

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

116. By Mr. HILLELSON: Petition of Frank J. McCann, and 15 others, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will reduce the tax burden caused by the payment of 32 cents out of every dollar earned by the average American; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

117. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Harry W. Putnam and sundry residents of Massachusetts urging enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1953

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian.

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

O Lord of our pilgrim years, the day returns and brings us the round of its concerns and duties. As in Thy sight Thy servants serve here in posts of high public office, make them solemnly conscious that their attitudes, their words, and their acts are not just their own, but that they go out from this Chamber, set as a light on a hill, to influence and to mold the whole structure of human relationships around this sad and weary world. Help those who here stand as the representatives of freedom in all things to be masters of themselves that they may be the servants of others. In these times of tension and strain preserve us from minding or magnifying little slights and stings, or giving them. Keep us calm in temper, clear in mind, sound of heart, in spite of ingratitude, meanness, or even treachery. In these crucial and creative days, enable us, we pray Thee, to perform faithfully and well what Thou dost require, even to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee our God. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 25, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and

joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3180. An act to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property;

H. R. 3655. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3853. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950;

H. R. 4130. An act to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953;

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; and

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today, in order to attend a funeral.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, because I will be absent on official business of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on those days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I ask unanimous consent that, after today, I may be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate for the next 10 days, for the purpose of proceeding to the west coast on a waterfront investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHOEPEL was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week because of official business incident to the holding of hearings by a subcommittee of the Select Small Business Committee.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary dealing with constitutional amendments was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. POTTER, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce investigating waterfront racketeering and port security, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the Senate is now in executive session, and that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that, without the Senator from Idaho losing the floor, the Senate proceed, as in legislative session, with the matters which would ordinarily be dealt with in the morning hour.

Further, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the transaction of such routine business as may be presented, the clerk call the nominations on the Executive Calendar other than the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, which is under consideration.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CHARLES J. ABARNO AND OTHERS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN COAST GUARD CONTRACTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATIONS ENTITLED "PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY, CAPACITY OF GENERATING PLANTS, 1951" AND "CONSUMPTION OF FUEL FOR PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY, 1951"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of that Commission's newly issued publications entitled "Production of Electric Energy, Capacity of Generating Plants, 1951" and "Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy, 1951" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of sundry aliens whose deportation had been suspended from lists heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chief Scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1952

(with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INTERIM REPORT OF GRAND JURY, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

A letter from the foreman, grand jury of the United States District Court, Anchorage, Alaska, transmitting an interim report of the grand jury, United States District Court, Third Division, Territory of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"House Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider legislation allowing a Federal income-tax deduction for certain military, Air Force, and naval reservists

"Whereas all components of the military, Air Force, and Naval Reserve of the United States are an integral part of the national defense effort; and

"Whereas military, Air Force, and Naval Reservists desire to increase their respective skills in order to better serve their country in time of emergency, and devote time and energy to this pursuit; and

"Whereas many reservists lose time from their civilian employment without pay in order to attend training sessions and temporary tours of duty in order to further increase military, Air Force, and Navy skills; and

"Whereas Federal income-tax relief to reservists would greatly bolster active participation in Reserve components and provide many more trained personnel to occupy a skilled post in the Armed Forces in event of a national emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to initiate legislation that would allow a deduction up to \$800 from Federal income-tax returns of all military, Air Force, and naval reservists receiving pay for inactive training and temporary tours of duty not exceeding 30 days; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of the memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of this State.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"LEE MATTIES,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

"GORDON ABBOTT,

"President of the Senate.

"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Joint Memorial 17

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commission on Fine Arts to cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson

"Whereas Kit Carson was a pioneer of the western part of the United States, an intrepid scout, and a great patriot; and

"Whereas Kit Carson is worthy to be honored and remembered by present-day Americans as a worthy example of devotion to duty and devotion to country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commission on Fine Arts cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Commission on Fine Arts, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

"GORDON ABBOTT,

"President of the Senate.

"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"LEE MATTIES,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to Federal gasoline taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. THYE on March 25, 1953, p. 2266, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Defense League of America, Washington, D. C., signed by John Milton DeWitt Kyle, national president, praying for action by the Senate to cause immediate withdrawal of the United States from membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 9

"Memorial requesting the formulation of a plan for cooperation in the development of ground water supplies on Indian reservations in central and southern Arizona

"To the President of the United States, the Department of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents: "Of the estimated total of 1,200,000 irrigated acres under cultivation in Arizona in 1952, over 800,000 acres, or almost 70 percent, derive their principal source of water from ground water supplies.

"Of Arizona's 72,000,000 acres only about 2 percent is agricultural land, one-half of which is privately owned. Almost 20,000,000 acres, or 27 percent, are Indian reservation lands.

"Most of the irrigated lands deriving their principal source of water from ground water supplies are situated in the great central valley of Arizona in Maricopa, Pinal, and Pima Counties.

"A survey made by the Phoenix area office of the office of Indian affairs shows a possibility of developing approximately 400,000 acres of Indian reservation lands in the central valley of Arizona through the installation of pumps and the use of ground water supplies. Much of this land is near or adjacent to the presently developed irrigated acreage and in the same geological basin.

"Studies made by the United States Geological Survey and the State of Arizona es-

tablish that the water tables in the central valley of Arizona are lowering and in most instances the declines in the water table are steady and persistent.

"Proposals have been made by the Indian tribes involved and the Phoenix area office of the office of Indian affairs to develop considerable additional acreage on the reservations in the central valley of Arizona through the medium of development leases to non-Indian lessees. Additional withdrawals from the ground water basin supplying this area on the scale proposed would constitute a serious threat to the existing agricultural economy of the State, would not be a permanent development of Indian reservation lands, by reason of the resultant competition for existing limited ground water supplies and would not, therefore, add materially to the permanent economic welfare of the Indian nor enable the Indian to immediately farm the land himself. So long as the possibility of this type of development of reservation lands exists, it will be impossible to secure passage of adequate legislation regulating the withdrawal of ground water in the affected areas. It is recognized, however, that the normal development of land by the Indians themselves would not seriously interfere with any policy of water control.

"The State of Arizona has just completed a study of the underground water resources of the State, and legislation designed to control further development in a large part of the central valley will undoubtedly be introduced as soon as a decision by the State supreme court in a pending case is announced.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona urgently requests:

"That those agencies of the United States Government directly concerned with this problem recognize its significance by adoption of a statement of policy for the guidance and assistance of the legislature in its future deliberations, and indicate their willingness to cooperate with the State of Arizona in effecting an orderly withdrawal of existing ground water supplies."

PROTEST AGAINST TRANSFER OF TVA OFFICES AND PERSONNEL FROM TENNESSEE TO ALABAMA—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, House Resolution No. 37, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, protesting against transfer of the offices and personnel of the Tennessee Valley Authority from the State of Tennessee to the State of Alabama.

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

House Resolution 37

Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of the legislature that the TVA is contemplating moving offices to Muscle Shoals, Ala., and a large portion of its personnel from the State of Tennessee and into the State of Alabama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee go on record as opposing the removal of any of the offices or personnel from the State of Tennessee and the offices remain in Knoxville and

Chattanooga as originally set up; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk be instructed to mail copies of the resolution to the Members of the United States Congress and Senate from Tennessee.

JAMES L. BOMAR,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION—JOINT RESOLUTION OF TENNESSEE LEGISLATURE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Tennessee, memorializing the Congress to retain the Small Defense Plants Administration as a separate and independent agency.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 33

Whereas small-business firms from all parts of the country have complained to Congress they are not able to get defense contracts without adequate financial backing, and, on the other hand, are not able to get financial backing without defense contracts; and

Whereas there was created by Congress on July 31, 1951, the Small Defense Plants Administration, the principal functions of which, as prescribed by Congress, are to see to it that: (1) Small business gets its fair share of defense contracts; (2) it receives a fair share of critical materials; and (3) it gets the financial and technical assistance needed to participate effectively in defense and essential civilian activities; and

Whereas it was the expressed intention of Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution to the defense program, and that small business be maintained as a vital part of the national economy, and thereby preserve and promote small-business enterprises throughout the United States of America; and

Whereas it is the sense of this body that small business is the life essence of American industry and should be well preserved, protected, and encouraged: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Tennessee (the House concurring therein), That we hereby approve and endorse the Small Defense Plants Administration as greatly beneficial and successful for the purposes for which it was created, and memorialize and petition Congress, through our Senators and Representatives in that body, to retain this agency as a separate independent agency as an aid and benefit to small business as well as any other essential industry to the defense program and protection of our national economy; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this house is directed to furnish each member of the Tennessee delegation in the Congress a copy of this resolution and urge upon them the enactment of Senate bill 753 now pending, providing for the retention of the Small Defense Plants Administration, originally created by amendment in the 82d Congress by section 714 to the National Production Act of 1950. Adopted March 11, 1953.

JARED MADDOX,

Speaker of the Senate.

JAMES L. BOMAR,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved:

FRANK G. CLEMENT,

Governor.

CONSTRUCTION OF TUTTLE CREEK DAM ON BIG BLUE RIVER, KANS.—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Kansas, favoring immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River, in Kansas, until certain debatable issues have been resolved.

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

Senate Resolution 19

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas until certain debatable issues have been resolved

Whereas during recent years studies and research in flood-control methods have evolved new theories and practices for the effective and economical control of flood water; and

Whereas the construction of said Tuttle Creek Dam may not control flood waters to a measure commensurate with the cost and damages occasioned by and resulting from such construction; and

Whereas the report of the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas, in conjunction with the Kansas Industrial Development Commission, recommends that the said Tuttle Creek Dam should not be constructed and that more modern methods of flood control should be initiated for the prevention of flood damage on the Kansas River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and memorialize the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas until debatable issues have been resolved, as recommended in the report of the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States.

