military phases upon our national defense.

For the further information of the Senator, I understand that today, for instance, the fly-away cost of a Saberjet plane approximately \$250,000. With all the spare parts, and so forth, the cost mounts up to perhaps \$550,000.

I believe that we must very carefully examine certain phases of this question in connection with aid to other countries which have not indicated that they are willing to stand up and be counted in this effort. I also believe that there is an obligation upon the Congress and upon the American people not to let some of those countries violate the letter and spirit of section 511 (a) and (b), wherein

the Congress clearly indicated that they should stand up and be counted. In this connection I think there has been considerable winking at that legislative requirement, and an attitude of tongue-in-cheek.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is not arguing, is he, that the Armed Services Committee should take jurisdiction away from the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not arguing that; but I am not agreeing that the Foreign Relations Committee should take jurisdiction away from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is the reason why the Senator from New Jersey favored joint meetings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think we would have avoided this difficulty if there had been joint meetings, as the able Senator so clearly indicated.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think we could have avoided the difficulty, but the situation we face now is that that decision was not made at the time. The subject was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. The Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings and has submitted a report, and we are prepared to present the bill to the Senate.

I ask the distinguished Senator from California whether he intends to take a new look at the subject and bring in a different recommendation as to the form of the bill, the amounts, and so forth. If so, what will the parliamentary procedure be? I am seeking light.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey in all good humor that I do not intend that this procedure shall be an empty gesture. I do not intend that the Armed Services Committee shall be required to sign a blank check for something which has already been done by the Foreign Relations Committee. If the bill is as good as the Foreign Relations Committee apparently believes it to be, and if that committee has considered all aspects of the situation, there may be very few changes to be made in the bill by the Armed Services Committee. If there are certain aspects relating to our own critical defense needs with respect to which the Foreign Relations Committee lacked the background information, and if there are certain aspects into which the Foreign Relations Committee did not go, I should consider it incumbent upon the Armed Services Committee to make such recommendations to the Senate as it believes should be made. Then the question can be amply discussed in the Senate.

Let me add one additional word. On Friday I tried to obtain a copy of the report, as well as a copy of the hearings. At that time the hearings were in proof form and were not available to me. I was told that it was expected that they would be ready on Saturday. On Saturday my office again inquired. The report was not ready, but it was expected soon. Finally, on Saturday afternoon, I obtained a copy of the report of the Foreign Relations Committee and a copy of

the thick bound volume of hearings. I worked rather diligently Saturday evening and Sunday trying to digest as much of the material as possible. It is now Monday. I believe that if the Armed Services Committee should be accorded the limited time which we are requesting to study this proposed legislation, in the meantime the Senate would have an opportunity to study the report and the bill as reported from the committee of which the able Senator from New Jersey is a member.

Mr. President, we are not dealing with peanuts. As I pointed out, even with a reduction of \$1,000,000,000 by the Committee on Foreign Relations, the bill still provides for expenditures of \$6,900,000,000. That is more money than the entire Federal Government was costing the American people as late as 1938. It is more money than all the taxes taken into the Federal Treasury as late as 1940. I think it is not unreasonable that the 96 Members of this body should have a little more time than one weekend to consider a question of this magnitude. I say again that \$6,900,000,000 is not peanuts, although there may be some who think that we are dealing with such astronomical figures that this amount can be handled in one afternoon.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from California, and I am in sympathy with much of what he has said. I myself had not seen the report until last night. That was because I had been out of the city.

I am still confused as to the parliamentary situation. If the Senator will yield for a parliamentary inquiry, I should like to ask the Chair to advise me as to the parliamentary situation presented by the pending motion. In the event the Armed Services Committee should submit a report which differed from the report of the Foreign Relations Committee, would the Foreign Relations Committee report and recommendation which is now before the Senate be subject to amendment by the Armed Services Committee, or would there be a conflict of jurisdiction? In other words, does the motion of the Senator from California contemplate that jurisdiction would be transferred from the Foreign Relations Committee to the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the Chair rules, if I may make an observation, I will say that the Senator from California is not proposing, in effect, that the work which the Foreign Relations Committee has done be eliminated and written off the record. The Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings and has submitted a report. The report is before the Senate. The bill is before the Senate. We are now merely asking that the bill be re-referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the bill has already been reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. However, if the Senate Armed Services Committee considers the bill, it will have authority to report it back with amendments so far as the military features are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Then the original bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee and the amendments recommended by the Armed Services Committee would both be before the Senate for debate when the time came to present the matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They would then be properly before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to say a word on the parliamentary situation. The Chair has indicated that if the bill were referred to the Armed Services Committee such reference would be only with respect to military items. If the bill is referred to the Committee on Armed Services, the whole bill will be before that committee, and everything in it will be before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is quite correct. However, the Parliamentarian advises the Chair that by the terms of the motion of the Senator from California the Armed Services Committee would report back only on the military aspects of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the question of amending the Mutual Security Act of 1951 was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That committee commenced hearings on March 13. The hearings continued uninterruptedly from March 13 to April 4. Thereafter the committee went into executive session, and has been considering the bill since that time.

This is only an authorization bill. It does not appropriate any money. It merely authorizes the appropriation of not to exceed a certain amount of money for the various purposes set forth in the Mutual Security Act.

The House committee has not yet acted on the bill. Therefore the entire subject is still before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. When the House acts, if there is a difference between the House and Senate versions of the bill, of course it must go to conference and the differences must be ironed out.

The Appropriations Committee will then consider the question of appropriations. The Foreign Relations Committee has carefully inserted in each item of this authorization the language "not to exceed" a certain amount of money. I know that the practice has developed for the Appropriations Committee to feel more or less bound to appropriate the sum authorized, especially in connection with matters pertaining to our foreign relations. That ought not to be the attitude adopted by the Appropriations Committee.

We have before us a motion to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee. Perhaps such reference would be limited. At any rate, the motion is to refer it to the Armed Services Committee. Had the Armed Services Committee been authorized to sit jointly with the Foreign Relations Committee, as was done last year, much of the difficulty would have been avoided. That was not done. The subject was before the For-

eign Relations Committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee proceeded to discharge its duty as best it could. The committee has reported the bill with an over-all reduction of \$1,000,000,000. Perhaps the view may be taken in this body that it should be reduced by more than a billion dollars. That is within the competency of the Senate. The bill is now before the Senate. The Senate may reduce it by another billion dollars, by \$2,000,000,000, by \$3,000,000,000; or the bill may be defeated entirely, if the Senate wishes to do so.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The reason I rise is that I observe that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a copy of the testimony on his desk. I do not find it on my desk. I wondered when it was made available. If there has not been sufficient time given to Senators to consider the matter—

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, Mr. President, that is an entirely different matter. If Senators have not had time properly to consider the measure, action on it should be postponed until they have had such opportunity. I thought that perhaps the measure would be before the Senate for the greater part of the week.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have just now received a copy of the testimony.

Mr. GEORGE. The point I make is that there is no occasion to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services at this time, because the subject has been before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and every member of the Armed Services Committee could have attended the hearings for almost 2 months, or at least for a full month of open hearings. Any member of the Committee on Armed Services could have been heard if he had desired to be heard. Any member could have been present at the hearings.

The House committee has not yet reported an authorization bill to the House. When that committee does report it to the House, it may report an authorization bill which is a billion dollars below the Senate bill, or it may report it in the amount contained in the Senate bill. However, whatever is reported to the House, and whatever is passed by the House, the bill must go to conference, and the conference bill will then come before both Houses. It is then that the Committee on Appropriations will consider the matter.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I unhesitatingly say that I believe the Committee on Appropriations should exercise its full jurisdiction. If it believes that it should not recommend an appropriation in the amount contained in this authorization bill, it should reduce the amount to the figure it feels should be appropriated.

However, the point is that if the bill is referred to the Committee on Armed Services, what will we then have? The Committee on Armed Services may come forward with a recommendation that not exceeding so many dollars be appropriated for military purposes. Nearly all the amount contained in the bill is

for military purposes. The Committee on Foreign Relations, it is true, is the committee which has jurisdiction over the authorization of expenditure of money even for military purposes in this field. Nearly all of it is for military purposes. Suppose that the Committee on Armed Services should make a different recommendation. In that case the Senate would be confused. On the other hand, the Senate, if it wishes to reduce the respective amounts, or if it wishes to raise them, has full power to do so.

Mr. President, we should debate the question on the floor of the Senate until it is disposed of. It would be confusing, I may say to my distinguished friend from California, for whose judgment I have great respect, if the bill were sent to the Committee on Armed Services.

I may say further to the Senator from California that there is not any way to separate any one item in this bill or in any other authorization bill from the general subject of national defense.

Reference has been made to the financial side of it. Undoubtedly the financial side of it is important. However, the bill has not been referred to the Committee on Finance. That committee has not had an opportunity to consider it. It is true that some of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are also members of the Committee on Finance, just as some members of the Foreign Relations Committee are members of the Armed Services Committee, and just as many Members of the Senate are members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Certainly there cannot be any national defense for this Government or for the free world which rests upon the unstable and shaky foundation of economic chaos. Everyone knows, or should know, that that is so. The Committee on Foreign Relations has proceeded as best it could to say that the full amount should be reduced by a total of \$1,000,000,000. Then it has provided that not exceeding the amounts provided for the several items covered in the bill may be appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia will yield to me so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on this question. If the yeas and nays were ordered, Senators could have the assurance now that there would be a record vote on the question. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall conclude in a minute.

I see no reason why this bill should be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. My distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I have great confidence in his judgment, as I have great confidence in the judgment of every other member of the Committee on Armed Services. I do not see that this bill has anything directly to do with our national defense, except that under the national defense bill, when that is before the Senate, it



will be found that perhaps the branches of our armed services may transfer some of the end items to the NATO countries if an emergency should arise which would authorize such a transfer.

Mr. President, I supported the North Atlantic Treaty. I did not vote for, but voted against, the first appropriation to support this very program. Before the ink was dry upon the North Atlantic Treaty, we were faced with a request for appropriations of more than \$2,000,000,000. Most of it was for the reconditioning of so-called excess arms and munitions and for excess surplus arms and munitions. One billion dollars of it was in money or contract authorizations. I voted against it. I knew it was foolish to throw away \$500,000,000, or perhaps a billion dollars, under that bill. It was foolish. It has produced no good to the NATO countries or to ourselves. But we had to do it. It had to be done in a hurry. The administration wanted to show the world that we were going to arm the Western European nations overnight. We did it before there was even a program drawn. What was the result? There is no man living, Mr. President, who can trace any benefit from the \$500,000,000 in contract authorizations and \$500,000,000 in cash money we gave away under that first bill.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe that the Senator from Georgia has as clearly indicated as it could possibly be indicated the very direct relationship between the arms implementation program and our military security, because in the particular area to which the Senator is now referring, namely, that of so-called excess equipment, actually that excess equipment had formerly been in the war reserve of this country.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was declared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and our military authorities that it was not needed for our war reserves and that it could become excess equipment.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now we are being asked to purchase for our own Military Establishment certain categories of equipment which a short time ago we declared to be excess equipment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, even when the first bill was before the Senate, the Armed Services Committee sat with the Foreign Relations Committee, and the bill actually reported was the joint product of the two committees. In the consideration of the second bill, the two committees sat together.

They did not serve together in regard to the bill, which now is before the Senate. At this time, to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee will lead to nothing but confusion, Mr. President.

I am trying to emphasize the point that the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee are very much bound, in respect to a measure of this sort, by the representations made to us by the spokesmen for the Government. We try to hedge against that by providing that not to exceed the

amounts stated in the bill shall be authorized for appropriation, and we leave the final determination to the Appropriations Committees.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is a member of the Appropriations Committee; the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is also a member of the Appropriations Committee. That committee is a very large one. So it seems to me there is no occasion to refer this bill to the Armed Services Committee.

I beg the Senate to remember that this bill is only an authorization measure, and the House of Representatives has not yet acted upon it. The House may vote to reduce further the amount of the authorization provided by the bill, or the House may vote to increase the amount of the authorization. When both Houses have acted on the authorization bill, and when it is enacted into law, a corresponding appropriations bill must be referred to and considered by the Appropriations Committees.

So, Mr. President, there is no occasion for the Armed Services Committee to have the bill referred to it. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and he will be there, together with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and other distinguished Members of this body. Of course at that time they can pass upon this subject, in the light of what that committee is doing for our national defense together with what we are also doing for other countries.

Mr. President, if I were sure that it would not lead to confusion, I would say that it would be all right for the Armed Services Committee to consider this bill. However, if that committee differed at all in regard to any item, a state of confusion would ensue. So, Mr. President, if I wished to have the bill killed outright, I would vote to have it referred to the Armed Services Committee; and then, thereafter, I would vote to have the bill referred to the Finance Committee.

I do not believe the distinguished Senator from California has any purpose to kill the bill; I think that, generally speaking, he has favored the enactment of legislation of this sort. However, I am saying that if the bill were referred to the Armed Services Committee, the result might be to kill the bill, because following action by the Senate, the House must act on the bill, and thereafter both Appropriations Committees must consider the corresponding appropriation bill. So, in view of its present status, I can see no reason on earth for sending the bill to the Armed Services Committee.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall be compelled to vote against the motion of the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on what question is the request for the yeas and nays made?

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the motion to recommit.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second to the request for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think we are entitled to have the yeas and nays on this motion, and therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from California had a chance to request the yeas and nays, and the Senate would not agree to order the yeas and nays on his motion.

I do not object to having a quorum call at this time, but I think we are engaging in a great deal of ballyhoo that is not helping the work of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Texas may think it is ballyhoo. He has his responsibility, and I have mine. I believe we are entitled to have the yeas and nays ordered on this question. In view of the small number of Senators now on the floor, I think it is proper parliamentary procedure to suggest the absence of a quorum, in order to have a quorum on the floor, and then to see whether the Senate itself wishes to have the yeas and nays ordered on this question.

So, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California withhold momentarily his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think we shall expedite matters if we either have the yeas and nays ordered or if there is a quorum call at this time. A number of Senators who have commitments to attend committee meetings will be able to attend those meetings if they know there will be a yea-and-nay vote on this question.

I shall be glad to withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum if we can have the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I was on my feet, addressing the Chair, and was awaiting recognition, when the Senator from California rose to his feet and suggested the absence of a quorum. My parliamentary question is this: Can a Senator, without being recognized, but merely by suggesting the absence of a quorum, interfere with a Senator who is on his feet, seeking recognition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair must say to the Senator from Iowa that the Senator from California was recognized, and the Senator from Iowa was not recognized.

Therefore, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum is in order, and the clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Benton	Hennings	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Mundt
Byrd	Humphrey	Murray
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Ives	Nixon
Case	Jenner	O'Connor
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Seaton
Duff	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	Malone	Taft
Ferguson	Maybank	Thye
Flanders	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Welker
George	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	McMahon	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is obviously a sufficient number seconding the request, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from California will not prevail. Senators have been questioning me as to when the Senate may conclude its business for the session. I realize that there is hardly a bill which comes before the Senate that does not overlap, so far as jurisdiction is concerned. It might even be said that it may be important for a tax bill to be referred to the Armed Services Committee because taxes must be levied in order to raise money for the maintenance of the armed services. The Committee on Foreign Relations is a competent committee and it has given the pending bill careful consideration. Long hearings have been held. If the Armed Services Committee had felt that it should have jurisdiction, it had the right to appeal in the first place from the decision of the Chair referring the President's message to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to recall to the mind of the majority leader that the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], at the time the message was referred, gave notice that he would make a motion, when the bill came from the Foreign Relations Committee—

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know what other information the Armed Services Committee could gather in addition to what has already been gathered. It may be that the members of that committee are more competent than are the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I think the Foreign Relations Committee is competent to pass upon the questions involved.