I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the senate and was adopted by that body March 9, 1953.

FRED HALL,

President of the Senate.

SIDNEY MARGARET GARDINER,
Secretary of the Senate.

PETITIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have received 14 petitions of the board of directors of the National Farmers Union at a recent meeting in Denver. I have read them with great interest and find myself in complete sympathy and agreement with their contents. I understand that they have been sent directly to the President, and I am writing to urge that insofar as they lie within the administration's province the administration ac-

cept and put them into action. I now ask unanimous consent that the 14 petitions be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, in order that all Members of Congress who are concerned with the problem confronting the Nation's farmers may have them readily available.

There being no objection, the petitions were received, referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"I. STOP FALLING FARM INCOME

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby—

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to enact at this session legislation to stop the disaster-threatening drop in farm-family incomes and purchasing power including—

"(a) Definite mandatory legislation to protect the returns of family farmers on any agricultural commodity from dropping below 100 percent of a fair parity price. As a minimum in this session of Congress we urge enactment of legislation that will—

"(1) Extend at least until 1957 90 percent parity price supports for wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, and other basics.

"(2) Expand mandatory 90 percent of parity price supports to rye, flax, barley, oats, grain sorghum, soybeans, dry edible beans, and cottonseed.

"(3) Continue the present method of calculating parity prices of basic commodities and to extend this system to all other commodities, especially those listed in (2) above.

"(4) Provide mandatory parity-level price supports or other full parity income support program to milk and other dairy products, livestock, eggs, poultry, and other perishables.

"(b) Establishment of a special investigating committee, board, or commission to determine whether or not recent drops in price received by farmers, while retail prices paid by consumers remain high, have been the result of a conspiracy on the part of processors and middlemen and other monopolistic purchasing and marketing practices; and

"2. Petition the President of the United States to send a special message to the Congress reiterating his support of 100 percent of parity for farm income and prices and his support for enactment of parity-level farm income and price supports and recommending enactment of such legislation at an early date.

"We are making recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. Working family farmers are becoming increasingly concerned that existing farm price support programs may be allowed to expire before improved legislation has been adopted to replace them.

"B. A reasoned, considered, and orderly discussion of a long-range national food and farm program would be more likely if conducted in an atmosphere of relative security than if it must be conducted under the economic gun of falling farm incomes and farm price declines occurring in the face of an early termination of price support legislation.

"C. The old familiar economic scissors is cutting farmers down again. Real income per person on farms in 1953 is expected to be one-third lower than 5 years ago. The purchasing power of farm families will be lower than in any year since before World War II. Farmers' share of the national income in 1953 is now forecasted to be the lowest in our national history. Lower even than in 1932. Farm people are 15 percent of the population and will probably receive less than 6 percent of national income in 1953.

"D. Meanwhile, farm-operating costs in 1953 will be record high, above 1952; 29 per-

cent above 1948; more than twice as high as just before World War II; and almost six times as high as in 1932.

"E. Farmers are the only large group in the population whose income and purchasing power and whose share of the national income has been dropping.

"Interest rates received by bankers on short-term paper are up 124 percent—more than double since 1947.

"The purchasing power, in constant dollars, of the dividends paid by corporations to their stockholders has increased 20 percent in the same period.

"Corporate profits have increased 38 percent since 1947.

"And the purchasing power of the average weekly earnings of manufacturing workers has increased by 19 percent in 5 years.

"Meanwhile, farm-family purchasing power has gone down—down by 26 percent—in the last 5 years, with another 10-percent drop expected this year.

"F. Only 1 out of 6 full-time family farmers have a purchasing power equivalent to that of the average nonfarm family. Only 1 out of 4 have an income from labor, management, and return on investment equal to the purchasing power of the average manufacturing worker from labor alone. More than 1,500,000 full-time farm families had cash family income below \$1,000 in 1949; of those, 707,000 had incomes less than \$480.

"G. Falling farm income and farm-family purchasing power is of direct concern to everyone in the Nation, not just to farm people alone. In addition to the 24 million people on farms, the level of farm production and income directly affects 6 million workers (plus their dependents) who are producing goods and services for sale to farmers, and 9 million workers (and their dependents) who process and distribute farm commodities. If farm income drops, some of the 6 million lose their jobs; when farm production drops, some of the 9 million lose their jobs.

"This leads the way down into national depression. Average per-person annual income on farms dropped from \$264 in 1919, to \$207 in 1920, to \$116 in 1921. Industrial workers' income hit bottom a year later in 1922, 40 points below 1920. Exactly the same pattern occurred again from 1928 to 1933; and again in 1937-38. Is that where we are headed again?

"H. Industrial prices are held up by administrative devices, while industrial production is cut when farm demand and purchasing power drops. That is what has happened time and time again. Farmers try to maintain their production and the result is falling prices and greatly reduced farm incomes.

"I. In the past, for example 1929-32, farmers were able to maintain production. Farm production in 1932 was actually 4 percent greater than in 1929. Industrial production was cut by 47 percent. Farm prices fell by 68 percent. Now and in future years, however, farm production cannot be maintained in the face of such drops in income owing to the extremely high, inflexible cash cost of production and the need for purchasing fertilizer, chemicals, oil, power, and machinery from off the farm for cash.

"J. Forty years ago an average farm family could have lost its farm-cash-operating expenses for 9 years in a row before wiping out their investment in land and buildings. Now the investment, on the average, would be wiped out in only 4 years. Even if farm families were willing to accept for family living a purchasing power no greater than they had in 1932, and were able to reduce cash costs by 10 percent from 1952, the income available from sale of products would fall almost \$4 billion short of covering depreciation on the present stock of operating capital if agricultural prices are allowed to drop to 75 percent of the 1952 level.

"K. Present high level of farm production, even temporarily, can be maintained only by protecting a parity level of farm prices or by accepting intolerably deep cuts in farm-family living standards, or by using up and not replacing the present working capital of power, machinery, and equipment. Only by maintaining full-parity prices can high production be maintained over the long run.

"L. Only by the early enactment of mandatory high-level farm price-support legislation of the type recommended in 1 above can stabilized farm markets be reestablished. Continued uncertainties and confusion resulting from official criticism of existing price programs and the search for ways to eliminate them has contributed materially to present weak markets. Farm prices have dropped 15 percent since January 1951; almost one-half of this drop has occurred in the last 4 months. This is further illustrated by the weakness which characterized the dairy markets in the weeks preceding the dairy price-support announcement. In the long run, elimination, destruction, or weakening of the price-support program will destroy farm-family income, drastically threaten abundant farm production, and lead to the imposition of a drastic scarcity situation.

"We commend the following Senators and Congressmen who have introduced bills in the Congress which, if enacted, would improve the farm price-support legislation: SENATORS YOUNG, KERR, THYE, BEALL, MANSFIELD, HUMPHREY, EASTLAND, and RUSSELL; CONGRESSMEN LOVRE, WICKERSHAM, SMITH of Mississippi, ABERNETHY, PASSMAN, McMILLAN, H. CARL ANDERSEN, KRUEGER, and BURDICK.

"II. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION CREDIT LOANS

"The National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions, the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will authorize and direct the establishment, as a supplement to the agricultural conservation practices and Soil Conservation Service activities, of an Agricultural Conservation Credit Loan program that will greatly increase the availability to farmers at low interest rates 12 to 20-year loans that will enable them to undertake farm improvements and adopt farm practices that will contribute to greater agricultural soil and water conservation and, thereby, allow the Nation to move at a much faster rate than now toward a permanently and increasingly abundant agricultural production, recognizing that such a loan program will not be of value if farm price support legislation is not maintained and improved, and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States, at an early date, to send a message to the Congress (a) urging the enactment of such legislation and (b) expressing his determination to approve such legislation if enacted by Congress.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. The Nation is currently using up and losing farm soil structure and nutrients and its water resources at a faster rate than they are being built up.

"B. The total cost of adopting the farm improvements and improved practices needed to establish a permanent agriculture is so large that, even if there were no continued drain on farm resources, a period of 120 years would be required to reach the goal, if the present annual rate of adoption is not speeded up.

"C. We are convinced that the general public should assume its share of this cost through an expansion of the ACP and SCS programs. However, a great deal of the investment cost must and can be met by farmers themselves if adequate credit adapted to conservation needs of family farms can be made available.

"D. The income-increasing potentialities of soil conserving practices and installations are not all installed simultaneously and the benefits become available over a period of years, not immediately. This requires a type of credit that has the nature of a drawing account and can be repaid over a period of up to 15 or 20 years. Currently credit resources to meet this need of family farmers is almost totally lacking.

"We commend the Senate and House Agricultural Committees for having initiated staff studies looking toward congressional consideration of agricultural conservation credit legislation. Particularly we commend the following Senators and Congressmen for the personal interest they have taken in pushing such legislation toward formal consideration by the Congress: Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, AIKEN, of Vermont, and ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and Congressmen LOVRE, of South Dakota, and HOPE, of Kansas, and POAGE, of Texas.

"III. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

"The National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to enact, at this session of Congress, legislation to authorize the Department of Agriculture to continue to expand the Federal Crop Insurance program, on the present basis, each year, to additional counties not now served, and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States, at an early date, to send a message to the Congress (a) urging the enactment of such legislation and (b) expressing his determination to approve such legislation if enacted by the Congress.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. The present law which authorizes the annual expansion of the experimental crop insurance program to additional counties will expire on December 31, 1953, if not renewed prior to that date.

"B. The experience with Federal crop insurance operations over the past 6 years has been highly successful in the approximately 800 counties now served. This service should be made available to farmers in the remaining 2,200 counties and should be expanded to cover additional crops.

"C. It is our deep conviction that the payment by the Federal Government of necessary administrative costs is fully warranted by the contribution made by the program to the broad national public interest in maintaining the basis for fulfilling future national needs for an increasingly abundant production of food and fiber as well as for maintaining farm purchasing power as a contribution toward an expanding national economy.

"D. Federal crop insurance provides a means whereby the whole people can protect themselves, as well as farmers, against the economic shocks of natural disasters such as insects, flood, drought, and plant epidemics without the costly expedient of huge relief expenditures after disaster has struck.

"E. It is our deep conviction that the Federal crop insurance program should continue to cover all risks involved. The type of coverage provided in an all risk crop insurance policy is not comparable to any single risk coverage provided by private insurance companies and therefore is not competitive. For example, an analysis of hail insurance sales in several States established the fact that hail insurance sales increased as crop insurance participation expanded.

"We commend Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, and Congressman HILL, of Colorado, and MARSHALL, of Minnesota, for the personal interest they have taken in pushing this proposed legislation toward formal consideration in the Congress.

"V. FULL CONSUMPTION OF ABUNDANT FARM PRODUCTION

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby—

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to enact additional legislation to expand domestic and foreign consumption of farm commodities that can be and are produced in abundance. Such legislation should include:

"A. Enactment of the international food-reserve resolution that has been introduced in the Senate.

"B. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture and Commodity Credit Corporation to extend loans to farmers and farmers' cooperatives to build expanded storage and processing facilities for perishable farm commodities to be used in conjunction with price-supporting loans and purchase agreements on such commodities held in on-farm or farmers' cooperative storage facilities.

"C. A food-allotment plan to subsidize adequate diets for low-income consumers in the United States and other countries.

"D. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize parity payments and other nonwasteful methods of price support, particularly for such perishable commodities as, for example, butter, to the end that this butter will be used for human consumption rather than piling up in warehouses for eventual disposition in a soap vat.

"E. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake necessary action to develop and maintain a fully adequate safety reserve of all food and fiber commodities, including storable processed products of perishable farm commodities, and to protect the farmer from price-depressing effects of such reserves and to charge the cost of the program, as it properly should be, to national security and defense, not to farm programs; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to direct the departments and agencies of the executive branch to exercise the discretionary power they have under existing legislation to the end of encouraging full consumption of abundant agricultural production while protecting farmers from below-parity incomes or subjecting farmers to the degrading specter of being forced into a scarcity system of production through actions of the type outlined above. We also urge the President to send a message to the Congress stating his belief in abundant farm production, parity farm incomes, and the desirability of promoting full consumption, particularly better diets for low-income consumers, and recommending adoption of the legislation outlined above. For example, the President should direct the Defense Department and other Government agencies to put special effort on utilizing greater quantities of farm commodities in temporary surplus, such as beef, butter, and edible fats and oil at present.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. We are absolutely opposed to starvation and malnutrition and undernutrition in a nation of actual abundance and a world of potential abundance.

"2. We believe that the main opposition to a workable system of getting abundant land resources and farm production together with hungry people results from a doctrinaire blindness to the realities of the world we live in. We do not view as insurmountable such obstacles as currency inconvertibility, trade barriers, export and import quotas, tariffs, and other vested interests. All of these can be geared into a system of workable international economic cooperation.

"3. It is a matter of deep conviction with us that working family farmers in this and

other countries should be encouraged in every way to maintain and improve their land and water resources and to produce a balanced abundance which public policy will also insure will be used to benefit mankind, both in our own country and in foreign lands.

"4. We view with alarm the increasing official tendency to put exclusive reliance for solution of these problems on the private-profit, manager-administered market, both domestically and internationally.

"5. While we believe a strong military defense is necessary, American food will win more people to our beliefs in democracy and the dignity of man than will a similar expenditure for guns and military hardware.

"6. As far back as Biblical times it has been known that, in order to have enough food at all times, it was necessary to build reserves in times of good crops to draw on during the lean years. This principle is even more important today when the defense of the free world may be at stake. The billions spent for weapons of war will not be very effective if we do not have adequate food and fiber supplies to sustain our fighting force, our civilian population, and, if necessary, assist our allies with food and fiber. Even in the cold-war period communism probably can more effectively be kept from spreading by alleviating hunger in food-shortage areas than by the threat of weapons of war.

"We specifically commend Senators MURRAY and YOUNG for their personal interest and efforts in behalf of the development and introduction of the international food-reserve resolution.

"VIII. FARM HOME WATER SUPPLY LOANS

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to extend loans at low rates of interest to farm homeowners without adequate indoor running water for the purpose of installing such systems, including adequate bathing and sewage-disposal facilities.

"We make this recommendation for the following reasons:

"1. We believe that adequate credit facilities for this purpose are almost totally lacking.

"2. It is a deep conviction with us that working farm families are entitled to be able to earn for themselves, within their incomes, a standard for the necessities and conveniences of life equivalent to those available to comparable families living in urban areas.

"We commend the efforts of Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, and the late Congressman Reid Murray, of Wisconsin, for their personal efforts in this regard.

"IX. AMERICAN FOOD AND AMERICA'S ALLIES

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the executive branch to purchase with defense funds United States farm commodities for use in raising the dietary standards of our allied armies fighting in Korea and elsewhere around the world, and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to direct the civilian and military authorities of the executive branch henceforth in their military-procurement activities to purchase food for the troops of our Allies whose armies are suffering malnutrition to the end that military-assistance funds will be used to purchase United States produced farm commodities for shipment and contribution to the soldiers of allied armies fighting shoulder to shoulder with United States servicemen, and that the funds

so expended will be charged against defense appropriations rather than being charged against the cost of farm programs.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. The soldiers of other armies fighting at our side can no more carry out their duty than could ours without adequate diets of nutritious food. Yet millions of South Korean soldiers are now incapacitated by undernutrition.

"2. We believe it to be morally indefensible to have butter and other food commodities go to waste in this country while allied soldiers go hungry and fall from the ranks because of the lack of food.

"3. It is widely reported that the developing farm-income crisis is due to the development of at least a temporary surplus of supplies of food beyond domestic and foreign demands. This would indicate that the diversion of such temporary surpluses to friendly military personnel would not unduly restrict domestic United States food supplies.

"X. APPROPRIATIONS FOR CARRYING OUT FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will provide sufficient funds to maintain the services of Federal farm programs at the present level except as follows:

"(a) The agricultural conservation practices program should be expanded.

"(b) An increase is justified in the funds made available to Soil Conservation Service.

"(c) Sufficient funds should be made available to make possible the expansion of Federal crop insurance into additional counties and crops as provided by law.

"(d) The loan authorizations and funds for farm and home management supervisory assistance of Farmers Home Administration should be greatly increased to more nearly fill the expressed need for these services.

"(e) Loan authorizations and administrative funds of the Rural Electrification Administration should be increased to meet farmers' increasing demand for electric power and to speed up the rate of progress in the rural telephone loan program.

"(f) Funds provided for the school lunch program should be increased commensurate with increased school enrollments, the rising cost of food and operation, and to match the increased financial participation of States, counties, and school districts.

"(g) Increased funds should be appropriated to expand marketing research studies and service to reduce marketing margins and spreads; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to send a message to the Congress pointing out the vital contribution of farm programs to national welfare, prosperity, and security; recognizing the already heavy reductions made in these appropriations over the past 12 years; and urging the enactment of legislation along the lines outlined above.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. The present farm program has been a cumulative development through the democratic process over the Nation's entire history to fill needs of the whole people for an assured continuous and increasing abundance of food and fiber and for a prosperous agricultural population on family farms.

"B. It is our deep conviction that destruction or reduction in the scope of these programs will be more costly to the Nation in lost production, farm-relief measures, and wasted resources than would the small increased Federal expenditure that their continuation on an adequate basis would require.

"C. The beginning stages of what may well become a deepening farm-income crisis is not the time to weaken or destroy already existing farm programs. Rather, the course of wisdom is to improve and strengthen them, particularly at a time of heightened world tension when we do not know at what moment greatly increased production may be demanded of our farms and the farm people.

"D. Existing uncertainties are heightened by the fact the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee of the Congress is being required to consider this proposed appropriation without benefit of specific recommendations from the executive branch. This situation should be corrected immediately.

"E. We are seriously concerned and troubled by reports that the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations has employed a staff of 75 officials of industry, business, and finance (whose names are kept secret from the public, but whose chairman is known to be a private utility executive) to prepare official recommendations on the appropriations for farm programs. As a minimum, the names and industrial affiliations of these people should be made known to the public.

"F. The spread between farm price and retail price paid by consumers is now increasing at a rapid rate.

"G. The Nation is fully able to afford the Government expenditures we have recommended for the agricultural agencies. The gross national production is currently at a record level, about twice as high as only 10 years ago. Just in the past 30 months production increased from an annual rate of \$284 billion to \$360 billion, an increase greater than the total annual budget of the Federal Government. Less than 2 cents of each dollar of Government expenditure is devoted to the farm programs. When you consider the inflationary effects of scarce farm production, the appropriate question is, Can we afford to spend less to assure our future food supply?

"XI. PRESERVATION OF COOPERATIVE RURAL ELECTRIC AND TELEPHONE LOANS PROGRAM AND ADEQUATE PROVISION FOR PUBLIC POWER DEVELOPMENT

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States (1) to further expand the scope of cooperative rural electric and telephone loan programs and the public power development policy, and (2) to reject all proposed legislation and reorganization plans that would have the effect of (a) reducing the ability of farmer-owned and controlled cooperatives to obtain sufficient direct Government loans to expand their facilities including transmission lines and generating plants, to meet farmers' increasing needs for electric power and telephone service, or (b) of reducing the untrammelled access of such cooperatives to low-cost publicly generated power, or (c) to slow down the rate of expansion of public power development, or (d) prevent the public erection of transmission lines to load centers of municipalities, cooperatives, and other preferential customers who use the power on a cost basis, or (e) to sell or otherwise transfer public power facilities to private profit utilities; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to direct all departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government to promote the objectives of 1 (1) above and to refrain from the actions that would contribute to the adverse developments listed in 1 (2) above.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. A massive, well-financed attack intended to get REA cooperatives under the control of private power companies and to

wipe out public power development is now out in the open. The Power Trust, with the assistance of one farm organization, is making a frontal attack on public power. Their strategy is to block REA cooperatives from having direct access to adequate, dependable, and low-cost wholesale power.