I did not want the bill to become involved in a jurisdictional dispute. If the Armed Services Committee intended to take action it should have taken it before this time. It should have moved to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations after the hearings were concluded.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think any member of the Armed Services Committee has taken the position that the Foreign Relations Committee had not a proper interest in the bill, but I also feel that there are many members of the Foreign Relations Committee who likewise understood that the Armed Services Committee had a proper interest in the bill. When the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in his judgment and wisdom, determined that the Senate would not follow the same procedure it followed a year ago, it was clearly indicated on the floor that such a motion as I have made would be the only alternative. We are not trying to deprive the Foreign Relations Committee of its proper interest, but we also feel that there is a very real interest in the bill on the part of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not question the fact that the members of the Armed Services Committee have an interest in the bill, but they do not have any greater interest than has the junior Senator from Arizona or any other Member of the Senate. Because a Senator happens to be a member of a certain committee it does not follow that other Members of the Senate do not have an interest in the questions which may be involved in a given measure. The rules of the Senate provide that only one committee shall consider proposed legislation. I should have liked to see the question determined without such a motion being made, but that was not done.

Personally, I think the Foreign Relations Committee has done well with this bill. If the Senate is ever going to get away from Washington it must take the recommendations of its committees and consider proposed legislation on the floor. I do not think a showing has been made that the Armed Services Committee has any superior knowledge of the facts with reference to the questions involved in the bill than have members of the Foreign Relations Committee. So I hope, Mr. President, that the motion will be rejected.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I sought recognition in order to correct an erroneous impression which I feel is somewhat prevalent.

The eminent Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has made a motion to rerefer the bill. There is no question of rereference before the Senate. The bill has never been referred to a committee of this body. The President sent a message on the sixth day of last March in which he asked that consideration be given to an extension of the Mutual Security Act. The message was referred by

this body to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Committee on Foreign Relations, as every Senator knows, conducted protracted and extensive investigations and public hearings and reported a bill under leave of the Senate.

I invite attention, Mr. President, to the fact that on the 28th day of April the eminent majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND] stated as follows:

Mr. President, I understand the Committee on Foreign Relations has ordered reported an extension of the mutual security program, and I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized during any recess of the Senate this week to report an original bill extending the Mutual Security Act.

Under order of the Senate, which was made on April 28, the Committee on Foreign Relations, on the 30th day of April, while the Senate was in recess, reported an original bill which was given a number and ordered placed on the calendar. Through inadvertence it is not on the calendar on page 12, where it should be, following calendar No. 1417. But an original bill was reported to the Senate under leave of the Senate.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The technical point which the Senator has raised may be correct, but the bill which is now reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee was certainly before that committee. In view of what the Senator from Iowa has said, perhaps the language of my motion should have been that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, rather than rereferred. But, certainly, the subject matter was before the Foreign Relations Committee. The President's message was before the Foreign Relations Committee. The bill itself has been formulated by the Foreign Relations Committee. For that reason I thought the technical question of rereference would not be material.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from California is correct in his statement that under the order of the Senate the President's message was before the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee conducted protracted investigations into the subject matter. The bill was reported under leave of the Senate. The bill and the subject matter involved are within the jurisdiction and control of the Senate. It is true as a parliamentary matter that the Senate can take the bill from the calendar and refer it to some other committee if it sees fit to do so.

I hope the Senate will not take such action. It would mean delay, which considering the subject matter and its importance, would, in my judgment, be wholly unjustified.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not correct to say that perhaps the major share of the appropriation proposed to be authorized is for direct military purposes?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think perhaps the greater percentage is, yes.



Mr. CASE. Is it not also correct that General Gruenther, in testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations, stated that he was unable to speak in dollar amounts, but that he was speaking of the military equipment that would be necessary, in his judgment and in the judgment of General Eisenhower, for purposes of the mutual security pact?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not know that I understand the question of the eminent Senator. Is he questioning the testimony of some witness before the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. CASE. If I may make a brief statement, I will then ask a question which I think perhaps will clarify what I have in mind.

My understanding is that when General Gruenther was before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and was asked whether he felt the amount of dollar appropriations provided for was needed, he stated he was not in a position to price items of military equipment, but that he could state what was needed in terms of so many planes or so much military matériel.

If that be so, the point then is, would not the Committee on Armed Services be in a good position to give the Senate valuable judgment in translating military equipment into dollars, and hence their recommendations would be important?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, I repeat what I said a moment ago, that in all probability the greater portion of the sum of \$6,900,000,000 will be devoted to military purposes. It is the contention of those who are supporting the appropriation that even the portion of the expenditure that is to go to ECA assistance will be of military value indirectly.

What some persons overlook, and what I believe the eminent Senator overlooks, is that the whole purpose of military aid and economic aid contained in the bill is to assist our allies abroad. The whole question is one of international cooperation and international action, and, as such, is, of course, within the purview of the authority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which, acting under that authority, formulated the bill and reported it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a little further?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. I certainly do not question in any degree the fact that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations appropriately considered the bill and made its recommendations with respect thereto. However, in view of the fact that by far the larger portion of money is for military aid, in view of the fact that General Gruenther said he was not equipped to translate such aid into dollars, and in view of the further fact that the Senate in considering this bill obviously cannot go into categories of individual pieces of military equipment and price them in dollars, it seemed to me that it would be appropriate to have the Committee on Armed Services give considera-

tion to military equipment items, so that they could be translated into dollars and the Senate might thereby be enabled to legislate intelligently.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. Whatever logic there is in the statement just made, and the statement along similar lines made earlier by the eminent Senator from California, the same type of argument can apply to other phases of the aid provided for. It could be urged with just as much logic that because the bill provides ECA assistance and technical assistance under point 4, dealing with the question of raising food, it should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and let that committee consider it, because much more than a billion dollars, indeed, as I recall, about \$2,000,000,000, goes into the field of production and distribution of food. By the same argument and the same logic, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could say that the bill comes within their jurisdiction. Likewise, the Committee on Banking and Currency, which deals with the question of exchange and currency among the nations, could claim, because of that fact, the right to handle the bill.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me complete my statement, please. The fact of the matter is that there is not one sentence in the bill which refers to any other matter than the question of international cooperation. There is not one such sentence at any point in the bill.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have the highest regard and respect for my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Iowa, but the fact of the matter is that of the \$6,900,000,000 authorized in the bill as reported 70 percent deals with military aid. Furthermore, in the total amount, as the Senator has said, provision is made for food and economic aid. However, ECA legislation as such has historically been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I merely wish to say that there is a vast difference between the question whether, because provision is made for food, the bill should properly go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and what we are suggesting, namely, that when we are dealing with military equipment, first, we must realize, that much of it is coming from our own war reserve and war stocks, or at least is competing with military equipment we want for our own forces. Secondly, when we enter the field of military equipment, we get into a highly classified area, with which the Committee on Armed Services has to live day after day. So I think there is a vast difference between the point raised by the able Senator from Iowa and a bill which contains an amount 70 percent of which deals directly with the Armed Forces.

Mr. GILLETTE. We are dealing with principles; we are not dealing with percentages. However, even on the basis of the Senator's own argument, the assumption is that 30 percent deals with funds to be made available for inter-

national cooperation outside the military sphere.

In that connection, I wish to quote from the testimony of Secretary Lovett, when he appeared before the committee, in answer to a question propounded by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. The Senator from New Jersey asked:

Will you give us a picture of how that was done? It must be a very complicated job.

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir; it is a very complicated job. Senator SMITH the first step, of course, is the development of what is called a military plan. That planning is done by the chiefs of staff of the various member countries separately, and then in unison in what is called the military committee of NATO. That is the over-all military committee, one adjunct of which is the so-called standing group, which consists of Britain, France, and the United States, and is in constant session. After the basic plan is developed, the so-called military-assistance advisory groups, the MAAG's in the various countries, work with the country itself to find out what portions of their total contribution in men and matériel are unavailable to that country for reasons perhaps beyond their control. They measure the size of the orders, the equipment, the locally procured equipment by the country itself, and then there is left a gap.

Mr. President, I shall try to get to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts as soon as possible.

The point is that the entire basis of the bill, including the direct military assistance, which is supposed to have its effect on our military alliance with our friends and our allies in the NATO organization, and every other feature of the program, deals with international cooperation. I repeat that it would be just as logical to ask that the bill be referred to the other committees which I have mentioned, because of their jurisdictional authority over certain features. The Senate could have referred the bill to those committees. However, I submit that there is no agency or subagency of the United States Senate, in the entire list of committees, other than the Foreign Relations Committee, which has complete charge of every phase of this subject.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know that the committee of which the Senator is a member gave this subject careful consideration. I should like to point out to him two or three considerations.

First, I point out that according to the committee report, on page 25, the military-assistance feature of the bill amounts to \$5,350,000,000 out of a total of \$6,900,000,000. Since the bill was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee there has been considered by the House, and is now before the Senate Appropriations Committee, a Defense Department budget with respect to which there is great resistance by the Defense Department to reducing the budget from \$52,000,000,000 to \$46,000,000,000, a reduction of \$6,000,000,000.

Since that bill has come to the Senate from the House the President has sent to Congress a message asking for

an authorization of \$2,800,000,000 more in public works for the Armed Forces. Since this bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations the Atomic Energy Commission has suggested that it is coming before us with proposals for more than \$4,000,000,000 worth of new construction.

All those items concern the military. It seems to me that it is perfectly proper for the Armed Services Committee to take an over-all look at the picture, balancing all the factors, to determine what it believes should be recommended for the military. If arms are going to Europe, some of those arms cannot go to our Armed Forces at home. Therefore, I say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa it seems to me that conditions have changed and many new conditions are arising which make it proper to refer this subject briefly to the Armed Services Committee. That is all the Senator from California is asking. He is requesting only a brief over-all consideration by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the distinguished Senator. He made only one statement to which I take exception, and which he repeated.

The Senator stated that a bill had been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. I repeat that there is no bill before the Senate except the original bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Massachusetts accepts the correction.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Massachusetts was undoubtedly referring to the President's message, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I do not care to take more of the time of the Senate. There are two things to which I wish to invite attention. One is that there is nothing before the Senate except the bill which was formulated and reported, under leave of the Senate, by the Foreign Relations Committee. That bill is now on the calendar. The Senate, in its discretion, can send the bill anywhere it wishes to send it. It can proceed to consider it, or it can refer it to any committee to which it chooses to refer it, because the Senate has control of its own actions in that respect.

I repeat what I stated earlier, that there is no subagency of this body which has complete jurisdiction of the subject matter of this particular bill, which was reported as an original bill from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia feels that we should proceed to act upon this authorization measure now. I am not unmindful of the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. He has stated that since the bill was acted upon in the Foreign Relations Committee the Department of Defense has objected to the reduction of \$6,000,000,000 made by the House in the appropriations for that de-

partment; also that the President has submitted a new public-works program for the military, and that the Atomic Energy Commission intends to propose a new construction program.

When the Senate acts on this bill it will go to the House. The House can refer the bill to any committee to which it wishes to refer it, or to any number of committees. We may rest assured that the House will go into the subject very fully. Then the differences between the House and the Senate will have to be reconciled.

Later the subject will come before the Appropriations Committee. As a member of that committee I very definitely feel that if, before reporting an appropriation bill, we receive information to the effect that the amount ultimately authorized is beyond our ability to finance, the Appropriations Committee will be under neither a legal nor a moral obligation to recommend the appropriation of the entire amount which may be agreed upon in the authorization. Nor will any Member of the Senate be bound by the vote we may take this week on the pending bill to make the authorization agreed upon the final figure, regardless of any information which the Committee on Appropriations may receive, or any developments which may subsequently arise.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his contribution.

Mr. President, I see no purpose whatever which could be served by the adoption of the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] other than that of delay; and under the circumstances, delay is unthinkable.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from California, who was first on his feet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask the able Senator from Iowa whether he is familiar with the discussion which took place in the Senate on March 13, when the President's message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The question has been raised as to why a different procedure was not followed. I read from page 2274 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1952:

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I repeat what I stated in my opening remarks. I said I wished to serve notice on the Senate that, in my opinion, the Senate Committee on Armed Services should be directed to examine the bill before it is voted on by the Senate. It bears a very vital relationship to matters which pertain to the equipment of the armed services of the United States and to the defense of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Senator yields, the Chair will state to the Senator from Georgia that if and when the bill is reported to the Senate from the Committee on Foreign Relations, after it is up for consideration and not until then a motion will be in order to refer it to the Committee on Armed Services.

I wondered whether the Senator from Iowa was familiar with the exchange which took place between the Vice President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in reply to the question of the Senator from California, let me say that the Senator from Iowa now recalls the discussion, since it has been called to his attention by the eminent Senator from California.

I think I am justified in making the statement that I have just been informed that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] has telephoned from Florida, where he is rather actively engaged at the present time, to the effect that at that time he was in favor of the course which he then recommended, but that it is now too late, in his opinion, to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services. I asked my informant if I would be justified in making that statement, and I was told that the statement had been made to the whip on the majority side, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa some questions with respect to one or two points.

Suppose the bill should be referred to the Armed Services Committee, and that committee should change certain provisions of the bill—for example, the provisions dealing with the point 4 program—and report the bill back to the Senate. Then I suppose it would be in order to refer it again to the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine the effect of the recommendations of the Armed Services Committee. There is no end to that kind of procedure if we are to adopt the narrow point of view of the Senator from California. If his point of view were adopted, would not the procedure which I have described be justified under such circumstances?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Arkansas has placed his finger upon the impossible situation which we might face. We might have two entirely different bills before us. Then the subject might be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and we would have another bill. This bill is in control of the Senate. The bill is on the calendar. It is now before the Senate for consideration. Any amendments which any Senator may have in mind can be offered. Indeed, the present speaker expects to offer some important amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one other point I should like to raise. It is with respect to the amount authorized for direct military aid. Approximately \$1,000,000,000 of that amount, as mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts, is to be used to make what are referred to as offshore procurements, namely, to purchase within European countries whatever armaments they can make. That has a very important eco-



monic effect, and that effect is one of the motives for authorizing the appropriation. I cannot understand how the Armed Services Committee would be able to exercise as good judgment in that respect as would the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Therefore, when we get down to analyzing the objectives of the bill, it is seen that the bill is not entirely a bill for military purposes, as the Senator from California seems to have indicated. Certainly some aspect of it, such as the point 4 program, should not be subjected to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GILLETTE. I again thank the Senator from Arkansas for his contribution. I repeat what I said a moment ago, namely, that in no sense is this bill to be construed as purely a military measure. It involves the question of international relationships, of which subject the Committee on Foreign Relations has complete jurisdiction. It has augmented jurisdiction by having been authorized by the Senate to act for it when the President's message was referred to the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one further illustration I should like to make. Every treaty which comes before this body touches some aspect of our life, such as manufacturing, agriculture, arms, or some other aspect. If we were to accept the theory advanced today, every treaty would have to be referred to two committees, or perhaps even more committees. The Committee on Foreign Relations strikes me as being a committee that is different from what we call a substantive law committee.