"B. Modern family farming is solidly grounded upon an increasing use of electric power. Presently available facilities are inadequate to meet increasing needs.

"C. To meet increasing farm electric-power needs, farmers' electric cooperative require a heavying-up of existing systems; to do so will require considerable additional investment for which REA loans should be available.

"D. If the power trust effort to drive a wedge between farmers' electric cooperatives and the source of power succeeds, they can drive the cooperatives to bankruptcy and enhance their own private profits from low-cost, publicly generated power through increased rates to cooperatives.

"E. Progress in developing the rural telephone program has been stalled owing to lack of funds which were exhausted at the middle of the fiscal year.

"F. We view with profound misgivings the proposals that have been made by some big-business executives that public-power projects should be donated to high-income taxpayers. There is a grave risk that if the power trust wins the first rounds to destroy REA co-ops, they will then be in a position to win round two and take over completely.

"XII. POLICY FORMULATION AND ADMINISTRATION BY FARMER-ELECTED COMMITTEES

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the President of the United States (1) to broadened application of the principle of farmer-planned and farmer-operated farm programs within the executive branch; it being clearly understood that this principle means actual policy development for an administration of farm programs (rather than advisory consultation) by democratically elected farmer, county, and community committeemen, and (2) to prevent the taking of any additional steps within the executive branch that would further weaken the application of this principle, and

"2. Petitions the Congress of the United States (1) to enact legislation to increase the control by farmers themselves over policy development and administration of farm programs, by mandatory provisions requiring by law that major farm programs such as the crop-insurance program, CCC price-support loans and purchase agreements be administered through the agency of democratically elected farmer committees. And (2) to reject any plan for reorganizing the executive branch of the Government that would result in eliminating the farmer-elected committees or removing important functions from their supervision.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. It is our deep conviction that development and use of democratically elected farmer committees in the planning and administration of important programs was one of history's important advances in broadening the application of democratic ideals of Government.

"2. Farmers themselves, better than any full-time paid employees on State or Federal payrolls, know how to adopt Federal nationwide procedures and policies to fit the circumstances of farming in local communities and counties.

"3. Preservation and broadening of the farmer administration of farm programs is the one sure way to prevent the development of political partisanship in these agencies because under this system the program will

be administered by neighbors selected in free democratic elections, not by strangers appointed by authoritative officials in far-away cities.

"4. Merely advisory committees, particularly if made up largely of processors, bankers, and middlemen, should have a valuable but not centrally important place in the determination and administration of farm policies. There is both an opportunity and a tendency to use committees of this type as window dressing and as a means of bypassing the usual farm organizational and congressional democratic procedures. We shall continue our policy of full cooperation with the executive branch of the Government in urging our officials and members to participate in any capacity, including advisory committees, in which we are invited. However, we want it to be quite clear that we do not consider advisory committees of the type recently consulted by the Department of Agriculture as an adequate substitute for consultation with duly elected farm-organization officials, nor for the already-established system of democratically elected farmer committees. Moreover, we view with alarm the announced policy of the executive branch to consult with only those people whose financial position is such that they can pay their own travel expenses between their home and Washington. Continuation of this policy can only result in giving increased influence over farm policy to bankers, processors, middlemen, manufacturers, rich farmers, and those with access to organizational or business-concern expense accounts. With farm incomes expected to be 10 percent lower in 1953 than in 1952, many working-family farmers, particularly those who live in States at considerable distances from Washington, D. C., cannot afford to pay, from their own meager resources, the heavy expense of travel and hotel living.

"XIII. OPPOSE REORGANIZATION OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the President of the United States to direct the executive branch of the Government to refrain from any actions or recommendations that would result in transferring the Farm Credit Administration outside the Department of Agriculture, or placing the several institutions of the farm-credit system under an interlocking, self-perpetuating structure of Federal and district boards beyond the control of borrowers and potential borrowers and of the general public through normal democratic processes, or placing new and unnecessary Federal excise or other taxes on these institutions or their member organizations; and

"2. Petitions the Congress of the United States to reject any proposed legislation or reorganization plans of the type described in 1 above.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. The institutions of the Federal farm-credit system such as the Federal land banks, the banks for cooperatives, and the intermediate credit banks, as well as the Farm Credit Administration itself, were established to perform a nationwide service to the Nation as a whole—in the interest of the general public as well as farmers; to potential borrowers and loan applicants as well as present borrowers of the system; to family-type working farmers as well as bankers, mortgage departments of insurance companies, and career Government employees.

"2. A period in which we seem to be moving into a deepening farm crisis with farm income falling at a much more rapid rate than farm costs, when private credit restrictions are tightening up, when interest rates on both short- and long-term farm

loans are rising seems to us to be a very unwise time to remove the farm-credit system from control by all farmers and the public generally through usual democratic processes.

"3. Proposed legislation was introduced in bill form in the last session of Congress that would effectively turn over control of the farm-credit system to just such an interlocking, self-perpetuating structure of boards as described above, such boards to be selected in such a manner that career Government employees, private bankers, and finance men, and, to some extent, present borrowers could obtain and retain permanently complete and independent authority.

"4. Such a reorganization of the farm-credit system would be tantamount to the turning over, scotfree, to a private clique of a great national public asset.

"5. Under such circumstances it would not be unreasonable, in our judgment, to expect that the private control structure would then operate the system to tighten credit requirements and raise interest rates so as to present less competition to private banks and to increase the dividend returns to those individuals who happen to own stock in the institutions at the time of the reorganization.

"6. Farm-credit policies should be geared into other national agricultural policies to make the greatest contribution to public welfare. This coordination can be most effectively brought about if farm-credit agencies are under the same supervision as other farm programs.

"XIV. PRESERVE INTEGRITY OF NATIONAL SOIL-CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to preserve the organizational integrity of the agricultural conservation payments program and the Soil Conservation Service and to appropriate increased funds to broaden the scope of these necessary, effective, and highly efficient programs through which are expressed the Nation's interest and the public concern to preserve and improve the soil and water resources of the Nation; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States (1) to direct the executive branch of the Government to refrain from any action contrary to the objectives stated in 1, above, and (2) to use the prestige and authority of his office to further these objectives.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. We are deeply convinced that the agricultural soil- and water-conservation programs of the Federal Government can most efficiently and effectively be managed in the years ahead through the integrated and coordinated activity of the democratically elected farmers' committee, to whom the ACP is assigned by law, and the governing bodies of local soil-conservation districts under State laws.

"B. The Soil Conservation Service as presently organized is a highly trained and technically skillful corps of agricultural soil and water engineers with a high morale and the requisite flexibility of personnel assignment to provide scientific technical assistance to local soil-conservation districts and individual farms in development of long-term soil-conservation plans in a highly competent manner. It would be extremely wasteful and, in our judgment, most unwise to tear down this great reservoir of technical competence that has been slowly built up over the past 20 years.

"C. The farm-to-farm, neighbor-to-neighbor approach to encouragement of soil and water conservation made possible through the conduct of the ACP program by part-time farmer-elected community committee-

men is an effective combination of education, financial assistance, and friendly persuasion for which no adequate substitute can be found, if the objective is, as we are convinced it should be, to encourage the widest possible adoption of soil- and water-conserving measures on the privately owned farms of the Nation.

"D. Direct encouragement and assistance to farmers to adopt conservational methods of farming does not lend itself to administration by usual methods employed by general educational agencies, but rather partake of an action and service nature. It is our deep conviction that it will be an inconvenience to farmers and a hindrance to faster progress toward a permanently productive agriculture if Federal conservation programs for privately owned farmland are divorced from production and income-support programs in the States and counties.

"E. As a matter of deep conviction, we believe that loading the State agricultural extension services with the action-and-service-type Government operations would unduly hamper and render less effective the educational programs now carried out by the extension services."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"IV. INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

"The National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the President of the United States of America to direct the United States delegate now engaged in negotiations with other nations looking toward a renewal of the International Wheat Agreement (a) to demonstrate a greater determination to develop a renewed agreement; (b) to exercise a more positive role in the negotiations; and (c) to bring the negotiations to an early agreement as nearly as possible along the lines recommended by the organizational and the congressional wheat agreement advisory committees; and

"2. Petitions the Senate of the United States to ratify such renewed International Wheat Agreement as may be negotiated and agreed upon by the participating nations.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. We are becoming increasingly concerned that no signs of progress toward renewal of the International Wheat Agreement have been evidenced, although the negotiations have been under way since January 30, 1953.

"B. Not all members of the organizational and congressional wheat agreement advisory committees have been kept informed through proper channels of the progress or lack of progress toward a satisfactory extension of the agreement.

"C. It is our understanding that the United States delegate was not directed by the executive branch to follow the negotiational strategy recommended by the organizational and congressional advisory committees.