Mr. GILLETTE. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Every matter dealing with foreign relations deals also with some aspect of our national life, involving some substantive legislation which is now within the jurisdiction of another committee. There is no question that this bill is in essence a foreign relations bill if there ever was one.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Arkansas is correct. I take exception to one statement he has made, from which an improper conclusion might be drawn. I refer to his comparison of the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Relations with the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services. I concede to the members of the Armed Services Committee as sound judgment as I concede to any other Senators in this body. I do not concede to them superior judgment in a matter that is within their jurisdiction.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not mean to leave such an implication.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am certain the Senator did not intend to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was trying to draw a distinction between matters essentially in political and economic fields on the one hand, and the military field on the other, not as a matter of judgment. Perhaps I should have said information.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate is presented with a motion on behalf, not of the Committee on Armed Services, but by one of its members, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations, so long as I have been connected with it as a humble servant of the Senate, has endeavored to do what the Senate has ordered it to do. We have undertaken to bring whatever ability, intelligence, and industry we possess to the solution of the questions which have been properly referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

That being the case, the Senate has never yet within my recollection ever turned down the Committee on Foreign Relations on any important measure, and it has never turned it down on any minor matter, like the motion of the Senator from California to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services.

The motion itself presupposes on the part of the Committee on Armed Services superior knowledge and superiority over the Committee on Foreign Relations.

What did we do? In the first place, last year we had the members of the Committee on Armed Services sit with us. I made no objection to it. Did we get any better bill than we would have gotten otherwise? I do not think so. This time we invited the members of the Armed Services Committee to the preliminary hearings. We had the Secretary of State before us when the members of the Armed Services Committee were present. We had the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, before us when the members of the Armed Services Committee were present. We had Mr. Hariman, the Administrator of this program, before the committee when the members of the Armed Services Committee were present. Everything that was presented to the committee was known to the members of the Armed Services Committee. Did the Committee on Armed Services or any of its members ever come back before the Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss any particular item in the bill? If any member did, I have no knowledge of it. Did any of them, either individually or on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, come before the Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss any item of the bill at all? If anyone had come, he would have been courteously received, and his testimony would have been accepted. We would have given every consideration to any member of that committee.

That did not happen, Mr. President. Now, after the Committee on Foreign Relations has toiled, expended great effort, and devoted much work to this bill, a motion is made to refer it to the Committee on Armed Services.

The Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on this bill from March 13 to April 4, and thereafter considered it to April 30. The motion is now made that the Committee on Armed Services be given 10 days to supervise and over-

rule and modify and amend and debate a measure the consideration of which took the Committee on Foreign Relations from March 13 to April 30.

We held executive sessions, Mr. President. We did not hold executive sessions because we wanted to exclude any information from our sessions to the outside. We held executive sessions in the interest of speed, and in the interest of legislation. Those executive sessions were held on April 7, 16, 17, 18, 21, and 30.

Mr. President, there is some evidence today that some Senators at least are approaching this question from a political and partisan standpoint. We have Republican members on the Committee on Foreign Relations. Only one Senator withheld his vote by voting present. Every other Republican Senator on the committee voted to report the bill.

I ask Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle, "Do you want to repudiate their votes? Do you on the floor of the Senate want to cast a vote which will be construed in your State and in the country generally as a repudiation of the Republican members of the Committee on Foreign Relations?"

The bill was reported by a vote of 12 to 0. One Senator did not vote. Do Senators wish to inform the country that on this important aid bill, the Mutual Security bill, which affects not alone the building up of Western Europe, but also the safety and security of the United States, the Senate has rejected the action of the Foreign Relations Committee and repudiated the votes of the Republican members of that committee, in order to gratify the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. President, let us consider for a moment the question of jurisdiction. I hold in my hand rule XXV of the Senate rules. That rule comes from the Legislative Reorganization Act, and relates to standing committees.

Paragraph 1 (c) of that rule reads in part as follows:

The Committee on Armed Services, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Common defense generally.

Is anything said there about foreign relations or about the activities of our Government in foreign lands? Not a word.

Next, the rule provides:

2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.
3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.
4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes—

And so forth. Mr. President, not a dollar proposed to be authorized by the pending bill would be authorized in connection with matters which rule XXV says shall be within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Not a dollar proposed to be authorized by the bill would be authorized for our domestic Armed Forces or for the Navy. The bill relates purely to foreign relations, whereas the jurisdiction of the Armed

Services Committee is in relation to matters pertaining to our own defense, military and naval.

Mr. President, are two committees to have jurisdiction of the same subject? If such a policy is to be adopted, then in the case of practically every bill called up on this floor, some Senator could find a point on which to base a motion that the bill be referred to some other committee. What good would that do, except to cause delay, confusion, uncertainty, and misinformation?

The members of the Armed Services Committee and every other Member of the Senate will have full opportunity on the floor—not in some closed room, but on the open floor of the Senate—to propose any amendment or any modification or any increase or decrease in the authorizations provided by the pending bill. Anything provided in the bill will be open to review by Senators on the floor, not because they are members of this committee, that committee, or the other committee, but because they are Members of the Senate of the United States and because they will then be dealing with a subject which was referred by the Senate of the United States to a particular committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield at this point, to permit me to make an observation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Texas. I would call his attention to the fact that the first subject listed in paragraph 1 (c) of rule XXV as coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services is common defense generally.

Furthermore, section 101 of title I of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 refers to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and the United States is paying a great portion of the burden in connection with that Organization.

I would not say that the Armed Services Committee was attempting to exercise any superiority of judgment or anything of the sort; but I believe it is simply endeavoring to put together, for consideration in one place, all matters pertaining to the common defense.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not agree with some Senators who take the position that this entire problem is one of dollars and cents and mathematics and statistics. Great principles are involved. The mutual security pact is not based on dollars, but it is based on the great questions of liberty, freedom, and the individual rights of the governments that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Heart beats, noble thoughts, and high conceptions cannot be considered in or reduced to terms of dollars. Something more than the ring of a dollar is involved in these matters.

They should not and cannot be considered alone from the point of view of dollars. The Senate is taking legislative action in regard to great questions which affect the people of the world.

Some committee that is jealous or that believes it should have superiority of wisdom, seeks to intrude itself upon the jurisdiction of another committee,

although the Senate itself has voted to have this matter referred to the latter committee.

Mr. President, we who serve on the Foreign Relations Committee are not saying that we should settle this question. The question has already been settled by the Senate itself. At the time when the President's message was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, if the Armed Services Committee had challenged that reference, that committee could then have submitted a motion to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee, instead of to the Foreign Relations Committee. However, the members of the Armed Services Committee waited and delayed, just as the action now proposed would result in delaying action on this important measure.

Mr. President, according to the view of some persons, all appropriation bills should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee because every appropriation bill deals with money, with financial outlays, with expenditures. Therefore, according to the view of some, all appropriation bills should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, not to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, the pending bill does not deal at all with our military and naval programs. Some Senators have spoken about an item of the pending bill which authorizes an expenditure of \$4,000,000,000 for military arms. Mr. President, Congress has authorized appropriations of more than \$50,000,000,000 for our military defenses here at home. Yet some Senators would have the Senate believe that the rather small military arms authorization item carried in this bill for mutual security should outweigh all other considerations and should result in the reference of the bill to the Armed Services Committee.

It seems to me that if the Armed Services Committee is so anxious and willing to toil and study with the defense bill of over \$50,000,000,000 and with the organization of the Army, the organization of the Navy, and all other matters relating to those services, it should have enough to do without spreading its wings, not only all over the United States but also over foreign countries and taking over the jurisdiction of foreign relations which rightly rests with the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, if I am not in error, the Senator from California complained about what was happening in Korea and how our planes in Korea were inferior and were outnumbered; and he made other complaints about happenings in Korea. Those matters are certainly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Therefore, why does not the Armed Services Committee correct the situations complained of, inasmuch as they relate to the arms of the United States, not to the foreign relations of our country. Their only relationship to foreign affairs arises because of the fact that in Korea we are fighting some foreigners. However, if we do not have a sufficient number of planes in Korea, if we do not have adequate supplies for our planes in Korea,

if we do not have proper support for those planes, let the Committee on Armed Services provide for those things. If that committee has been as derelict in performing its duty in respect to Korea as it has been in its effort to take over the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee, that is its responsibility.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Texas familiar with the fact that when question is raised by members of the Armed Services Committee or by members of the Appropriations Committee, in asking our responsible military authorities why our Air Force is flying obsolete or obsolescent planes in Korea, against the Communists, one answer which constantly is made is that with our productive capacity we cannot take care of the requirements for Europe and at the same time take care of the requirements for the Americans who are fighting in Korea? That is one of the reasons why I have made the motion to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee, so that we can obtain some integration of our defense activities.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the bill pertaining to our defense activities already is before the Armed Services Committee, so the argument now made is only a pretext. I do not know what the Joint Chiefs of Staff told the members of the Armed Services Committee, but evidently what they told them did not influence the committee sufficiently to make it provide more planes or better planes. I am in favor of more planes and better planes. I want the United States to send to Korea a superb and superior Air Force which will bring us victory and will result in bringing our boys home. However, that will not be done by quarreling within the Armed Services Committee. There is the weak spot, if there is any. That is where the fault lies, if there be fault.

Mr. President, after all, what is wrong with this bill? What fault has been found with it by members of the Armed Services Committee who are presently supporting the pending motion? Do they think the amount it authorizes is too large? Do they want to cut down the support program for Western Europe, where we are undertaking to build a rampart which cannot be infiltrated by vicious and hostile and evil influences from Communist countries? Do they want to abstain from giving money for the purpose of building a protective wall in Western Europe, through which no arm, no sword, and no spear in a Communist infiltration or a Communist attack could pass to destroy the liberty and democracy of Western Europe? Do they want that effort to fail, and then to have laid open to attack the democracy and security of the Western World? No, Mr. President; I do not think so. If there be anything wrong with the bill, it can be corrected through amendments on the floor of the Senate. Members of the Armed Services Committee will be here, or they ought to be here; and, when the bill is taken up section by section, let them offer amend-



ments. Let such amendments stand the test of debate upon this floor; let them stand the test of current and accurate information and discussion. I have no objection to that. If Senators want to attack the entire bill, they could do that upon the floor of the Senate. In fact, they could do it much better on the floor of the Senate than in a private committee room. Let them proceed if they want to deny all help in behalf of mutual security; but what they would accomplish, Mr. President, if this motion were adopted, would be delay and still more delay. I do not want more delay. We must pass imperative legislation; we must enact pressing measures in order that Congress may be able to adjourn so that Senators may attend the national conventions which will be held in July.

Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has given this measure every possible consideration. We not only considered the bill in its over-all respects and heard leading citizens of the United States, including the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of Mutual Security testify concerning it, but we then considered it in detail. Amendments were offered, discussions were had. We voted on all controversial questions. We cut the authorization \$1,000,000,000. There had been a loud cry that the amount authorized should be reduced. We reduced it to the extent of \$1,000,000,000. The bill, so reduced, has been approved, even by such conservative members of the committee as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and other Senators. It is not an extravagant measure. It has been carefully considered. One provision has been dovetailed with another.

Mr. President, I should regard it as a great misfortune if the Senate, reflecting upon its own authority, reflecting upon what it has already done, and reflecting upon the Committee on Foreign Relations, with all the toil, labor, and anguish it has undergone in the consideration of this measure should now refer it to another committee.

Mr. President, what are some of the matters within the normal jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations with which the Committee has undertaken to deal? Among other matters included within the bill—and I hope the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] will pay heed—is technical cooperation, known as Point 4. That subject has always been before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Is it desired now to remove it from consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations and send it to the Armed Services Committee?

The former European Recovery Program, the ECA, was before the Foreign Relations Committee. That program is no longer in operation, though there are certain kindred activities which must receive attention. Matters affecting the Institute of American Affairs, and dealing principally with Central and South American countries, have always been handled by the Committee on Foreign Relations. That subject is included in the pending bill. Do Senators desire to send that to the Armed Services Committee?

Matters connected with the International Refugee Organization and the Palestine Refugee legislation have always been considered to be within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder what the attitude of the Senator from Texas would be, assuming that the Armed Services Committee, for purposes of illustration, were to eliminate, or practically eliminate the Point 4 program. Would not the Senator, as Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, be compelled then to ask that the matter be referred again to his committee for reconsideration?

Mr. CONNALLY. I see the point of the Senator from Arkansas. This would be my view of the situation: We have this bill now before the Senate, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the bill were referred to the Armed Services Committee, that committee would be expected to report another bill. In that event, instead of having one bill, we should have two. I assume that the Chair would then have to determine which bill would be considered first. Amendments would be in order, of course, during the consideration of either of the bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not hear the first part of the speech of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. Is it contemplated that the pending bill would remain on the calendar, and that another bill would be reported, resulting in our having two bills on the same subject before the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I may say my understanding is that the Senator from California—if he is listening—wants to refer this entire bill, including every part of it, to the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. But I did express my personal opinion that, in my judgment, the Armed Services Committee would direct its attention to the military aspects of the bill, those aspects which have a very direct bearing upon the American Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there anything in this bill for the American Army, Navy, or Air Force?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; but approximately \$4,700,000,000 of the amount authorized, or 70 percent of it, could very well come at the expense of the American Air Force, Army, and Navy, and have a deterrent effect upon them.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is up to the two Houses of the Congress.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. I am glad the Senator from California admits and acknowledges that, of all the money authorized by this bill, there is not \$1 for the United States Army, there is not \$1 for the Navy, there is not \$1 for the Air Force yet the Senator claims that

the bill should be referred to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Texas will yield further to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Surely the Senator does not want to misrepresent my position. I made it very clear, I believe, that approximately 70 percent of the amount authorized by the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee relates to military aspects. I have pointed out that the amount of money involved has a direct relationship to our own Army, Navy, and Air Force in a very close and coordinated manner. Therefore, Mr. President, I do not believe we should talk about the common defense, which is what we have been talking about, in connection with the arms implementation legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator pointed out that \$4,000,000,000 is to go to foreign nations. Is that ours? Does it go to our armed services, to our Navy, to our Air Force? No; it goes to Europe. Is not Europe foreign? I have always regarded it as being foreign. Therefore, the entire subject comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the attention of the Senator from Texas to section 8 on page 11 of the bill. He says it does not affect the United States Armed Forces. I suggest to him that that section gives the opportunity of buying from the Armed Forces of the United States excess equipment amounting to \$1,200,000,000; so that it does directly affect our armed services.