"D. Failure to negotiate and ratify renewal of the International Wheat Agreement would, by eliminating an assured market for at least 255 million bushels of wheat produced by farmers in the United States, develop chaos in the wheat market, put an unnecessary and dangerous burden on wheat and other grain price-support programs, and contribute additional fuel to the consuming fire of the currently deepening farm income crisis."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"VI. WATERSHEDS, FLOOD PREVENTION, AND CONSERVATION WORKS

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the President of the United States (a) to submit to Congress a reorgan-

ization plan that will transfer the civil works functions of the Army Engineers to the Department of Interior and transfer the Bureau of Land Management and the agricultural functions of the Bureau of Reclamation to the Department of Agriculture and (b) to send a message to Congress recommending the enactment of legislation to fill the present gap in national soil conservation flood-prevention flood-control programs; namely the lack of authority for anyone to build small flood-prevention installations on the upstream and watersheds, and

"2. Petitions the Congress of the United States (a) to adopt at this session the bills now before it to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts with local governmental bodies to assist them to develop and establish small water retention and other flood-prevention installations in the upstream watersheds of the Nation, and (b) to approve a reorganization plan recommended in 1 (a) above and reject any plan contrary to this.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. Critical reports of several congressional committees during the past 2 years are solid evidence of the ineptitude, duplicity, and inefficiency in the civil works of Army Engineers, as presently organized.

"B. Flood prevention and harbor and waterway improvements are largely civilian, not military, in nature.

"C. Under existing law, large appropriations and broad authority has been extended to the executive branch to build levees, dams, and other works to control floods after they have developed; the ACP and SCS programs have been developed to hold water on the land where it falls and conserve the soil; but practically no provision has been made for the large and important area between the farm itself and the lower stretches of the largest streams.

"D. We are convinced that these problems will never be fully solved until it is approached on a fully coordinated river valley basin basis such as TVA and the proposed MVA. However, we are also convinced that we must not allow all of our small watersheds to wash away prior to the time that a fully coordinated approach can be put into effect.

"E. The present ratio of Federal expenditure is about \$100 for flood control to \$1 for flood prevention. This ratio should be evened up by filling the gap on small watersheds.

"We commend Senator JOHNSON of Texas and Congressmen POAGE and CURTIS, as well as the entire membership of the House Committee on Agriculture for their efforts on this proposed legislation."

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"VII. FISCAL POLICY AND INTEREST RATES

"National Farmers Union Board of Directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to give careful attention to legislation concerned with fiscal and monetary policy of the Federal Government with a view to enacting amendments that will result in lowering the general rate of interest charged and the availability of funds for all types of credit and to reject all proposals that will result in increasing the rate of interest or decreasing the availability of credit funds for production and economic expansion; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to direct all of the departments and agencies of Government to be guided in all their actions by the principles indicated in 1 above.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. We are seriously and profoundly alarmed to witness the continuing rise of interest rates on all different types of loans

in our economy. Interest rates on prime commercial paper have more than doubled since 1947. The average interest rate on AAA corporate bonds is higher than at any time since before World War II. The rate of interest on taxable Government bonds set a modern record high in February 1953. And the interest rate on short-term Treasury bills is almost nine times higher now than it was only 14 years ago.

"2. We are impressed by the evident manner in which high interest rates on borrowed funds in the underdeveloped nations of the world has almost entirely blocked any sort of economic progress in those countries. We hope we will not allow this to develop in our country.

"3. We are concerned that rising interest rates discourage expansion of plant capacity, render many proposed capital investments potentially unprofitable, raise the cost of living for consumers and reduce their expenditures, tend to increase the amount of hoarding and discourage consumption, and in many other ways have a retarding effect upon economic expansion and bring about a reduced rate of economic development which brings in its train mounting unemployment, reduced consumer incomes, and artificial scarcities of manufactured items and artificial surpluses of food, fabrics, and other items.

"4. It is rapidly becoming obvious that rising interest rates and increasing scarcity of credit in other areas of the national economy are quickly passed on to the field of farm credit. Interest rates on both short- and long-term farm loans is increasing. Newly recorded farm mortgage interest rates averaged 4.5 percent in 1951; 4.75 percent in 1952. Two of the 12 Federal land banks found it necessary to raise their rates during 1952. Rising interest rates and increasing stringency of available funds can only increase the severe problems already generated by falling farm income and rising farm cash costs of production.

"5. We are fully convinced that the national welfare and security should no more be executed on the cross of high interest rates and credit scarcity than on a cross of gold. The purpose of the credit system is to facilitate the smooth operation of an expanding national economy. Public policy should be framed to keep it working that way."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 134).

ELIZABETH A. REILLY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution, to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth A. Reilly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 94), reported by Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth A. Reilly, widow of Sylvester Reilly, an employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time

of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WALTER QUARLES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution, to pay a gratuity to Walter Quarles.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 95), reported by Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Walter Quarles, widower of Mattie Quarles, an employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of her death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 133)

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments in the nature of a substitute, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be placed on the Legislative Calendar.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the committee may submit its report early next week, and, at such time as the report may be ready, any minority views which members holding such views may desire to make to the Senate.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the printed hearings be ready at the time the report is submitted to the Senate?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is advised that the hearings will probably be ready on Tuesday next; if not, on the day following.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is it intended that the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution before the printed hearings are available?

Mr. CORDON. As I said to the Senator from New Mexico, the printed hearings will be available probably on Tuesday, or at least by Wednesday. My understanding is that it is not contemplated that the joint resolution will be taken up for consideration before Wednesday.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will further yield, I think it is only fair that the printed hearings be available to the Senate at least 1 day before the debate begins in the Senate.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Oregon feel certain that the hearings will be available by Tuesday?

Mr. CORDON. That is my understanding.

Mr. MALONE. May we have it understood that if the printed hearings are not available on Tuesday, they will be made available at least 1 day before the debate begins?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I can make no such deal. So far as the joint resolution is concerned, we propose to take it up on Wednesday. I shall do everything to see that the printed hearings are on the desks of Senators just as soon as possible.

This question has been before the Senate for a long time. I have told many Senators that we would proceed as rapidly as possible. On the earnest request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I have agreed not to take up the joint resolution on Monday. Possibly we could not reach it on Monday any way, because other matters must be considered first. However, I give notice that not later than Wednesday I shall move to make the joint resolution the unfinished business. I have every reason to believe that the hearings will be available long before that.

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

Mr. TAFT. Let me say to the Senator from Nevada that the debate will last for probably a week or 10 days; so the presentation of the subject by those in favor of the measure can be made, and I am sure that the fact that the hearings are not available will not seriously interfere with the program. The Senator from Nevada himself will have plenty of time to present his statement after the printed hearings become available.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this question involves public lands in a considerable number of States. It is quite possible that this subject would be considered a great deal more important in such States than in the State of Ohio. Members of the Senate who live in the so-called public-land States desire an opportunity to review the record, because it is rather voluminous, and much new information has been developed in the hearings which was not available to the Senate in prior debates.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair invites the attention of Senators to the fact that under the informal rule recently adopted, as enunciated by the majority leader [Mr. TAFT], 2 minutes was to be the limit on any speech or remarks made during the morning hour. If the Senator from Oregon wishes to exceed that limit he should request unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent to make a brief statement with reference to the joint resolution, which statement may conceivably take a little longer than 2 minutes. However, I shall endeavor to keep within 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 3 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the joint resolution is reported to the Senate with an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 13, commonly termed the Holland joint resolution. It embodies the philosophy of the Holland measure. The method adopted, of reporting an amendment in the nature of a substitute, is due to the numerous perfecting amendments throughout the joint resolution, and the necessity for some major changes and additions.

The only way in which the joint resolution in anywise differs from the philosophy and purpose of the Holland measure is that it recommends that the Congress confirm the jurisdiction and control by the United States with respect to the land and the subsoil of the continental shelf outside the statutory boundaries of the adjacent States.

I should like to say further for the benefit of Senators who are present, particularly members of the committee, that there are available at this time transcripts or galley proofs of the hearings so that Senators who desire to utilize the intervening time in the study of the hearings can obtain the transcript or the galley proof at the committee room.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have no disposition unduly to delay this matter, but I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Nevada. We must have the hearings before us and we must have some opportunity to examine them. Questions were raised in the hearings which had not been raised previously. Some very interesting testimony was developed in the hearings which was not given in prior hearings. So the printed hearings will be very useful. We must have an opportunity to examine the hearings, and also to examine the majority report and any minority views which may be filed. Unless we have the hearings and an opportunity to examine them, I do not think we can save very much time. We would have to rely on the old hearings; and when the new hearings became available, we would have to make use of them.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Prior to the time the discussion of the joint resolution begins, I think I should say that the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was compelled to spend a good deal of time in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. During that time, it fell to my lot to participate in the discussion in the committee. I would not want the joint resolution as reported by the distinguished Senator from Oregon to be presented without expressing the appreciation of all members of the committee for the very splendid way in which he conducted the hearings. He was uni-

formly fair. We have enjoyed very much working with him. I hope we may continue in the same spirit, and that we will not proceed to rapidly to a discussion of the joint resolution. I think we should have an opportunity to examine the hearings. I am sure the Senator from Oregon hopes there will be such an opportunity.

Mr. CORDON. I express my appreciation for the very complimentary remarks made by the Senator from New Mexico.

The Senate should have an opportunity to advise itself before the debate. I realize that this is a situation in which perhaps an exception may have to be made, for a day or so. I regret the exception, even to that extent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] that the report of the committee, and minority views, on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) may be submitted early next week? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CORDON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 3 minutes in order to make a further statement with respect to the so-called tidelands joint resolution, and to cover certain material to which I neglected to refer in my previous statement, and I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed at the conclusion of my previous statement on the same subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] that he may proceed for not more than 3 minutes and that his statement be printed as a part of his previous statement on the same subject? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, when the hearings were in progress on Senate Joint Resolution 13, departments of the Government representing the administration appeared before the committee and requested that in any measure reported by the committee there be included a title dealing with and providing for the mechanics of the administration by the Government of the subsoil and sea bed of the outer portion of the Continental Shelf, or that portion lying beyond the statutory boundary lines of the States.

The committee went into the subject and endeavored to meet the request. It made a considerable study of the subject, and encountered some serious legal questions because of the peculiar political and legal status of the portion of the Continental Shelf adverted to.

The committee felt that the portion of the bill consisting of titles I and II, comprehending the Holland bill, be reported at this time, but that further study should be given to the matter of implementing the Presidential proclamation and, we hope, its confirmation by Congress.

In order to do that, Mr. President, the bill was divided into two sections. I wish to make a public statement now to assure my colleagues in the Senate that the committee is going forward imme-

diately with the consideration of the second, or additional, problem involved, and it is the view of the acting chairman in considering the matter that a report on it should be made to the Senate at the earliest possible moment so that an appropriate measure may have consideration and be passed by Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1463. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces depicting the Hoover Dam; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1464. A bill for the relief of Maria Zarabe; and

S. 1465. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille (Swett) Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1466. A bill for the relief of Shizue Araki Mraz; and

S. 1467. A bill for the relief of Patrick Devine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1468. A bill to require that the motto "In God We Trust" appear on all postage stamps printed after June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. (See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1469. A bill for the relief of Pier Luigi Broghesi Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1470. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers and doctors engaged in the practice of their professions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1471. A bill for the relief of Patrick Devine; and

S. 1472. A bill for the relief of Krikor V. Goekjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1473. A bill to authorize loans to owners of housing accommodations on farms for the purpose of assisting in the acquisition of adequate facilities for providing and using water in such accommodations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1474. A bill authorizing the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the birth of President James Buchanan; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1475. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Kiraga; and

S. 1476. A bill for the relief of Henry Baranczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1477. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Nicklaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1478. A bill for the relief of Chung Keun Lee (Thung Kuen Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):
S. 1479. A bill for the relief of Antonio Silva De Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:
S. 1480. A bill to relinquish the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over Federal lands within the State of Maryland, and to provide that the United States and the State of Maryland shall hereafter exercise concurrent jurisdiction over such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAYBANK:
S. 1481. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:
S. 1482. A bill to provide that all United States postage stamps bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1483 (by request). A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to George Scott; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:
S. 1484. A bill to provide for the reinstatement or reissuance of certain national service life insurance policies, and for other purposes; and

S. 1485. A bill to increase the rates of compensation payable to veterans for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1486. A bill for the relief of Robert J. McGarry;

S. 1487. A bill for the relief of Vera Ivanovich;

S. 1488. A bill for the relief of Gerda Graupner; and

S. 1489. A bill for the relief of Hella Wolter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:
S. 1490. A bill for the relief of David Maisel (David Majzel) and Bertha Maisel (Berta Pieschansky Majzel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1491. A bill to provide for the revision of the public land laws in order to provide for orderly use, improvement, and development of the Federal lands and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the Federal range, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:
S. 1492. A bill to require the establishment of adequate provisions relating to the appointment or retention of certain female Reserve personnel with minor or dependent children; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. FERGUSON:
S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union for the year 1953, to be held in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

S. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taxation and borrowing powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF MOTTO "IN GOD WE TRUST" ON POSTAGE STAMPS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce for reference to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee a bill, which authorizes and directs the Postmaster

General of the United States to engrave the motto "In God We Trust" on all United States postage.

It is only fitting and proper, especially in these critical years, that we manifest our divine belief in all things at all times, and the inclusion of the motto "In God We Trust" on all of our postage is therefore another manifestation of our consciousness of His omnipotence.

I have discussed the proposed legislation with the Postmaster General and he indicated his wholehearted endorsement of the bill, as I am sure all who are Members of this group will do likewise.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1468) to require that the motto "In God We Trust" appear on all postage stamps printed after June 30, 1953, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PIER LUIGI BORGHESI STEWART

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I introduced for appropriate reference a bill which, for the purposes of stated sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act, would hold and consider the minor child, Pier Luigi Borghesi Stewart, to be the natural-born alien child of Clarence Eugene and Fannie Jordan Stewart, citizens of the United States.

Mr. and Mrs. Stewart, well known to me, have adopted a baby in Italy, where Mr. Stewart is presently stationed on a business assignment. As an adopted child, the baby comes under the non-preference immigration quota and therefore would not be eligible for immigration into the United States for a number of years. This special relief bill would enable Mr. and Mrs. Stewart to bring their adopted child with them upon their return to this country.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1469) for the relief of Pier Luigi Borghesi Stewart, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PATRICK DEVINE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Patrick Devine. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1471) for the relief of Patrick Devine, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

James J. Devine, who is serving with the Navy at Yokohama, Japan, and living there with his wife, has taken into his home a 3-year-old boy of mixed Japanese and American blood. The child was placed with the Devines by Our Lady of Lourdes Orphanage in Japan.

At the expiration of his enlistment in August 1953, James J. Devine and Mrs. Devine plan to return to the United States, and they desire to bring the child with them as their son.

The bill would give the child, Patrick Devine, the status of a natural-born alien child of CT/IC and Mrs. James J. Devine and would so entitle the child to entry into and citizenship in the United States.

James J. Devine is from Hartford, Conn. Mrs. Devine, who served 4½ years in the WAVES, is from Portsmouth, Ohio.

KRIKOR V. GOEKJIAN

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Krikor V. Goekjian. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1472) for the relief of Krikor V. Goekjian, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

The bill would grant permanent residence status to Krikor V. Goekjian, a young man of Greek citizenship and Armenian ancestry. He is a resident of Shaker Heights, Ohio, and presently a student at Syracuse University, where he is in his senior year. He holds a full-tuition scholarship there.

Throughout his life in Greece, Ethiopia, and Cyprus, Krikor V. Goekjian has come under the influence of many Americans. The principal of the school he attended for 6 years on Cyprus was an American. In Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Goekjian worked under Americans in the Foreign Economic Administration. Later he worked for 2½ years as private secretary to the Director of Public Health in the Ethiopian Ministry of the Interior—also an American.

PARTICIPATION IN OBSERVANCE OF FOURTH OF JULY 1953 AT PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. MARTIN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States shall participate in the Fourth of July 1953 commemorative observance of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., and the rededication of the Nation to the principles upon which the United States was founded. The Congress further requests the President of the United States and the Governors of the several States and Territories to be present on this occasion. Further it is the hope of the Congress that this shall become an annual pilgrimage to the historic grounds where our independence was proclaimed.

There is authorized to attend and participate on behalf of the Congress of the United States a member from each State in the Senate and the House of Representatives, such members to be selected on the basis of seniority. The necessary travel expenses of any Member of Congress incidental to the performance of duties and responsibilities hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the particular House of Congress of which such Member is a Member.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 3180. An act to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property; and

H. R. 3655. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3853. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4130. An act to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. FERGUSON:

Address delivered by Senator TAFT at Washington, D. C., on March 8, 1953, before the National Leadership Conference for the State of Israel Bonds.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Address delivered by Senator DOUGLAS at meeting of all faiths in Chicago, Ill., March 17, 1953.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Address delivered by Senator MORSE at reunion of oldtimers at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, on March 20, 1953.

Article written by Marquis Childs dealing with the disposition of surplus commodities, together with a statement on the subject prepared by Senator DOUGLAS.

By Mr. FREAR:

Washington Birthday address delivered by Robert Silliman Hillyer before the Governor and the State Legislature of Delaware.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Sermon preached on March 22, 1953, by Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., on the subject "Anchors That Hold."

By Mr. HUNT:

Letter addressed to him by Mrs. C. C. Browning, president of the Wyoming Congress, a branch of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, dealing with the proposed Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Editorial entitled "Emergency Controls" published in the Washington Post of March 27, 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "Broad Attack on Farm Problem," written by Lowell Mellett, and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 12, 1953.

By Mr. LONG:

Editorial entitled "Leftwingers Would Undermine the President on the Tidelands," published in the Shreveport Times of March 15, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Resolutions relating to United States responsibility for world leadership, adopted by American Association for the United Nations.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Editorial entitled "Food Control," published in the Texarkana Gazette, Thursday, March 12, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article entitled "Security and Freedom," written by A. Blair Knapp, president of Denison University.

By Mr. BUSH:

Editorial entitled "Tax Reform—More Revenue," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U. S. News & World Report, March 27, 1953.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Article entitled "Federal Construction Contract Bill," published in the March 1953 issue of the Qualified Contractor.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Rebuilding the CEA," published in the March 21 issue of Business Week.

Article entitled "West Can Beat Peking-Moscow Team in Asia: Hold in Korea, Indochina; Use Chiang Forces," published in the March 23 issue of Newsweek magazine.

WAGE AND PRICE FREEZE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, there appears in this morning's issue of the New York Times an editorial entitled "Wage and Price Freeze," which analyzes succinctly and most effectively the present economic controls situation where wages and prices are concerned. It is so excellent that I ask to have it incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WAGE AND PRICE FREEZE

Having just brought to an end the last vestige of direct Federal controls over prices, President Eisenhower has been notably unenthusiastic about congressional suggestions for continuing his authority to impose controls after expiration of the present law. However, he has now stated through an administration spokesman that if Congress wishes to give him the right to place a freeze on wages and prices in case of emergency, such a measure "would be acceptable." We think the President has been wise to make this concession.

Since early in the month the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has been considering three main alternatives: (1) authorization of a 90-day freeze if serious dislocations to the national economic stability are threatened; (2) enactment of a full-fledged standby price and wage control law which would permit the President in event of emergency to put into effect a system of controls similar to those in the expiring Defense Production Act, and would even keep a skeleton staff on hand in case of need; (3) no legislation at all, which seems to be the course the administration would prefer, relying on the ability of Congress to move quickly in an emergency to enact whatever control legislation might then be considered necessary.

We think the experience of the inflationary price increases that immediately followed the Korean crisis indicates the wisdom of taking speedy action in such an emergency. There is certainly no inconsistency in being determined, as President Eisenhower is, to keep the economy as free as possible and in being ready to control it if through extraneous circumstances it should threaten suddenly to get completely out of hand.