Mr. CONNALLY. Anything that affects the United States in its dealings with foreign governments with reference to any kind of aid, if it is only a dollar, means that we shall not have as many dollars at home to spend for other purposes. If wheat is involved, it means that we shall not have as much wheat at home after we send some of it to India or China. The Senator from California admits that there is not a dollar in the bill for the United States Army, Navy, or Air Force, but he wants to have the Armed Services Committee take over and control the bill.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if the bill was ever introduced?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it was reported as an original committee bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. All the committee had before it was a message from the President, was it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but there was a draft bill attached to the message.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Armed Services Committee had wanted to expedite the work of the Senate, it could have held hearings on the part of the message

over which it felt it had jurisdiction, or it could itself have introduced a bill. But, no; it waited, although we were anxious to proceed rapidly with the business of the session, until after the Foreign Relations Committee had completed its work and reported a bill to make a motion to refer, a motion which, if agreed to, involves going back over the whole subject again.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Arizona is correct.

I was mentioning a while ago, Mr. President, the different subjects over which the Committee on Foreign Relations has had jurisdiction. They include the Palestine refugee situation; the children's fund; exchange of persons, known as the Fulbright program; the Korean Aid Act; aid to Greece and Turkey. All these questions which relate to foreign relations have been within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations and have been acted on by that committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is involved an authorization to purchase arms with the money provided under the bill; is there not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; that is true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me the impression which may have been created that the bill provides for the direct supplying of funds by the Armed Forces of this country is not accurate. It merely gives permission and authority to purchase excess armament, if it is available, under a certain formula, and it will be paid for under the authorization provided by the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should say that the Senator from Arkansas is entirely correct. I was trying to point out to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that though he says the bill does not affect our armed services at all, it does make it possible to send equipment now in the possession of our armed services to the armed services of other nations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator that practically every bill that comes before us impinges upon the jurisdiction of one or more committees. We can find overlapping jurisdiction in almost all bills. Questions dealing with the Defense Production Act go to the Banking and Currency Committee. It is certainly important, in some of its aspects, to the Committee on Armed Services. The central question is, What is the overriding signification of the bill? Is it more a foreign policy matter or is it a matter affecting our Army, Navy, and Air Force? It is a foreign relations measure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not for one moment state to my colleague from Arkansas that it is an armed services matter alone. Last year a similar question was heard by both committees. What concerns me is the fact that last Friday morning I listened to testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This morning I listened to tes-

timony before the Committee on Armed Services. The difficulty today is in getting sufficient equipment for our armed services. The pending bill permits the production of more equipment, which will not go to our Armed Forces but to our friends abroad. That may be the best way to handle the situation, but at the same time it is helpful to look over the whole field without going into details.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Committee on Foreign Relations looked into the whole field. We spent from March 18 to April 4, in addition to approximately 12 days of executive hearings. What does the Senator from Massachusetts think we were looking at? We were looking at the over-all picture. We were not simply twiddling our thumbs. We were considering the whole subject. Anything we do by way of giving aid to Europe has an effect on us. If we appropriate only 50 cents for Europe it has a reaction here; infinitesimal, I admit, but it illustrates my point. Anything we do in regard to foreign relations has a reaction within the United States. It cannot be avoided. I do not want to avoid it. I want to meet my duties as I see them.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall vote to recommit this bill to the Committee on Armed Services. I have some doubt that if the chairman of the Armed Services Committee were present he would vote against recommitting the bill to the Committee on Armed Services. It is my impression that if the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee were here he would desire to look at the bill, and I believe it is very likely that he would support the motion, inasmuch as members of his committee would like to study the matter.

I have always thought we should reduce the enormous expenditures for foreign aid. It is my information that this particular bill, for example, involves more money than we have spent for flood control, for the improvement of rivers and harbors, and for the production of power in this country since the beginning of the Nation. Here is an item of \$6,900,000,000 to be expended at a time when our funds are limited. The taxpayers today are paying to the very limit of their ability, and we must now judge, in defending this country, how much of various things we can afford. The Armed Services Committee is at this time investigating the question of aircraft procurement for this Nation. We find that we are sadly lacking in the planes we need for a strategic air force, both to attack an enemy in the event we are attacked, and to defend the Nation with aircraft to intercept hostile planes.

The testimony before the committee, which I was privileged to hear in part, pretty well convinced me that until we have a strategic air arm able to strike enemy targets effectively, which can be called upon to retaliate in the event we are attacked, until we have an air arm effectively able to defend this Nation, the expenditures we make for other services, and the expenditures we make for foreign aid, should be token expenditures. The ability of this Nation to defend itself from atomic attack, and to repel any

such attack made upon us, should be of first importance in all our expenditures for defense.

The point has been made that foreign aid is involved, but I believe every Member of the Senate will agree that the only reason why we would be willing to vote for \$6,900,000,000 in 1 year for aid to foreign nations would be that it would directly contribute to our ability to defend ourselves as a Nation.

The point has been made that perhaps the Armed Services Committee believes it has superior knowledge of what should be done, in so far as foreign aid is concerned. I do not claim that to be the case at all. However, I believe it would be fair to say that the Committee on Armed Services might have superior knowledge of how the best results could be accomplished for the money spent in defending our Nation. It seems to me that we should take a look to see how much money this Nation can afford to spend to acquire new aircraft, such as jet bombers and jet fighter planes, in which we are sadly deficient, and make it possible to utilize atomic warfare, before we make the proposed enormous expenditures for foreign aid.

I realize that at a later time there will be appropriation bills for such items before the Senate, but in trying to decide how much should be spent for various items and programs, it seems to me the Committee on Armed Services should have some idea of what is being done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's contention that we are short of airplanes because of a lack of appropriations voted by Congress?

Mr. LONG. I know that Congress refused to go along with an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from California 2 years ago. He received very little support at that time. As I understand, most of his support came from members of the Committee on Armed Services. Perhaps we would be better equipped with airplanes today if the appropriations he sought had been voted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, is it the Senator's contention that the reason why we do not have as many airplanes as he says we need is that there has not been a sufficient appropriation of money?

Mr. LONG. If we had been striving in the last 4 or 5 years to produce more aircraft, we would have more today. That goes without any further argument. We have not had the production in the last 3 years to enable us to have today the effective air program which we should have.

At the same time, let me say that Congress was beating down efforts to reduce economic aid to Europe. If Congress had not been beating off proposals to give us a 70-group or larger air force, our air force would have been better able to defend the Nation today, in my opinion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator believes that the solution to the problems



that confront us today is military, does he?

Mr. LONG. Not entirely, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, primarily?

Mr. LONG. The ability to defend this Nation is primarily a military matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the solution, in the Senator's opinion, is to be sought through military means?

Mr. LONG. I cannot answer that question categorically in one word.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the Senator can take two words.

Mr. LONG. I will take a few more than that in my own time, and the Senator from Arkansas can address himself to the question in his time.

I would say that primarily what we are trying to accomplish with foreign aid, as I understand, is to develop the ability of this Nation to defend itself. The whole defense program is intended to provide for the common defense of the Nation. Many of us have voted for appropriations and expenditures for foreign aid based upon just such an assumption, namely, that we were going to be able to make it more possible to protect ourselves.

Let us look at the program. An appropriation of \$6,900,000,000 is proposed. Everyone who knows anything about it, including the committee which studied it, knows that if the Soviet Army should move tomorrow, all this money would be lost, because it would not prevent the Soviet army from overrunning Europe. We believe that by building up our resources over a period of time, we will be able to provide sufficient strength in Europe to enable the countries there to defend themselves.

What is the major factor that prevents the Soviet Union from moving at this time? It is the fact that the United States of America is substantially superior in atomic weapons, and has an Air Force that will enable us to break through with atomic weapons. What will keep the Soviet Union from moving for the next 2 or 3 years? Primarily American atomic warfare and an American Air Force. These should have first priority.

In arriving at correct judgments in these matters the Committee on Armed Services has made a study of the situation, and has had an opportunity to study it thoroughly, and would be well qualified and should be given an opportunity to pass on proposed legislation.

There is one other item. Some people prefer that the Armed Services Committee not look at this bill. I am not thinking of Members of the Senate: I am thinking about people interested in obtaining large appropriations for Europe. Those people have had a chance to discuss this matter with and to convince members of the Committee on Foreign Relations that this matter was justified. It has been my impression that they have not had as much success with the Armed Services Committee.

It is unfortunate that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is not presently here, being engaged at this time in a contest in the State of Florida with another member of the Armed Services Committee, who has had almost 3

months' leave in proposing his candidacy to the Nation.

Nevertheless we have as the ranking majority member of that committee the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The Senator from Virginia would be a most appropriate Senator to preside as temporary chairman of the committee, because, in my opinion, there is no Member of the Senate who has made a more thorough study in his effort to find where proper economies can be effected than has the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, there is involved here a question of how much we can strip our defenses for the defense of Europe. I understand this bill provides that excess arms would be sold to foreign countries. That immediately raises the question as to how the Army and the State Department will manage to work out a program so that Europe can have modern equipment taken from the American arsenal. It can be done only by declaring it excess. I suppose that means they might go so far as to declare jet aircraft excess, and then, even though useful here, they could be shipped to Europe. Various other equipment of that sort is involved.

It might be well for the Armed Services Committee to see just what kind of defense equipment is going to be declared excess, because I am of the opinion that, insofar as the Air Force is concerned, if anything that is taken from this Nation to be sent to Europe would be useful there, it would be useful here.

Therefore, I support the Senator from California in feeling that before this matter is acted upon by the Senate, the Senate Armed Services Committee should have an opportunity to look into it. I did not attend the meetings of the Committee on Foreign Relations the day General Gruenther appeared. I would have been interested in attending. However, a member of the committee senior to me advised me that the same testimony was going to be presented before the Armed Services Committee, and that therefore it might be wise to wait until General Gruenther appeared before the Armed Services Committee. General Gruenther did so appear. The junior Senator from Louisiana was under the impression that the other witnesses were going to appear before the Armed Services Committee. Therefore, desiring the opportunity to examine some of the witnesses and to become better acquainted with this legislation, in order, perhaps, to offer proper amendments to it, the junior Senator from Louisiana will support the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want the Senate, in voting on this question, to realize what it is acting upon. Senators who favor the motion will vote to reject the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and to affront, and almost to insult, that committee, to which this subject was referred by the Senate. At the time the President's message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations no motion was made to refer it to any other committee.

Senators who vote for the pending motion will be voting against acting upon

the bill which was reported from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 12 to none. Why should Senators wish to do that? Is it because they wish to make speeches? They have had ample opportunity to make speeches, and they will have further opportunity to make speeches when the bill is taken up formally in the Senate. There is no bridle on debate in the Senate. Senators can discuss the bill as long as they desire. If there is anything wrong with it, let us bring it out into the open, where we can see it. Let us not rely on generalities, and statements to the effect that the Armed Services Committee ought to look into the subject. According to its own statement, the Armed Services Committee has not been looking into the question of aircraft, as pointed out by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and as was pointed out earlier by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

If the Senate votes to adopt the motion of the Senator from California, it will be setting a precedent whereby, with respect to any bill which comes before the Senate, any Senator who can find some little pretext, some little loophole, can make a motion to refer the bill to some other committee.

Does such procedure contribute to the orderly operations of the Senate? Does it contribute to the prompt disposition of the business of the Senate? On the other hand, it contributes to delay, to speculation, and to quarrels and quibbles, even within the Armed Services Committee itself. No one expects the bill to be reported back from the Armed Services Committee untouched. It will be daubed up in some way if it is referred to that committee. If that were not the intention, the proponents of the motion to refer the bill to that committee would not be so strenuous in their efforts.

Mr. President, I regret to see delay in connection with this measure. It is of the highest importance. What we do here today will be reflected in every chancellery in every great country in Europe. It will be said, "The United States is not going to carry out its NATO obligation. The United States is not going to follow up and aid Western Germany to become a part of Western Europe. The United States is not going to follow up in aiding Western Europe to build up a rampart against the wild waves of communism which will break against it. The United States is not going to aid in building up a great fortress which no totalitarian army can pierce, and no totalitarian armed force can seriously endanger."

Do we want that to happen? It is going to happen if we vote to refer this bill to the Armed Services Committee. Mr. President, I hope and pray that the Senate will not commit such a tragic and grievous error.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no interest in the jurisdictional questions which arise as between the two committees. Both committees are manned by men as able, patriotic, and conscientious as any I have ever known. But while I am not interested in the

jurisdictional question, I am vitally interested in the entire issue of mutual-security legislation. As Senators know, I have long been an ardent supporter of mutual-security assistance. I think it would be a world tragedy and a tragedy for our own country if we should fail to take action promptly.

The motion of the distinguished Senator from California, if adopted, would inevitably lead to much delay. There could be no report from the committee in less than 2 or 3 weeks. Two weeks, I believe, is the time mentioned in the motion. Thereafter, of course, any changes made by the Armed Services Committee—and inevitably there would be changes—would have to be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee for further consideration.

The Armed Services Committee claims jurisdiction because of the large percentage of the proposed appropriation to be devoted to military purposes. The Foreign Relations Committee and other committees of the Senate may claim similar jurisdiction with regard to certain items and certain titles involved in the proposed legislation. In the meantime, I believe the world would be in a turmoil. Our allies would lose confidence in the good faith and good will of the United States to help them and, incidentally, help ourselves. I believe that the effect would be tragic in its implications. I believe that the effect would be one which we could not possibly overcome.

When the bill is debated on the floor of the Senate, amendments can be offered. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out, such amendments might cut half a billion dollars or a billion dollars, or more, from the bill which has been reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

On the other hand, the Senate might increase the amount. Today I submitted an amendment restoring the full amount which has been requested for foreign assistance. I hope that that restoration amendment will be carefully considered and favorably acted upon by the Senate. I believe that the money which has been asked for is vitally necessary, and means much to the success of our efforts to bring peace and security to our country and to the entire world. I believe that adoption of the motion made by the distinguished Senator from California to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee would inevitably confuse the thinking of the Senate. It would inevitably confuse the thinking of the entire American people, and would bring discouragement, loss of hope, and loss of confidence to the entire world.

For these reasons I shall vote against the motion of the Senator from California, and I very much hope that it will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions to report it to the Senate on or before May 15, 1952. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Benton	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Nixon
Cain	Ives	O'Connor
Case	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Seaton
Douglas	Langer	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Long	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Eaton	Malone	Taft
Ellender	Maybank	Thye
Ferguson	McCarran	Tobey
Flanders	McCarthy	Watkins
Frear	McClellan	Welker
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
George	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Millikin	Young
Green	Monroney	
Hayden	Moody	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand that on this motion a vote "yea" will be a vote simply to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee, with instructions to report the bill not later than the 15th of May, with any suggestions which it may have to make in the form of proposed amendments; and the bill which will then be before the Senate will be the bill which has been reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]

is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 33, as follows:

#### YEAS—40

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bennett	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Seaton
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Case	Knowland	Stennis
Cordon	Langer	Taft
Dirksen	Long	Thye
Duff	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	McCarthy	Welker
Eaton	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Morse	Young
Flanders	Mundt	
Hendrickson	Nixon	

#### NAYS—33

Benton	Hayden	McMahon
Clements	Hennings	Monroney
Connally	Hoey	Moody
Douglas	Humphrey	Murray
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Ellender	Lehman	O'Connor
Frear	Magnuson	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Maybank	Robertson
George	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	McClellan	Tobey
Green	McFarland	Wiley

#### NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Hill	Martin
Brewster	Holland	McKellar
Bricker	Hunt	Pastore
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Kefauver	Smathers
Capehart	Kerr	Sparkman
Carlson	Kilgore	Underwood
Chavez	Lodge	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to refer the bill (S. 3086) to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1310, which is Calendar No. 1155.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will a motion to lay on the table a motion to reconsider be in order following action upon the motion of the majority leader?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have no desire to preclude a motion to lay on the table, if the Senator desires



to make such a motion. So far as I am concerned, we are proceeding to other legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let us first have an opportunity to make the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, with the understanding that I may have the floor immediately following the disposition of that matter, I withdraw my motion temporarily.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which my motion to refer Senate bill 3086 to the Committee on Armed Services was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is very unusual for me to be unwilling to abide by the decision of a majority of the Senate, and so, of course, in this instance I am quite willing to do so. That is why I yielded for the motions to reconsider and to lay it on the table. However, I desire to call the attention of Senators to the fact that, by this vote to refer Senate bill 3086 to another committee than that which reported it they have probably delayed adjournment of the Senate by at least 3 weeks—not less than 3 weeks. That is satisfactory to the Senator from Arizona; he can remain here as long as any other Senator. But the responsibility for the delay must be upon those who voted to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee, not upon me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona renew his motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1310?