This does not mean that there is any real necessity for a detailed standby control law. The 90-day freeze period would give Congress enough time to adopt the necessary legislation, thus accomplishing the same re-

sult. It is impossible to foresee exactly what the circumstances will be in the event reimposition of price and wage controls becomes necessary; and, as Acting Defense Mobilization Director Flemming stated in his testimony, a previously enacted comprehensive standby program "might prove impractical in that it might not be responsive to the actual conditions existing at the time of the emergency." Furthermore, the very existence of such legislation on the books could help keep alive constant pressure to put it to use before it was really needed. Passage of the legislation authorizing the President to impose a freeze seems to be a sensible compromise, in the spirit of a free economy but with the precautionary foresight necessitated by the critical nature of our times.

THE KAMCHATKA AIRPLANE INCIDENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a few days ago on the floor of the Senate, I called attention to what seemed to me to be an obvious misstatement by the Air Force of the reasons for the flight of one of our aircraft which was attacked off the Kamchatka Peninsula. I was not at liberty to reveal the sources of my information, but I made quite plain that the airplane was not there for the purposes stated in the Air Force release.

Since that time I have received a press release from a meeting of the Meteorological Society held in Atlantic City, N. J. By the way, "meteorologist" is derived from the Greek and means "weatherman," and the meeting in Atlantic City was a meeting of the professional weathermen of the Nation. It included representatives from the United States Weather Bureau, the Air Force air weather service, the Navy's weather service, and other organizations. They substantiate and support completely my information with regard to the falsity of the press release as given out by the Air Force.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement of the meteorologists printed in the RECORD at this point; and at the same time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Deceiving the People," published in this morning's Washington Post.

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

USUAL WEATHER FLIGHT 360 MILES FROM MIG ATTACK

(By Wadsworth Likely)

WASHINGTON.—If that actually was a weather reconnaissance plane on a routine flight at which Russian MIG's recently shot off Kamchatka Peninsula, it was at least 360 miles off course, Science Service has learned.

The routine Loon Dog weather flight, flown out of Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska, since 1949 turns back close to Attu in the Aleutians, a point 360 miles almost due east from the point 25 miles off the Soviet coast where the attack took place.

This confirmed doubts expressed unofficially at a meeting in Atlantic City, N. J., of the Nation's top weathermen that the RB-50 plane was actually on a routine weather reconnaissance as claimed by the Air Force.

Meteorologists of the United States Weather Bureau, the Air Force Air Weather Service, and the Navy's Weather Service attending the meeting of the American Meteorological Society all scoffed at the Air Force's explanation of the reason for the big reconnaissance bomber's presence just 25 miles

off the Soviet coast of Kamchatka. They pointed out that no routine weather observations are received from that area, that RB-50's are not used as weather reconnaissance planes, and that weather reconnaissance planes are not armed.

The routine weather flight from Alaska which comes nearest the point of attack is that called Loon Dog. This has been flown almost daily since about 1949. It was last described in the Air Force Air Weather Service's Letter 55-12 of March 1952. It goes from Eielson to Nome to 53° north and 171° east, to St. Paul Island, to Bethel Island, and back to Eielson at Fairbanks. The RB-50 was attacked at 53° north and 161° east—10°, or about 360 miles, farther west than the farthest west point on Loon Dog flight.

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, declared on the Senate floor that the official Air Force version of the reason for the presence of the plane so close to Soviet territory was preposterous.

There is an alternative flight called Loon Echo. It goes from Anchorage, out to Attu, then back. A plane on this flight would also be 360 to 400 miles off course if it got to the point where the RB-50 was attacked.

The belief was expressed to Science Service that, while navigation is difficult in the Alaskan-Aleutian area, it isn't that bad.

[From the Washington Post of March 27, 1953]

DECEIVING THE PEOPLE

Senator FLANDERS has raised an extremely serious moral issue respecting the assorted protests over the most recent plane incident near Siberia. The question is simply whether the American people are being told the truth.

According to the Air Force account—backed by the State Department protest which the Russians rejected—an American B-50 bomber was attacked by a Russian MIG fighter some 25 miles off the Siberian coast. Technically, this may have been the case. But Senator FLANDERS charged that the American B-50 was not there on a routine weather mission, as the Air Force maintained. Most weather flights, he noted, do not go within 400 miles of Kamchatka.

Now, in the kind of cold war we have been fighting, border violations by both sides have been fairly frequent. Russian reconnaissance planes have been reported over Alaska, and it would be surprising, indeed, if we were not similarly conducting reconnaissance over Soviet territory. Sometimes the flights have resulted in incidents, as in the Baltic several years ago; sometimes they have gone officially unnoticed. These operations may well be a necessary concomitant of the cold war, just as certain clandestine psychological activities have been accepted.

What is objectionable is the pose of injured innocence when our hand is called in such operations. This has nothing to do with the definition of borders in international law—a point on which we must, of course, maintain our rights. But it has a great deal to do with the confidence of the people in the integrity of their own Government. What would be the reaction, for example, if we should become embroiled in a shooting war as the result of such an incident and Americans learned that their own Government had been waging what Senator FLANDERS called psychological warfare on the people of the United States?

As Senator FLANDERS observed, there are two honest and honorable courses, assuming that such episodes will continue. One is for the Air Force and the State Department to tell the truth. The other is to say nothing. Certainly both Congress and the public have a right to insist that their own Government will not deliberately deceive them.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I have prepared on the 132d anniversary of the declaration of the Greek War of Independence.

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

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY, MARCH 25, 1953

March 25 marked the 132d anniversary of the declaration of the Greek War of Independence.

One hundred and thirty-two years ago on that day the Archbishop of Patras, Germans, raised the flag of Greek insurrection and blessed the struggle of the Hellenes for regaining their national independence.

The gallant deeds of such heroes of the Greek War of Independence as Canaris, Kolocotronis, Miaoulis, and Karaiskakis, were comparable to those of the great heroes of antiquity; Leonidas, Miltiades, and Themistocles and gave additional proof that the modern Greeks are genuine descendants of their glorious ancestors.

Again in recent times the Greeks have shown their great devotion to the Hellenic ideals of freedom and dignity of the individual. When the Nazi and Fascist forces of darkness attacked Greece, the gallant Hellenes defended their freedom and independence most heroically and were the first to exploit the myth of Axis invincibility when they routed Mussolini's vaunted legions. And when later the Communist threat reared its ugly head within Greece the gallant Balkan country spared no effort or sacrifice in defending its freedom. A Greek contingent is now fighting violently in Korea for world freedom, and the participation of Greece in NATO preparations for the defense of the free world clearly indicates the determination of the Hellenes to help deter further Communist imperialist aggression.

These are some of the reasons why we rejoice on the occasion of this auspicious anniversary of the Greek War of Independence, and we send greetings and felicitations to the gallant people of Greece, as well as to our Americans of Hellenic descent who have contributed so much to the progress and welfare of America.

TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION WORK ON CAPITOL GROUNDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 229.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, similar joint resolutions were introduced in the House and in the Senate. The House has already acted on its joint resolution. The Committee on Public Works of the Senate unanimously reported a similar joint resolution, which is Senate Joint Resolution 59. A labor organization wishes to erect a permanent na-

tional headquarters on land adjacent to Federal land. There is the danger of some subsidence, and the desire is to fully protect the Government of the United States. If the joint resolution is not passed the erection of the building may be held up for some time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that the joint resolution is now on the Senate Calendar?

Mr. MARTIN. A similar Senate joint resolution is now on the Senate Calendar. The joint resolution which is now before the Senate was passed by the House. In order to facilitate matters, I ask that the Senate act on the House joint resolution, which is the same as the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are the joint resolutions identical in language?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; and the Senate joint resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which briefly clarifies the situation a little further.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 59

Inquiries have been made of the Committee on Public Works as to the relation of section 2 of the bill which relieves the United States from any liability, claim, or expense arising from the proposed work, to the provisions of the Tort Claims Act, Tucker Act, and other legislation under which the United States may be sued. I should like to make it clear that section 2 of this bill is intended to remove all possibility that the United States may be sued in this instance under the authority of the latter statutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 59 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 59 is indefinitely postponed.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous consent agreement, I ask that the Senate proceed with the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar other than that of Mr. Bohlen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar following the Bohlen nomination.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Edward Lumbard to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter S. Robertson to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

GUAM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ford Q. Elvidge to be Governor of Guam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the three nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmations forthwith.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Wilson L. Townsend, of Maryland, to be a member of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

NOMINATION OF CHARLES E. BOHLEN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

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

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

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

Anderson	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Barrett	Ellender	Johnson, Tex.
Beall	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Bennett	Flanders	Kefauver
Bricker	Frear	Kennedy
Bridges	Fulbright	Kerr
Bush	Gillette	Kilgore
Butler, Md.	Goldwater	Knowland
Butler, Nebr.	Gore	Kuchel
Byrd	Green	Lehman
Capehart	Griswold	Long
Carlson	Hayden	Magnuson
Case	Hendrickson	Malone
Chavez	Hennings	Mansfield
Cooper	Hickenlooper	Martin
Cordon	Hill	Maybank
Daniel	Hoey	McCarran
Dirksen	Holland	McCarthy
Douglas	Hunt	McClellan
Duff	Ives	Millikin
Dworshak	Jackson	Morse

Mundt	Saltonstall	Thye
Murray	Schoepfel	Tobey
Neely	Smathers	Watkins
Pastore	Smith, Maine	Welker
Payne	Smith, N. J.	Wiley
Potter	Sparkman	Williams
Purtell	Stennis	Young
Robertson	Symington	
Russell	Taft	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is absent on official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is entitled to the floor.