#### WELFARE OF COAL MINERS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1310, which is Calendar No. 1155.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1310) amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the Senator's understanding that, if the Senate proceeds to the consideration of Senate bill 1310, it will continue its consideration when the mutual security bill is reported from the Armed Services Committee and is placed on the calendar, or will the mutual security bill be placed

ahead of this bill and any other bill which may be on the calendar at that time?

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall have to meet that situation when it arises. We do not know what will be on the calendar at that time. I do not know what the Senate may do. The Senate might want to refer the mutual security bill to the Judiciary Committee or to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when it comes back from the Armed Services Committee. A number of committees may desire to consider that measure. I do not intend to commit myself.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I certainly want no misunderstanding. I have had numerous requests to report the control bill and the housing bill. The control bill, particularly, is for the good of all the people of America, since it is designed to stop inflation. I certainly want no understanding that if it should be pending when the mutual security bill is again reported, the control bill would be laid aside for the purpose of considering the mutual security bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1310, which has been read by its title.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 177; 30 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 41-40), is hereby amended as follows:

At the end of section 5 add the following:

"Any owner, lessee, agent, manager, superintendent, or other person who willfully fails or refuses to furnish complete and correct information pursuant to this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 60 days, or both."

Following section 6 (f) thereof, add sections 6 (g), 6 (h), 6 (i), and 6 (j) as follows:

"(g) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and from time to time revise such regulations in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act as he may deem necessary to establish safety standards and requirements to be observed in the operation of coal mines, the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce. Such regulations shall be designed to eliminate or ameliorate, so far as practicable, unsafe or unhealthful conditions or practices in such mines which result in explosions, cave-ins, inundations, suffocation of miners, accidents, and occupational and other diseases.

"Such regulations shall prescribe—

"(1) minimum standards governing timbering, support, and prevention of collapse or squeeze in coal mines as may be required in the interest of safety;

"(2) minimum standards governing the construction and use of machinery and equipment and the composition and use of explosives in coal mines as may be required in the interest of safety;

"(3) minimum standards governing operations, equipment, methods of mining, ventilation, prevention of gas or dust explosion, and transportation in coal mines as may be required in the interest of health and safety;

"(4) minimum standards, in the interest of health and safety, governing inspections of and repairs to coal mines, coal-mining equipment and machinery and inspections of coal-mining methods and procedures; and

"(5) other standards to effectuate the provisions of this act.

"(h) Any operator or his representative who after having been duly notified of a violation of any regulation promulgated under the provisions of this act continues to willfully violate such regulation shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months or both.

"(i) Whenever the Secretary of the Interior, authorized coal-mine inspector, or any other authorized representative of the Secretary, finds that any violations of any regulation under this act result in a condition that constitutes an imminent danger to the life or safety of employees in the mine, he shall by oral or written order setting forth the dangerous condition found to exist and the unsafe area covered thereby, require the operator or his representative to withdraw all employees, other than those necessary to correct such unsafe condition, from the unsafe area until such danger has been eliminated and a certificate of correction has been issued, as hereinafter provided. Any operator or operator's representative who has notice of such an order of withdrawal, whether oral or written, shall immediately comply with it. The posting of a copy of the order at or near the mine entrance and the delivery of a copy thereof to the operator or his representative while the mine is in operation shall be evidence that the operator or his representative at the mine has notice of the order as of the time of such posting and delivery. Whenever the Secretary of the Interior, an authorized coal-mine inspector, or any other authorized representative of the Secretary shall determine that the condition has been corrected, so that it no longer constitutes a violation of the regulations, he shall issue a certificate of correction, upon issuance of which the operator may reopen the area affected by the order of withdrawal.

"In accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, the operator of the mine to whom the order of withdrawal is directed may appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, or any authorized representative of the Secretary. Thereupon, a different coal-mine inspector or inspectors shall reexamine and inspect the mine and file a report within a reasonable time. A copy of the report shall promptly be delivered to the operator of the mine. Upon such reexamination, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, or any other authorized representative of the Secretary, as may be provided in such regulations, may affirm, revise, or set aside the order of withdrawal. Upon petition filed by any person aggrieved by the order of the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, or any authorized representative of the Secretary affirming, revising, or setting aside the order of withdrawal, he shall hold a hearing and, upon the record made at such hearing, enter a final order in the matter. All proceedings under this paragraph and appeals from final orders thereunder shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. Pending final disposition of any proceeding under this paragraph, the order of withdrawal shall be complied with.

"(j) Any operator or his representative who willfully fails to comply with the order of

withdrawal issued under the provisions of section 6 (1) of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 2 years, or both."

After section 11, add a new section 11A, as follows:

"Sec. 11A. State laws or contracts pertaining to mine safety shall not be deemed to be superseded, save only to the extent to which they are in conflict with the provisions of this act or the regulations or orders issued pursuant to it."

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that following the consideration of this bill, unless there is an appropriation bill ready, we shall probably take up Calendar 1072, Senate bill 2550, a bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes. Inasmuch as no notice has been given of the consideration of that bill, and because considerable interest has been manifested in it, it is my purpose to move that when the Senate concludes its business today, it recess until Wednesday, in order that Senators may have an opportunity to study the proposed legislation.

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

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the majority leader has now given notice that he intends at a very early date to call up Senate bill 2550, the so-called McCarran immigration bill. I want to protest with all the vigor at my command against the consideration of that bill. There is a bill which was introduced nearly 2 months ago which is a substitute for Senate bill 2550.

This is neither the time nor the place to enter into a discussion of the relative merits of the two bills, but the fact remains that Senate bill 2842, introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself, together with 11 or 12 other Senators, has received and is receiving the support of many religious, civic, and patriotic organizations, and of a great number of private individuals.

We have requested a hearing on the bill at which the sponsors as well as those representing important organizations could appear. We have not yet received a hearing. Certainly, the Senate should not take up Senate bill 2550 without at least having a hearing with regard to the bill which has been introduced as a substitute, a bill which has engaged the interest and support of many hundreds of thousands if not millions of persons. I ask, Mr. President, that before Senate bill 2550 be taken up, a hearing be given to the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill, Senate bill 2842. I make the request on the grounds of fair play and justice and as being in the interest of the great American people, many of whom are deeply interested in the complex, difficult, and highly important question of immigration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is Senate bill 1310. The question of taking up the other bill is not before the Senate.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCFARLAND. It was my understanding that Senate bill 1310 was made the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate voted to consider it and it is now before the Senate.

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

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Arizona has been outlining future legislation. I should like to ask him when he is going to make good on the promise he gave us to bring up the St. Lawrence waterway bill?

Mr. MCFARLAND. We shall do the best we can with that bill. The vote today jeopardized consideration of the St. Lawrence waterway bill. It will delay the Senate. But I shall do my very best. The bill has been reported, but the vote today has jeopardized its consideration, without question.

Mr. TOBEY. I voted "nay."

Mr. MCFARLAND. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am amazed to hear the Senator from Arizona say that the vote taken by the Senate this afternoon has jeopardized the consideration of the St. Lawrence waterway bill. The bill to which he refers on which the vote was taken has to do with cooperation with foreign nations. Is there any nation more neighborly and more cooperative with the United States, more necessary to the security of the United States, than is the Dominion of Canada?

The Dominion of Canada for months has been asking whether the United States is going to cooperate with her in the construction and development of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. We have not even given her the courtesy of an answer. Whether we vote yes or no, our nearest and best neighbor is asking whether we are going to cooperate. Canada wants to let contracts for the work during the coming summer, and she will undoubtedly go ahead. Do we not owe it to Canada, even if we do not owe it to the people of the United States, to consider the measure? Are we going to adapt the economy of this country to suit the desires of a few bankers and utility and railroad men, or are we going to take into consideration the welfare of Canada and the United States? Are we going to let the Santa Fe Railroad and the Union Pacific Railroad—

Mr. TOBEY. Do not forget the New England railroads.

Mr. AIKEN. Are we going to let them tell us what the Congress is going to do and when we are going to do it, or are we going to do what we should do?

Mr. TOBEY. We should show some guts here. That is what we need.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, we are trying to proceed with the business of the Senate in an orderly manner. I meant by my statement that the vote jeopardized the consideration not solely of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, but of other bills. Any vote which delays consideration of a bill and wastes the time of the Senate jeopardizes the consideration of other proposed legislation.

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

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the delay has not been more than 4 hours because of the procedure of referring the mutual security bill to the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. MCFARLAND. No; that is not true. The Mutual Security bill is one which has to be considered, and the Senate is being delayed in the consideration of that bill and other "must" legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that cooperation between Canada and the United States is of high importance?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Oh, yes. I concede all that. But it is also true that when we get down to the last days of the session and Members on the Senator's side of the aisle are asking whether Congress can adjourn in time for the conventions, there will not be a corporal's guard of Senators present to consider the business of the Senate when the conventions start.

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

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator, most respectfully, as one Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, that I hope and trust that the reference of the mutual security bill has not delayed the Senate in any way. So far as I am concerned, my vote was not a partisan one at all. I have been hearing about the enormous amounts of money required for atomic energy and for public works, and I have listened to statements of the leaders of the armed services that they cannot stand a reduction of \$6,000,000,000 in expenditures. The action just taken, I believe, assures proper and thoughtful consideration of a very important measure, and, personally, I do not believe it will delay the Senate 1 minute.

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

Mr. MCFARLAND. In a moment. The Senator from Massachusetts may not have thought that his vote was partisan, but it certainly was a partisan vote. There can be no "ifs" and "ands" about that. We know why the bill was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. It is all right. The minority have a right to delay. That is their privilege.

I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question, with the permission of the Senate.

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



Mr. CONNALLY. In the case of the mutual security bill, I heard objections raised about the amount of this appropriation, the amount of that appropriation, and the amount of the other appropriation. Did the Senator raise those objections because he wanted to cut the amounts appropriated for foreign aid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Not necessarily.

Mr. CONNALLY. Either necessarily or unnecessarily.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Not necessarily at all. I feel that the problem is an over-all one dealing with the security of the United States, and its solution is based on the armed strength of the United States. Is it better for an American boy to have a gun or for a European boy to have a gun? Is it better for an American boy to have a tank or for a European boy to have a tank, or for American boys in Korea to have tanks? Is it better for us to have a jet fighter here or that there be one in Europe? These are all important questions.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has very skillfully evaded answering the question I asked him. I asked him whether he favored major cuts in the program. He has not answered that question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not going to answer it—

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Until I see what is presented as the over-all picture. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that I always have the greatest respect for him, and if I was able to evade a question of his, I am brighter than I thought I was.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator said, "I am not going to answer." If that is not evading, I do not know what it is. Will the Senator tell us what the mutual security bill ought to contain?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will tell the Senator when the Armed Services Committee gets a chance to look at the over-all picture, in connection with the \$56,000,000,000 requested to be appropriated for the defense of our country; the \$4,000,000,000, which presumably will be asked for atomic-energy development; and the \$2,800,000,000 for public works. All those matters must be considered together.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator still skillfully evades. The Committee on Foreign Relations has nothing to do with the \$56,000,000,000 recommended appropriation, but the Senator from Massachusetts does have, and he puts that up as a bugaboo while he is saying that he will not tell how much he favors for mutual security.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. In reference to the question whether it is better for an American boy to have a gun or for a boy in Europe to have a gun, I merely wish to say that if it means that the man in Europe will help do Europe's part of the fighting, I am willing that Europe should have some guns. I think the American people should be willing to let Europeans have some guns to help in the

fight against communism. We do not want to see the fighting done by Americans. We do not want to see American boys killed in an effort to protect the whole world.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the action taken by the Senate in referring S. 3086 to the Armed Services Committee, and the announcement of the majority leader as to pending business, and also the business which will be forthcoming later, I wish to make some observations.

First, when the mutual security bill is reported by the Armed Services Committee, it is my intention to offer an amendment which will include the entire St. Lawrence seaway proposal, because I consider the seaway to be a part of mutual security. If anything is mutual, it is the relation between the United States and Canada. That is one matter about which we can be sure today in this mad world. It is my intention to give every Senator a chance to go on record and do his part in the creation of the St. Lawrence seaway as a matter of mutual security. That is the first thing I shall propose.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it the desire of the Senator from Minnesota that the Senate not take up the St. Lawrence seaway measure until the mutual security bill comes from the Armed Services Committee? It may be quite a while before it is reported again.

Mr. TOBEY. We could take up the St. Lawrence seaway bill tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Arizona that I have a second alternative. I am not trying to be in any way unkind to the majority leader, and I voted with him on the question of referring the mutual security bill to the Armed Services Committee. I voted against referring it. I think the Senator's position is right, and I agree with him in his statement. I think we can at least amend the mutual security bill to provide some mutual security in this hemisphere, and that includes development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Minnesota take that view before the Committee on Armed Services, where the bill is now pending?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be more than happy to take it before the Armed Services Committee. I do not know whether I will get their view, but they will at least get what little benefit may come from my views.

I have a second proposal to make, to which I invite the attention of the majority leader. If and when the McCarran bill comes before the Senate—and it is to be the second item of business after the mine-safety bill—it is my intention to move that the McCarran bill be replaced by the St. Lawrence seaway measure.

Along with the Senator from New York, I wish to voice a protest. We worked almost a year on an immigration bill which would be a substitute for the McCarran bill. The McCarran proposal is a recodification of all immigration laws, and includes in it any number of legislative booby traps and other things that are being resisted by many religious, fraternal, and civic groups and national societies throughout the country.

The press of America has become alive to some of the difficulties involved in the McCarran bill. Editorial after editorial has appeared in Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish papers, and representatives of religious groups are coming before the Members of Congress saying that we ought to go slow and support the Humphrey-Lehman or Lehman-Humphrey proposal, which is a proposal in which they are interested.

I have told the majority leader what my position is. I am not being critical of him. The McCarran bill has been before the Senate a long time. I say the Committee on the Judiciary owes us a hearing on a substitute proposal advanced by 12 or 13 Members of the Senate. We have not had any hearing. Therefore, I wish to tell the majority leader that if the McCarran bill comes before the Senate as the second item of business, I shall move, first, to substitute the St. Lawrence seaway measure. If that is unsuccessful, I may say there is going to be a long pitched battle here, because there are surely a great number of people in this country who are concerned about an equitable immigration law and we think that the substitute measure would provide an equitable immigration law.

I know the majority leader and others are concerned about Japanese and other oriental immigration. That can be taken care of separately. We do not want to buy the whole package that has come from the Committee on the Judiciary, known as the McCarran bill.

I wanted the majority leader to know my position. I stated it to him privately; now I am stating it publicly.

Mr. McFARLAND. In all fairness, I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I do not desire to commit myself this far ahead, but I shall probably oppose any proposal to substitute the St. Lawrence seaway bill for the immigration bill. There is no connection whatever between them. I have been interested in helping the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway, and have wanted to push that measure along as rapidly as possible. But I should like to see it come forward in such a manner that it will have a fair opportunity to be passed by the Senate. So I probably shall be one of those who will vote against the Senator's proposal. I want it understood now that if we proceed with measures in their proper order, in an orderly manner, I shall support it. But if it is proposed to do anything like what is suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, I shall probably oppose it as vigorously as I can.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the information of Senators, the Chair thinks it his duty to state that while a motion

is pending to take up one bill it is not in order to move to substitute another bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that. I was merely discussing what I feel are some of the alternatives to be presented in the days to come.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course, if a bill is taken up it is then in order to move to displace it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I understand that the unfinished business is the Neely mine-safety bill, and we must surely act on that measure.

I am merely saying to the majority leader, who has been with us in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway bill, that I am not differing with him, and I do not say he has not cooperated. I am merely saying that the McCarran bill, which recodifies all immigration laws since the beginning of the Republic, is a bill which is not thoroughly understood. It is a bill which has been lying on the table a long time. For 2 months there has been a substitute bill before the committee, and there have been no hearings on it.

I desire that the RECORD be perfectly clear that I have no delusions as to what is going to happen in the days to come. I know that we do not have time to go through hundreds of pages of legislative amendments and that undoubtedly, if the McCarran bill is passed, we are going to have ourselves saddled with a very unfortunate piece of legislation.

I ask the majority leader at least to give credence to the validity of the argument that after many people representing some of the greatest religious, civic, and fraternal bodies in America, have worked for a year to perfect a substitute measure, at least they are deserving of a hearing before a committee of the Senate.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Let me say to my good friend from Minnesota that fortunately or unfortunately—I think fortunately for me—I do not have control of the committees, and I cannot tell them what they should do or what they should not do. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that when he offers his substitute I shall certainly give what he has to say my careful consideration before I cast my vote. I realize that the immigration bill is a large bill, and involves a codification of all the immigration laws. It should receive careful consideration. However, there are certain provisions in that bill which I feel must be given consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They are worthy of consideration.

Mr. MCFARLAND. One of them is the provision that the Japanese shall have the same privileges as others in the East. I feel that we must take up the bill and consider it. I am sorry if the Senator from Minnesota has not had the hearings to which he feels he is entitled. That fact may result in more time being consumed on the floor of the Senate. However, I assure the Senator that I will give careful consideration to whatever he may have to say on the subject.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to address a question to the majority leader. First, let me say that our bill takes care of the oriental situation to exactly the same degree, and quite as fully as does the McCarran bill.

I am very much interested in the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

I have fought for that project for upwards of 30 years—I believe longer than has any other Member of the Senate. I shall certainly make every effort to see that it is considered and brought to a vote.

However, I am also deeply concerned about the immigration bill. I am concerned because we are estopped from having a real hearing, in which the American people, including many civic, religious, and national groups and others may have an opportunity to express their opinion and point out the weaknesses of the McCarran bill and the merits—if there are any—of the substitute bill which my associates and I have introduced.

I feel that it is proper to bring this matter vigorously to the attention of the Senate and of the American people, because when we vote on the bill which is to be taken up after the mine safety bill is disposed of, I think the Senate should be in possession of all the facts, and should decide not to take up the McCarran bill at that time, but to take up the St. Lawrence seaway measure. I think it should be made perfectly clear that in the opinion of the Senate a hearing should be afforded on the substitute immigration bill. I think that is a reasonable request. I believe that the protest and demand which have been made are fair.

I bring this subject to the attention of this body and to the attention of the American people, because I think we are not receiving a square deal. I do not believe that the American people are receiving a square deal if legislation so complex and bulky as that represented by the two bills to which reference has been made is to be passed without the closest scrutiny by the committee, in the first place, and by the Senate, in the second place. The committee has not scrutinized the substitute bill. It has not opened the bill. It has not the slightest idea what is in the bill. I feel that I am justified in making this demand, and in making as vigorous a protest as lies in my power. I hope that I shall be supported.

In conclusion, I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. I have laid my cards on the table. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has done likewise. We shall endeavor to have the McCarran bill laid aside temporarily, and take up the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

I should like to have notice as to the time when the distinguished majority leader intends to seek to have brought up the next bill after the mine-safety bill. I ask the majority leader to agree to give notice to the Senator from Min-

nesota and myself when he intends to bring forth a proposal to take up whatever bill he may decide to try to bring up. In that way we can oppose, if we wish to do so, taking up such a bill, or we can offer a substitute for it in the form of other legislation. I think I am making a fair and reasonable request.

I voted against the Knowland motion, because I thought it bad for the country, and bad for the peace and security of the world. However, I do not wish to be trampled upon. I do not wish to have the rights of our people trampled upon. I do not wish to see a far reaching piece of legislation such as is represented by the immigration bill passed without the most minute and careful scrutiny. We intend to offer Senate bill 2842 as a substitute and to offer many scores, if not hundreds, of amendments if we are not successful in securing the passage of our substitute bill.

Mr. President, I think the request which I am making of the majority leader is reasonable.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I certainly agree that the request which the Senator from New York has made is reasonable. It is reasonable for any Senator to ask that he be given notice ahead of time as to when a motion is to be made to bring up certain legislation. That is my reason for giving such notice at this time. Certainly before I make the motion I will see to it that the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota are notified and given an opportunity to be present in the Chamber.

My good friends have been very patient with me and considerate of what I have tried to do. For a period of approximately 2 months the bill referred to has been on the calendar but has not been considered. I see no evidence that there are to be hearings in the Judiciary Committee. I have not heard of any vote to allow hearings. Under those circumstances, I feel that the only way to bring the subject before the Senate for consideration is to move to proceed to consider the bill which has been reported. Then if the distinguished Senator from New York and other Senators who join with him desire to do so, of course it will be their privilege to move to take up the substitute. The subject can then be fully debated.

That is about all I can say in that connection.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to associate myself with the statements of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] regarding the immigration bill. I believe that their bill, of which I am a cosponsor, is a far superior bill. However, I do not want the St. Lawrence seaway project to be brought up under circumstances in which it would be handicapped. I am very glad



to hear the majority leader say that he is ready to support that measure.

I hope that the majority leader will see fit to substitute the St. Lawrence bill for the immigration bill so the Lehman-Humphrey measure may be considered by the committee. I hope the distinguished Senator from Arizona will see his way clear to do this.

But in any event, I should like to ask the majority leader whether we can have his assurance that if the immigration bill is considered first, the St. Lawrence seaway measure will be brought before the Senate for a vote and next on the agenda.

The St. Lawrence seaway project has been under discussion for more than a quarter of a century. It has been backed not only by every President for the past quarter century, but by every nominee for the presidency of both parties. The measure has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 9 to 4. I realize that we are trying to adjourn at an early date. I am afraid that the measure might be caught in the late adjournment rush, and in that way not come to a vote before the Senate. Therefore I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether we could have his assurance that either before or after the immigration bill is disposed of, the St. Lawrence seaway project measure will be brought up for a vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Policy Committee of the Senate has not considered the question of when the St. Lawrence seaway bill should be brought up for consideration by the Senate. I do not like to take all the responsibility in that regard, and I should not be expected to take all the responsibility. All I can say to my good friend from Michigan is that I am in favor of having it considered by the Senate. As Senators well know, I should like to have it considered at an early date. I hope that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will give very careful consideration to what the effect might be of substituting the St. Lawrence seaway bill for other legislation, unless it is done as a last resort.

Mr. President, I cannot tell in advance what the Policy Committee will decide to do. I can tell the Senator from Michigan that I am in favor of taking up the St. Lawrence seaway bill and having it considered at this session of Congress. But I realize that we get into legislative snarls. For example, the vote today on the mutual security bill has delayed and jeopardized consideration not only of the St. Lawrence seaway bill but of other bills as well. So far as I am concerned I shall not hold it against some of my friends on the other side of the aisle for voting against us, even though I know that they could have helped us if they had voted with us.

I shall do my very best to have all important legislation considered by the Senate at this session. There are other important bills which will have to be considered. Perhaps it will mean that we shall have to work longer hours and a few more days than we thought would be necessary. I hope the committees

will give early consideration to all important legislation, particularly the appropriation bills, which must be acted upon. The faster we can pass these bills the more it will help all of us.

The mutual security authorization bill which we were considering today, until it was referred to another committee, must be passed in both the Senate and in the House before the Appropriations Committees of both Houses can consider the subject. There can be no question that the work of the Senate has been delayed by the vote today to refer the mutual security bill to the Armed Services Committee. Let those who did it take the responsibility.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I realize that the distinguished Senator from Arizona is not the entire Policy Committee. I also realize the high respect in which his colleagues hold him and the great influence which he has in the committee. I hope he will use that influence in this case. I would appreciate his giving us assurance that his purpose would be to see to it that the St. Lawrence seaway measure will come up for consideration either before or directly after action is taken on the immigration bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know what important legislation may come up for consideration even tomorrow.

Mr. MOODY. There is no more important legislation than the seaway legislation.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know about that. Some very important legislation may be proposed in the Senate. I have gotten myself into a few awkward positions by making promises and then trying to live up to them. I will say that I will do what I can—and I know that the Senator from Michigan believes me when I tell him that—

Mr. MOODY. I know that I can take the word of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I appreciate his statement.

Mr. McFARLAND. However, I do not want to commit myself to do something that I may not be able to do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon without losing the floor.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of the Humphrey-Lehman immigration bill, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made this afternoon, and to express the view that those of us who are sponsors of the bill—and we are a considerable number in the Senate—are entitled to the parliamentary courtesy of having a hearing held on our bill before another bill, for which our bill is intended as a substitute, is brought before the Senate for debate and action. I think that is a just, fair, and reasonable request.

I am at a loss to understand why a bill on this subject should be scheduled for a vote on the floor of the Senate when a large number of us have not had an opportunity of having a hearing held on our bill. Such a course violates my sense of fairness. Hearings on the Hum-

phrey-Lehman bill should be proceeded with at once so that we may have the record put on the desk of every Senator. In that way each Senator can take his choice between the two records, and decide whether the McCarran bill or the Humphrey-Lehman bill should be adopted. In my judgment that is the way legislation should be considered in the Senate, not by literally setting aside a large group of our colleagues in the Senate and saying to them, "You have a bill, but we will not give it hearings; we will leave it up to you to amend on the floor of the Senate the bill on which hearings have been held."

I am sure that after further reflection on the subject the point of fairness that I now make will receive favorable consideration from the Senators who are in charge of scheduling the business of the Senate, and that the McCarran bill will be set aside until hearings have been held on the Humphrey-Lehman bill.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Connecticut, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The so-called McCarran bill is 300 pages long. I venture to suggest that very few Members of the Senate are likely to read it. In my judgment it is full of inconsistencies and potential injustices, not only to fellow American citizens but to those who seek to become American citizens after entry into this country.

It would be a tragic mistake, in my opinion, Mr. President, if we did not follow the leadership of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who have given so much thought and time to this bill, by seeing to it that hearings are granted upon the bill, so that the complex issues in the two bills might be drawn up side by side for the Senate to see and understand more clearly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] may make a brief statement at this time without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, a few moments ago I spoke on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project. I should like to make it clear that I feel that the great work which has been done by many organizations on the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill should have very serious consideration by the Senate. I am sure that it will be brought up in one way or another. Therefore it seems to me that the proper course of action for the Senate to follow would be to have the Committee on the Judiciary hold the hearings on the bill that have been requested this afternoon.

I hope the committee is willing to give consideration to the proposals made by the distinguished Senators who have spoken here, and is willing to give consideration to the views of a great many persons who are intensely interested in this matter because it means their very lives. They object strenuously to some of the provisions of this 300-page bill. If Senators choose to ignore those proposals and those views, of course, they can do so. However, I hope they will not.

In my judgment, it would be wise for the Senate to defer considering the McCarran bill until the Humphrey-Lehman bill has been gone into thoroughly by the Judiciary Committee. I would regret to see these two great issues, the St. Lawrence and Lehman bills, both of which are so important, caught in a vise on a question of substituting one for the other, because the result might be to bring about the defeat of both of them.

So I hope the majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who is sponsoring a bill of his own, will give consideration to the bill introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I am at a loss to understand why that bill, which was introduced many weeks ago, has not been given serious consideration and why hearings have not been held on it long before now.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

#### AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT RELATING TO BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably 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, with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 1509) thereon.

At this time I should like to submit a brief analysis of the bill:

First, it permits the execution of collective-bargaining agreements prior to the hiring of employees in the building trades industry.

Second, it permits labor agreements which require membership in the contracting union on or after the seventh day following employment.

Third, it permits such agreements despite any other provision of the act or of any other Federal, State, or Territorial law.

Fourth, it requires that a labor organization executing such a contract be in compliance with the financial statement and non-Communist-affidavit-filing provisions of the present act.

Fifth, and finally, it provides for an expedited election in which employees covered by a contract permitted under the bill could choose another bargaining representative.

Mr. President, these amendments are intended to remedy the hardships and disruption of labor relations which have

resulted from the proved impracticability of accommodating the normal doctrines and election procedures of the National Labor Relations Act to the building and construction industry. I may say that we held extensive hearings on the bill; and with the bill, which is reported favorably from the committee, a report is being filed.

It is my hope that we shall soon reach the bill, for consideration in the Senate, because of the dire need in the building and construction industry for the enactment of this remedial legislation. I may say that it has bipartisan support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BENEFITS—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent to introduce and send to the desk 3 bills to amend the social security laws. These bills are a part of a series designed to liberalize the social security benefits for the American people. I trust that the Congress will see fit to act on these bills during the current session.

The social security system at this time is a dual one. In addition to the contributory phase of the program, our laws also provide for old-age assistance. The inflated cost of living in recent months has placed a severe burden upon all Americans, but a particularly onerous burden on our older citizens who are forced to live on a fixed income. Members of the Senate are already aware of the bill I introduced a few days ago, providing for an average increase of 12½ percent in old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Mr. President, I would say again that the statistical information I received from the Social Security Board indicated that such a 12½-percent increase could be forthcoming without any additional taxes or without in any way sacrificing the solvency of the social security fund. I presented my documentation from the board to uphold my position.

In addition to this increase in insurance benefits, it is important that we increase the benefits going to the recipients of old-age assistance.

Therefore, I send to the desk a bill to increase by \$5 the financial contribution of the Federal Government toward the payment for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children.

There is a second and most urgent problem in connection with our social security laws. A number of editorials recently have been written urging the reform in those laws insofar as they affect the ceiling income which a recipient of old-age and survivors insurance benefits may earn without loss of those benefits. I ask unanimous consent that two of those editorials in my possession—one from the Washington Post of April

20, 1952, and the other from the Saturday Evening Post of April 5, 1952—be incorporated in the body of the RECORD following this statement.

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

(See exhibits A and B.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so as to complete my statement about the bill, let me say that in this period of growing manpower shortage, it is wrong to discourage persons over 65 years of age from working even at part-time jobs. However, our present law does just that. Our laws do not discriminate against a recipient of old-age benefits if he receives additional funds through investments, annuities, or employment in a job not covered by the Social Security Act.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear, for the RECORD, that if a man is a recipient of old-age insurance and if he receives additional income from stocks or dividends or from some employment not covered by the old-age insurance legislation, he still can obtain his old-age insurance benefits check. However, if he is over 65 years of age and if he has more than \$50 a month income from any employment that is covered by the social-security legislation, he will receive no old-age and survivors insurance benefits check. Such a situation seems to me to be downright discrimination.

That act discriminates against a person who attempts to earn additional funds by part-time or full-time employment in a job covered by the Social Security Act. Regardless of whatever merit there may have been at one time for such a provision, in my judgment, it does not exist today. It works to the disadvantage of persons in the lower-income brackets, who—after all—are those most in need of social-security benefits.

It would be preferable, in my judgment, to eliminate all ceilings from the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the law. It is my judgment, however, that the Congress would not be prepared to go that far at this time. However, a healthy society is one which makes the maximum use of available manpower, and a healthy individual is one who can feel that by his employment he is making a contribution to his society, regardless of his age.

Mr. President, by increasing the amount of income which a recipient of benefits under the old-age insurance system may earn and may still retain his insurance benefits, we shall release millions of man-hours of skilled labor for our production program. We need additional manpower, and we need the experience and the trained manpower of our senior citizens.

I wish to emphasize the point that many of these persons at the age of 65 are still in the vigor of life; and their old-age insurance benefits come to them by right, not by charity, for those funds have been contributed to by themselves and by their employers. So those beneficiaries receive those funds by right. Yet the social security system law, because it was written in the days of the depression, when we wished to decrease the number of employables, prevents a man from receiving any old-age insur-



ance benefits if he has additional income amounting to \$50 a month or more. I think that provision of the law should be changed. My proposal is that such a person should be allowed to earn at least \$100 a month, for today a man cannot live on \$49.99 a month, plus what little insurance benefits he is able to obtain. After all, Mr. President, under the present law the recipients of these insurance benefits are being discriminated against by being denied a chance to obtain gainful employment.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that any person who has an annuity policy with a private insurance company will receive those annuity payments regardless of whether he continues to work?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Obviously that is true.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator from Minnesota know that in the city of Detroit not long ago a man over 65 years of age earned in 1 month, at odd jobs, \$50.67, and as a result of the fact that he earned 67 cents more in 1 month than this foolish law allows a recipient of benefits under the old-age-insurance system to receive, he was disqualified from receiving from the Government the annuity for which he had paid?

I should like to add that I am delighted that the Senator from Minnesota is introducing a bill on this subject, for I have a similar bill at the desk, and I would be happy to join the Senator from Minnesota in urging early action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I understand that many of the newspapers throughout the country—and one which I can recall at the moment is the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which recently published an editorial on the subject—have referred to that same provision of the present law.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who now is serving as Presiding Officer of the Senate, knows more than any of the rest of us do about financial matters and the system of insurance benefits, and I hope he will lead in the effort to increase the ceiling in this insurance structure and at the same time make it possible for employment to be had by thousands and thousands of our senior citizens who would engage in additional and valuable employment if they were permitted to do so under the old-age-insurance system.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to introduce and send to the desk the bill which will increase to \$100 the amount which old-age and survivors' insurance beneficiaries may earn in covered employment without loss of insurance payments.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill which makes it possible for employees of institutions of higher education to be covered under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, under the terms of Federal-State agreements, regardless of the fact that these employees may be covered by an existing retirement system.

In a poll of public educational institutions conducted by the American Council on Education in March 1950, 80 percent of the institutions expressing an opinion favored giving college-university teachers who are members of public-retirement systems an opportunity to go under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. Over 83 percent favored making coverage available to non-teaching personnel covered by a public plan.

I hold in my hand a letter which I have received from the president of my university, Dr. James L. Morrill, president of the University of Minnesota. In writing as a spokesman, he informed me that at the annual meeting of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, held at Houston, Tex., last November, the presidents of the member institutions, meeting with the member institutions of the National Association of State Universities, concluded by an overwhelming majority that those institutions should be accorded the opportunity of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system.

This principle has been accepted by a great many Members of the Senate. In fact, I am cosponsor of a bill, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Senator LEHMAN, Senate bill 2705, in which this recommendation is incorporated. In the interest of clarifying this simple and straightforward objective, I have been asked to introduce the bill which I am now sending to the desk. This bill would separate this provision from other amendments of the Social Security Act which might be more controversial. It is a pleasure for me to introduce this bill.

It is my hope that the Senate Finance Committee will soon schedule hearings on this bill. A companion bill, H. R. 5604, has been introduced in the House of Representatives.

The Members of the Senate are aware that I, as a cosponsor of Senate bill 3079, am in favor of a more extended revision of the Social Security Act than is provided for in these bills. The three bills which I am introducing today do not call for lengthy consideration or extended debate. They are meritorious on their face, and should be acted upon without further delay.

#### EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Post of April 20, 1952]

#### DISCOUNT ON WORK

Reform is urgently needed in many sections of the Nation's social-security laws, but the first call for attention should be the provision denying a person his old-age benefit if he earns more than \$50 a month in a job covered by social security. The Social Security Act discourages persons over 65 from working even at part-time jobs. A person who can find a job not covered by social security, however, may earn as much as possible and continue to receive his old-age benefit. Or, if he happens to have investments or annuities, he may receive any amount of money from them and yet continue to draw his old-age benefit under social security. Here is a discrimination against earnings as opposed to incomes.

That discriminatory rule was written when the New Deal was fighting mass unemployment and using every possible de-

vice to get people out of the labor market. Now there is a manpower shortage and a great need to encourage people to work. The chief person hurt is the one in the lower-income brackets who needs the benefit most of all, but, in present circumstances, society itself is the loser. Society is losing the labor of many persons who would like to work part time but refuse to do so because they would have to forego a pension they believe they have earned. All this is without consideration of the immensely important fact that nearly everyone is better off doing some kind of work.

In its annual report just issued, the Social Security Administration recognizes the inequity of the old-age provision and recommends a partial reform. The reform, unfortunately, does not go far enough. It would merely raise by an unspecified amount the total which beneficiaries may earn and still receive benefits. Most of the objections would still prevail even if the amount were \$100 or \$150 rather than \$50. The report says that the earnings ceiling "should not be so large that beneficiaries could continue to work at regular full-time jobs and still get benefits." But the Nation needs their work.

Persons over 75 receive old-age benefits whether they earn \$50 a month or \$500. It would be costly to make the same provision for all over 65 at once, but we should move as fast as possible in that direction. Persons over 65 should not be discriminated against for being worth-while members of society. That is what the present law does.

#### EXHIBIT B

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 5, 1952]

#### WHY PUT A LIMIT ON EARNINGS OF RETIRED PEOPLE?

Under the unique theory embodied in the social-security law, a single man or widower who has retired and is receiving a maximum of \$80 per month may not earn more than an additional \$50 per month. If he is paid more than that, he forfeits his \$80 stipend. In fact, it is only slightly more than a year ago that Congress amended the law to permit beneficiaries to augment their social-security income to the extent of \$50. Before January 1, 1951, the limit was \$15 a month.

Just how elderly people on small annuities are supposed to pay their bills in these inflationary times, the Social Security Act does not state. Neither does it explain the justice of restricting the amount which a retired man may earn by his own labor when no restriction is placed on what a more fortunate oldster may receive from investments, private pensions, and annuities, or rich and grateful relatives. Another mystery is the provision in the law by which beneficiaries of social security who reach the age of 75 are permitted to earn as much as they like.

However, until he is too old to tear into an 8-hour day like a game cock, the retired man does well to play it safe. If he decides that it is ridiculous to try to live on \$130 a month—his \$80 social security stipend plus the \$50 he is permitted to earn—and goes out and gets a job, the first \$100 a month he earns, less income tax, makes it a stand-off between working and sitting quietly on the porch. The \$80 social-security check which he forfeited, was tax-free but the \$100 or more which he earns is taxable at the new high rates. Any normal annuitant would ask himself, "Why work for the price of loafing?"

On page 18 of the 1951 booklet, Your New Social Security, is found a heading: "Who pays for it?" The answer: "Federal old-age and survivors insurance is paid for by a contribution (or tax) on the employee's wage and the self-employed person's earnings from his trade or business." Well, if the retired worker has "paid for" his benefit, along with an equal contribution by his employer, what

business is it of the Government what other income he has or how he earns it? A man on a private retirement plan gets his pension without any strings attached as to the amount he may earn. The same is true of annuities from insurance companies. Social security is described by the Federal wind machines as insurance for which the worker has paid with his own money along with a contribution by the boss. But if the worker at age 65 has bought no more than an obligation not to add to his small allowance by taking a job on the side, he has a right to ask, "Is this insurance or a dose?"

This restriction on the earnings of social-security beneficiaries was tacked onto the law in 1934 because it was considered a good idea to discourage elderly people from entering the labor market. Unemployment was high when the law was passed. But, aside from economic hardships, the restriction discourages able and active men from utilizing their abilities at a time of life when they need all the help they can get. Retirement is tough going for most healthy men, and to force idleness on them is a cruel injustice. Social workers and business leaders who expected retirement plans to solve the problem now hold conferences on how to reconcile people to retirement.

There is also the national angle. If the Nation's defense industries demand more and more men, it is obvious that the abilities and skills of thousands of men who have reached their sixty-fifth birthdays can be used. It is a strange policy indeed which would suppress this available labor supply by bribing men not to take jobs that pay them more than \$12 a week. When this antisocial practice is carried on in the name of social insurance, to which all employed people are compelled to contribute out of their earnings, insult is added to injury. Representative W. STERLING COLE, of New York, has proposed an amendment to the Social Security Act, permitting people over 65 to earn \$100 a month without losing their annuities. But why should there be any limit at all?

There being no objection, the bills introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY were severally received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 3120. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal financial participation for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children;

S. 3121. A bill to increase the amount which old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries may earn in covered employment without loss of benefits; and

S. 3122. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to employees of institutions of higher education who are covered by State or local government retirement systems.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1650. An act to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Savannah, Chatham County, Ga.;

S. 1798. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico relating to the waters of the Canadian Rivers;

S. 2160. An act to authorize the Attorney General to admit persons committed by

State courts to Federal penal and correctional institutions when facilities are available;

S. 2223. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy the Government-owned magnesium foundry at Terborro, N. J.; and

S. 2639. An act to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 586. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land on the Chena River to the Tanana Valley Sportsmen's Association, of Fairbanks, Alaska; and  
H. R. 4199. An act to authorize the transfer of lands from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

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

H. R. 836. An act for the relief of Harumi China Cairns;

H. R. 1968. An act for the relief of Senta Ziegler;

H. R. 1969. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic;

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

H. R. 2608. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

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

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

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

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

H. R. 3598. An act for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene;

H. R. 3830. An act to authorize the construction and equipment of geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 4220. An act for the relief of Hazel Fong Hee;

H. R. 4337. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions;

H. R. 4397. An act for the relief of Minglan Hammerlind;

H. R. 4535. An act for the relief of Nigel C. S. Salter-Mathieson;

H. R. 4764. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4772. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Harris;

H. R. 4788. An act for the relief of Yoko Takeuchi;

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

H. R. 5187. An act for the relief of Rodney Drew Lawrence;

H. R. 5437. An act for the relief of Motoko Sakurada;

H. R. 5590. An act for the relief of Marc Stefen Alexenko;

H. R. 5922. An act for the relief of Karin Riccardo;

H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Holly Frindle Goodman;

H. R. 5609. An act to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of poisons in the mails to persons or concerns having scientific use therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5936. An act for the relief of Kunto Itoh;

H. R. 6012. An act for the relief of Gylda Raydel Wagner;

H. R. 6055. An act for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour;

H. R. 6088. An act for the relief of Hisako Suzuki;

H. R. 6101. An act to extend the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 6172. An act for the relief Manami Tago;

H. R. 6480. An act for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley;

H. R. 6561. An act for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht; and

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

#### REGULATION OF USE OF CERTAIN MEDICINES IN TREATMENT OF EPILEPSY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am sure that, like myself, many other Members of the Senate have received letters from constituents objecting to a proposed food and drug regulation which would, it seems, cut them off from a source of medical aid which has meant a great deal to them. These people, Mr. President, are unfortunate victims of epilepsy—a disease for which there is as yet no cure. They carry a grievous burden through no fault of their own. It is obviously the duty of decent people in and out of Government to do everything possible to help them and to shun anything which would unnecessarily add to their troubles. Yet their obviously honest, sincere, and troubled letters indicate that if the proposed regulation is allowed to take effect, it will, in their opinion, cause still further anguish and suffering.

Mr. President, I do not pretend to be an authority on epilepsy, on how it should be treated, or on the type of governmental regulations which may be needed to protect the public interest in these matters. Seeking information on this problem, I turned to one of our colleagues who for years has made it his business to study all phases of health legislation, a man who most certainly has a thorough knowledge of the human as well as the legalistic aspects involved in these problems. I refer to our esteemed colleague the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who for more than a decade has carried the responsibility of investigating for the Senate legislative proposals in the field of health. As regards this particular problem, I regard his opinion as most authoritative, since he was and is chairman of the Senate committee which considered the legislation under which the regulation in question is purportedly based—a committee, I must say, which struck from that legislation language which would have done by law that which it is now proposed to do by regulation. I find, Mr. President, that the Senator from Montana feels strongly that this regulation should not be permitted to take effect. I find that he has already vigorously protested the issuance of the regulation to which my constituents take exception. I find that his belief is based upon a thorough knowledge of the problem and is buttressed by sound and considered reason-



ing. I find those reasons most persuasive, and I think they should be brought to the attention of all those in the Congress who share my deep concern over the new problem confronting those poor people who have been unfortunate enough to be stricken by epilepsy.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks, a letter from the Senator from Montana to Mr. Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, in which the Senator urges that the proposed regulation be withheld, and an accompanying statement setting forth his well-considered reasons for taking that position. I commend them to the attention of the Congress.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND  
PUBLIC WELFARE,  
March 13, 1952.

HON. OSCAR R. EWING,  
Administrator, Federal Security Agency,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EWING: I am enclosing a series of letters sent me by good citizens of Montana in protest against a proposed regulation which apparently would make it impossible for these sufferers from epilepsy to continue to receive the medicines they believe helpful as they have in the past. I believe that if you read these letters, Mr. Ewing, you will conclude as I have that the writers are honest, sincere, and sorely troubled people unfortunate enough to have been stricken by epilepsy or to have someone in the family who has been so stricken. Since as yet we have no cure for epilepsy, theirs is already a grievous burden at best. They deserve our sympathy and every help we can give them. Yet, as their letters show so clearly, they are convinced that if this regulation goes into effect, the Government will be adding to their present burdens another and most serious one; that we shall be depriving them of a tested and effective source of aid without giving them any other place to which to turn for help.

Now I know that the Food and Drug Administration exists solely to help and not to hurt our people. I am convinced that Commissioner Crawford and his aides are sincere in their belief that it is very dangerous for anyone to take habit-forming drugs such as phenobarbital unless a physician actually sees the patient regularly and increases or decreases the dose in accordance with the patient's condition and considering the presence or absence of other diseases which the patient may not have been aware of. I know that the proposed regulation is intended to aid rather than to harm epileptic patients. Nonetheless, after reading these letters, I am convinced that the proposed regulation if issued at this time, under these circumstances, and before every effort has been made to solve the problem in other ways and so as to provide these sufferers with a practical and acceptable alternative, would be neither fair nor proper. Therefore, I strongly urge that the proposed regulation be withdrawn and not allowed to go into effect. I ask too that you personally review the many problems involved and that, in transmitting my strong feelings on this matter to the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, you add your own. I do this because of my knowledge of your long and sincere interest in our people's health problems, your professional experience in this field, and your often-proved

ability to properly equate long-range and desirable objectives with the immediate realities which confront our people.

For your further information, I am attaching hereto a brief statement of some of the reasons which have led me to urge, as I now do again, that the proposed regulation be withdrawn. In closing, permit me to say that my concern over this matter reflects an interest only in the problems confronting the sufferers from epilepsy and the members of their families who have written me. I have no interest in or personal knowledge of the particular firm which apparently would be adversely affected if this regulation went into effect.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

**SOME CONSIDERATIONS LEADING TO THE CONCLUSION THAT THE PROPOSED REGULATION AFFECTING PATIENTS OF THE WESTERN MEDICAL CORP. SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

1. The proposed regulation is based on the idea that if a physician prescribes phenobarbital for a patient he has not himself examined that action may be inimical to the health of the patient.

It is my understanding that if a physician regularly engages in actions actually inimical to the health of his patients, he would be violating both a cardinal principle of the code of medical ethics and the laws governing medical licensure in most of our States.

If this is true and if the physicians working for the Western Medical Corp. are in fact endangering the health of their patients by prescribing phenobarbital on the basis of mailed questionnaires, then I must ask why is this regulation needed? Why have not those Western Medical Corp. physicians, who are members of the Illinois Medical Society, been charged with violating medical ethics and, if they are in fact endangering their patients by their practices, expelled from the society? Surely their fellow doctors know better than we in Washington what practices are bad for patients and most certainly they have obligated themselves to take action against unethical practitioners. Furthermore, why haven't the licenses of all the physicians involved been revoked by the Illinois Board of Medical Examiners if, in fact, these physicians are engaging in practices harmful to their patients? Since neither of these actions has been taken, I can only conclude that the practices followed by the physicians of the Western Medical Corp. are not considered harmful by their fellow practitioners in Illinois. If they are not, then there is no reason for the proposed regulation.

2. I have reviewed the instances presented by the Food and Drug Administration to the Senate's Subcommittee on Health as justifying the contention that phenobarbital should not be dispensed in the manner followed by the physicians of the Western Medical Corp. I find on inquiry that when one thinks in terms of the way medicine is actually practiced in this country, those instances could just as well have occurred to the patients of local practitioners; that similar unfortunate instances have and do occur to the patients of local practitioners; that the proposed regulation might prevent the occurrence of such incidents among the patients of those few doctors affiliated with the Western Medical Corp. but not at all amongst the patients of the some 200,000 other doctors in the country and that, consequently, insofar as the regulation is aimed at ending or minimizing the occurrence of such unfortunate incidents as were recounted to the subcommittee, it is a most ineffectual approach and, insofar as its only effect along these lines would be highly discriminatory, an unfair one.

3. In effect this regulation says to the people who have written me, "Even though

you are satisfied with the treatment you have been getting; even though you believe it has been of great help; even though it might well be exactly what your own local doctor might prescribe, we believe it unsafe and we insist that you go to a local physician if you want to continue to receive the medication you have been getting." The Food and Drug Administration has advanced several very persuasive reasons why an epileptic patient should be under the regular and immediate supervision of a doctor of medicine. Were I unfortunate enough to be stricken by epilepsy, I should find those reasons compelling.

It seems to me, however, that such reasoning is of little importance when considered in terms of the facts set forth in the letters sent me. The Government in effect is telling the individuals concerned that they must go to local physicians for the type of treatment they desire and find effective. The facts seem to be that most, if not all, of the patients involved did go to local physicians—often to several and often, on referral to such fine men as those at the Mayo clinic—before they sought help by mail from the doctors of medicine associated with the Western Medical Corp. Only after feeling that their own doctors were not giving them satisfactory care did they turn to Chicago. For reasons compelling to themselves these people decided that as regards epilepsy they could no longer turn for aid to the doctors of medicine in their home communities. Now you would tell them that they cannot seek relief from duly licensed doctors of medicine in Illinois. What alternatives will they have? I think the alternatives are obvious, and I question whether it is either good public policy or good medical policy to leave these poor people with only such alternatives.

Before leaving this point and since it is connected, I noticed with interest that representatives of the Western Medical Corp. stated that they were willing to enter into a stipulation that they would accept no patients for treatment who had not been diagnosed as epileptic by a physician who had actually seen the patient and was willing to so state. It seems to me that the Food and Drug Administration might well have accepted this offer and studied its results before deciding to promulgate the regulation in question.

4. A fourth and most important consideration leading to my conclusion is the following. Even if there were no question but that the objective sought by the proposed regulation was sound and in the public interest, I would still question the advisability of putting it into effect before a real effort had been made to provide a really effective and medically desirable alternative for the patients who will be affected and for their families. These people are carrying a grievous burden. We must make every effort to lighten it rather than to increase it. Yet we would deprive them of their present source of aid and tell them to seek help from sources and through systems already found wanting. Would it not be well to seek the aid of State medical societies, of the AMA, of voluntary health-insurance plans, and of other agencies and attempt to work out plans whereby these people could be assured that they would receive competent treatment for epilepsy, from sources accessible to them, without any stigma of any sort, and at prices they can afford to pay before invoking anything as drastic in its effect as the proposed legislation? Not only do I think it would be well to thoroughly explore all such possibilities first, but I believe that competent, humane administration demands that such an effort be made before any action capable of causing such grave concern to so many already afflicted people is taken.

### STATE TITLES TO THEIR TIDELANDS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on May 3, 1952, the junior Senator from Washington found reason to address a letter to the editor of the New York Times. For the reason that the subject discussed is, I think, of interest to all Senators, I wish to read the letter for the information of the Senate:

MY DEAR MR. EDITOR: Under date of Friday, April 25, I read with interest but concern your editorial which carried the heading, *Veto Called For*. In this editorial, through which you called for a Presidential veto of legislation confirming State titles to their tidelands, you failed, in my opinion, to recognize certain facts and you made some misleading statements. I trust that your good paper will admit the omissions of fact and will correct those statements which seem to be in error.

Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate at this point to read the editorial to which I have made reference. It reads as follows:

#### VETO CALLED FOR

A national outcry would doubtless be raised if Congress should pass a bill simply handing over to the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana a multi-billion-dollar asset that now belongs to the people of all the United States. Yet that is, in effect, just what both Houses of Congress have already done in approving two different versions of a quitclaim bill resigning to the States all Federal rights to vast offshore oil deposits. The only choice now facing the conference committee is therefore a choice between two evils; and when the new quitclaim measure comes before him, we urge the President to repeat the veto action he took on a similar bill in 1946.

Last year the House passed by better than 2 to 1 vote the Walter bill giving away to the States full title to the land under the sea from the low-water mark along their coasts out to the traditional 3-mile limit or, in some cases, even beyond. This was essentially the same gift that the Senate approved 3 weeks ago, and we regret to note that Senator Ives, of New York, was one of those who voted for it. But the House went even further. It also gave the States three-eighths of the oil revenue from lands extending all the way out to the edge of the Continental Shelf, which reaches 150 miles into the Gulf of Mexico. Both measures were passed in the face of Supreme Court decisions confirming the paramount rights of the Federal Government to the lands under dispute.

The issue really comes down to whether the Federal Government or the States will control the private exploitation of one of the Nation's most important strategic and economic resources, which the highest Court has clearly indicated lies within the domain not of the States but of the Federal Government. Until the issue is settled, the development of the offshore fields will be hamstrung; and it is regrettable that Congress has refused to accept the compromise O'Mahoney bill that at least would have encouraged work to proceed. This measure would have confirmed Federal title to the area, but would have given the States some revenue. However, any quitclaim bill, in whatever form presented, deserves the Presidential veto it is almost certain to get.

Mr. President, my objections to the attitude shown by the New York Times are contained in the remainder of my letter to the editor, which I wrote under date of May 3, 1952:

Mr. Editor, you have stated that the pending quitclaim legislation would simply

be handing over natural resources to California, Texas, and Louisiana—the implication being that these are the only three States involved in the issue. I take it to be so that your editorial writers must know that the legislation in question applies to the submerged lands and resources beneath navigable waters within the statutory boundaries of all the States in the Union.

Your editorial writers ought to know and probably do know that the State of Washington has already been unceremoniously hauled directly into the tidelands question by the Secretary of the Interior who by Executive fiat has attempted to strip Washington State citizens of their coastal submerged lands. I am attaching a copy of the Secretary's letter on the matter to the Governor of the State of Washington for your consideration and information. The Secretary of the Interior has publicly claimed power over the submerged lands of all coastal States.

Permit me to ask several other questions: Can it be that the Times has charged Mayor Impellitteri, of New York City, with malfeasance in office because he wrote a letter to the junior Senator from New York, Mr. LEHMAN, asking for Senate passage of the quitclaim legislation?

Since the Times editorially supported the candidacy of Dwight Eisenhower, I wonder if you are criticizing the general's policy? Certainly the Times must know that General Eisenhower has endorsed the policy of State ownership of natural resources within their statutory boundaries.

Can the Times be charging as evildoers the attorney general of New York, the Governor of New York and the Port of New York Authority, who have all supported and approved the quitclaim legislation?

Your editorial gives me reason to inquire how really informed is the Times about the facts concerning tidelands, about who has owned these tidelands historically and about the legal status of these tidelands today? There is nothing in your editorial which indicates that the Times has done any competent research on the tidelands question.

Your editorial speaks as though its writer were an acknowledged authority on the tidelands problem. Is the Times aware that it has differed fundamentally from the legal interpretations offered by former Dean Roscoe Pound, of the Harvard University Law School, and other recognized legal authorities such as Prof. Manley O. Hudson, of Harvard, and Prof. John Hanna, of Columbia University Law School? Is the Times actually determined as your editorial implies, to impute moral turpitude to the National Association of Attorneys General, the American Bar Association, the Council of Governors, and the Council of State Governments who have, without more than several dissenting votes, supported and endorsed the quitclaim legislation while constructively criticizing and taking issue with Supreme Court decisions which made the quitclaim legislation necessary?

The Congress has studied and debated the tidelands question and problem for some years. A substantial majority in both Houses of the Congress have voted to pass quitclaim legislation. The Times seeks to dispose of a great public question in an editorial which leaves too much unsaid. I do encourage your writers to give the tidelands question the considered and documented consideration to which it is entitled.

In all sincerity, I beg to remain,  
Yours very truly,

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair) 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.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Clarence H. Adams, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1956.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that there is objection to the nomination of Mr. Adams. I have not been notified that it has been withdrawn. I favor the confirmation of his nomination, but I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Clarence H. Adams is passed over.

### POSTMASTER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James F. Hughes to be postmaster at Boise, Idaho.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand there is objection to the nomination of James F. Hughes, and I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of James F. Hughes to be postmaster at Boise, Idaho, will be passed over.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Karl Robin Bendetsen, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CAIN subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the Department of the Army and the Nation itself on the appointment of Karl Robin Bendetsen, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Army. Some years ago Mr. Bendetsen was a distinguished and promising young citizen of the State of Washington. Those of us who live there have admired his progress, and continued to respect his integrity and his ability, and to wish him well. We feel that his appointment will assure even greater security and protection of our Nation's welfare.



## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jack Garrett Scott, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William J. Kennedy, of Ohio, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the nomination of William J. Kennedy be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

## SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT AT SAN FRANCISCO

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John P. McEnery, of San Jose, Calif., to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

## THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowance of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

## RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, May 7, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of May 1), 1952:

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Joseph C. Green, of Ohio, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Edmund J. Dorsz, of the District of Columbia.

Charles W. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Sverre M. Backe, of California.

John W. Campbell, of Alabama.

Vincent Canzoneri, of Maryland.

Ernest B. Gutierrez, of New Mexico.

Lee M. Hunsaker, of Utah.

Leopold J. LeClair, of Massachusetts.

William P. Shockley, Jr., of California.

Francis M. Withey, of Michigan.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

John Crawford Brooks, of California.

Joseph W. Thoman, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Marcus J. Gordon, of Minnesota.

Robert G. Hooker, Jr., of California.

John W. Jago, of California.

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Rosel H. Hyde, of Idaho, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1952. (Re-appointment.)

## IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

Marguerite C. Casey, XXXX

Jean C. Cynkar, XXXXXX

Dorothy M. Kuehn, XXXXXX

Mary F. McLean, XXXXXX

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of May 1), 1952:

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Karl Robin Bendetsen, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Jack Garrett Scott, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

## MINT OF THE UNITED STATES

John P. McEnery, of San Jose, Calif., to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

## UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert H. Scarborough

Sydney M. Shuman

John F. O'Connell

To be ensigns

William K. Vogeler

Salvatore J. Bardaro, Jr.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualification provided by law:

To be captains

Isidor E. Rittenburg, effective May 1, 1952.

Kenneth G. Crosby, in accordance with law.

Glendon E. Boothe, in accordance with law.

To be commanders

William F. Deane, effective March 4, 1952.

Edgar F. Hicks, Jr., effective March 4, 1952.

John C. Bull, effective March 4, 1952.

Arthur L. Wardwell, effective March 4, 1952.

Emmett H. Sheridan, in accordance with law.

Raymond H. Tryon, Jr., in accordance with law.

Chester J. Beyma, in accordance with law.

To be lieutenant commanders

V. Ralph Sobierski, in accordance with law.

Lorne G. Taylor, in accordance with law.

John O. Boyer, in accordance with law.

To be lieutenants

Norman E. Taylor, effective March 1, 1952.

John R. Plaggmiller, in accordance with law.

Leonard S. Baker, in accordance with law.

Eugene W. Richards, in accordance with law.

Samuel D. Parkinson, in accordance with law.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Arthur E. Greaves, Jr., in accordance with law.

Omar H. Quade, Jr., in accordance with law.

## IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major generals

Christian F. Schilt

Thomas J. Cushman

To be brigadier generals

Gregon A. Williams

Frank H. Lamson-Scribner

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be brigadier generals

Arthur H. Butler

Thomas A. Wornham