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

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that I have in my hand communications from Mr. Joseph C. Grew, speaking for himself and Mr. Norman Armour, who is in New Jersey at the present time, and a statement from Mr. Hugh Gibson, with regard to their respective understandings of the so-called three-man group who were asked to advise on diplomatic appointments. I ask the Senator whether he would prefer to yield to me, to enable me to insert these communications in the RECORD now, or would prefer to have me wait until he finishes his remarks. I shall do as the Senator requests.

Mr. WELKER. I should be very glad to have the Senator insert them now; but I do want to make reference to Hugh Gibson's statement later on in the course of my remarks.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in light of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I will make a brief explanation and read these communications into the RECORD in order that they may be before the Senate during the debate today.

I may say that because of a committee meeting I was, unfortunately, unable to be present throughout the entire session of the Senate on Wednesday. At that time there was a hearing of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Following that meeting I returned to the Senate, at which time the question of Mr. Gibson's statement was being discussed.

As Mr. Gibson, Mr. Grew, and Mr. Armour all happen to be close personal friends of mine, I immediately called

Mr. Gibson and then Mr. Grew. On the same evening Mr. Grew called Mr. Armour in New Jersey. Mr. Armour later called me at my apartment at the Wardman Park Hotel. During the past 2 days I have been discussing this whole question with these gentlemen. I said to them that I did not wish to quote any of them on the floor of the Senate, but that I would be very happy, if they saw fit to send me communications regarding this matter, to read the communications to the Senate in order that the position of each of them could be understood. Therefore, with the consent of the Senator from Idaho, I shall read the communications.

First, Mr. President, I shall read a letter, which I hold in my hand, from Hon. Joseph C. Grew, dated March 26, 1953, addressed to me. The letter reads:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 26, 1953.

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am glad to have had our telephone talks today because I should like to do anything possible to clear up the misunderstandings regarding the Bohlen appointment. As Hugh Gibson, Norman Armour, and I kept no records of our discussions when asked by the Secretary of State to suggest the names of Foreign Service officers for appointment to vacant diplomatic posts, we must rely on our individual recollections of what transpired.

My recollection, which is fully shared by Norman Armour, with whom I have today talked on the telephone, is that we were given to understand that Bohlen was being favorably considered by the Secretary of State for the Embassy in Moscow. Armour and I each said that we thought Bohlen the best possible man for the job. His name was therefore placed on our list, which we submitted to Mr. Dulles with a letter signed by all of us when our work was finished.

In order to make the list complete, we entered in it the names of 3 or 4 nonservice people whose selection for certain posts we were informed had already been decided upon. We, however, made it clear to Mr. Dulles that we were not competent to recommend noncareer appointments. We entered Bohlen's name on the list as a Foreign Service officer.

As you have already talked to Gibson and have learned his understanding of the facts, I do not need to speak for him.

It will be a great satisfaction to all of us to have this whole problem cleared up.

With best regards,
Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW.

As I said, I talked with Mr. Gibson, and yesterday morning I called him again. He asked me whether I would lunch with him at the Mayflower, which I did. I spent 2 hours with him; but, as in the case of Mr. Grew, I told him I should prefer not to endeavor to quote him on the floor of the Senate, but I did ask him whether he would be good enough to send me a statement of what he had said to me, and of what his understanding was of the conference with the Secretary of State. I now have in my hand a letter from Hugh Gibson enclosing a memorandum entitled "Memorandum to Senator SMITH of New Jersey."

I shall first read for the RECORD his letter, then I shall read the memorandum. I have known Mr. Gibson very well. I have known him since World

War I, so he addresses me informally, "Dear Alec." His letter reads:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 26, 1953.
The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEC: I am sorry it has taken so long to prepare the memorandum which I promised to send you this afternoon. However, I hope it will meet your wishes.

At the risk of being repetitious I would like to emphasize what I told you today that when you read the memorandum on the floor of the Senate—

I may say in that connection that I read to him the excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which he was mentioned—

I would be most grateful if you would make it abundantly clear that I have asked you to stress the fact that I want it clearly understood that while my memory may differ from statements which have been made on the subject, I particularly wish that this should not be considered to impugn the good faith and integrity of those who have made statements with which I cannot express full agreement. When I came down here in January it was with a desire to be helpful to Foster Dulles, for whom I have a long-standing friendship, affection, and respect, and I should be deeply distressed if any differences which have since arisen should lead to misinterpretation reflecting upon him or anybody else.

I am very grateful to you for having taken time today to go into this so fully with me, and I am sure that your intervention will help to clear the atmosphere.

Yours,

HUGH GIBSON.

Mr. Gibson asked me if I would read that letter in connection with his statement, so that his approach would be thoroughly understood by everyone. The memorandum, dated March 26, 1953, reads:

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR SMITH FROM HUGH GIBSON

MARCH 26, 1953.

On Saturday, January 24, as I was preparing to leave for New York en route to Canada, I was requested by the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, to take part, together with Mr. Norman Armour and Mr. Joseph C. Grew, in advising the Secretary on some diplomatic appointments. I was glad to do this because of my longstanding friendship for him and I canceled my travel arrangements and reported to him on the morning of Monday, January 26, together with Mr. Armour and Mr. Grew.

The Secretary received us in his office and laid out for us the work he had in mind. He indicated seven vacancies which he considered should be filled first before his departure later in the week.

He then stated that a certain number of posts, namely, London, Paris, Rome, Madrid, and Bonn had already been settled, and that we were not to concern ourselves with them. He added, as I recall, that he intended to send Mr. Charles Bohlen as Ambassador to Moscow. I recall that Mr. Grew, under whom Mr. Bohlen had served, and also Mr. Armour, expressed their strong approval. I did not feel qualified to express an opinion, to recommend or oppose, as I hardly knew Mr. Bohlen personally, having met him only three times casually.

We worked for 4 days, and on Thursday, January 29, we submitted to the Secretary the list of 7 recommendations he had requested. This was supplemented by a list of all diplomatic posts and opposite each post was placed the name of a possible diplomatic service candidate. Among these appeared the names of those whom the Secretary had informed us he had decided to appoint, including Mr. Bohlen. Having re-

framed from comment when the Secretary informed us verbally of his intention to appoint Mr. Bohlen, I saw no purpose in raising difficulties any more than in the case of Mr. Aldrich or Mrs. Luce.

In acceding to the request of my friend, the Secretary of State, to assist in making lists of candidates for appointments to Foreign Service posts, and placing my past experience and personal acquaintance with some of the candidates at his disposal, I never lost sight of the fact that I was merely offering him my advice to facilitate his task of making the final decisions for which he as Secretary of State would alone be responsible.

As I have stated, Mr. President, our conversation was at some length; I was unwilling to quote any of the gentlemen, because my memory might have been faulty, and, therefore, I requested that they put in writing the messages they wished to give to the Senate as to their position.

I wish to thank the Senator from Idaho for permitting me to insert these items in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield briefly to me?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two recent editorials concerning the appointment of Mr. Charles Bohlen as Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. The views expressed in these editorials are consistent with my statement on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 1953.

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

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of March 24, 1953]

ACCORDING TO PLAN

Everything that the administration and its supporters in the Senate have done up to now about the Bohlen appointment has been in accord with the principles laid down in President Eisenhower's state of the Union address to Congress on February 2.

In that message the President took the position that the primary responsibility for keeping out the disloyal and the dangerous rests squarely on the executive branch of the Government. His further explanation that the executive branch invited disorder and confusion when it so conducted itself as to require policing by another arm of the Government seemed to imply that he would prefer not to have Congress interfere in a purely executive function.

The President went on to insist that he was determined to meet the responsibility of the Executive for security and that he had instructed all agencies to initiate programs to this end. He also declared that the measures to be taken would have two purposes: First, "to make certain that this Nation's security is not jeopardized by false servants," and second, "to clear the atmosphere of that unreasoned suspicion that accepts rumor and gossip as substitutes for evidence."

The Bohlen appointment has been handled strictly in accordance with these principles. Mr. Dulles had all necessary investigations of Mr. Bohlen's fitness made, and then accepted the responsibility for the appointee's loyalty and discretion. The President, as head of the executive branch, backed him up but took the precaution to consult the Attorney General, who was of the same mind as Mr. Dulles. All this was in consonance with President Eisenhower's declaration as to the duty of the executive branch.

Having assumed full responsibility, the President and Mr. Dulles have stood their

ground firmly when challenged by a few members of the Senate. This is in accordance with the President's idea that if the executive branch of the Government acts it is only likely to confuse things to have the legislative branch step in and try to go over the same ground. Fortunately, Senator TAFT and most of the other Republican leaders in the Senate have stood by the administration on this matter, with the result that the principle is by way of gaining acceptance.

Finally, it should be noted that while taking all necessary precautions, Secretary Dulles refused to be moved in his judgment on Mr. Bohlen by rumor or suspicion. He made up his mind by reference to what he considers evidence. Whether he reached the proper conclusion on the evidence, those who have not seen the record cannot know. But it may at least be said that if the rules laid down by the President in February are to have any validity, it is Secretary Dulles who is the man to make the decisions.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1953]

MR. BOHLEN'S FILE

There is no denying that a certain risk is involved in permitting even Senators TAFT and SPARKMAN to read the FBI summary of the Charles E. Bohlen file. For despite Secretary Dulles' disclaimers, it sets a precedent of a sort. It will not be as easy as Mr. Dulles seems to think to take the position that it is all right to do this for Messrs. TAFT and SPARKMAN, but that a similar request from say, Senator MCCARTHY, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, can be refused. It is essential, however, that the information from the FBI files not be made available to everybody who asks to see it. This would be one sure way of destroying the FBI and wrecking the reputation of many an innocent person.

If there are these disadvantages, however, there are also compensating benefits in the Bohlen case.

One of these benefits is to nail Senator MCCARTHY to the mast. He has been implying that he has seen the Bohlen file, or at least that he knows what is in it. He has also said that the evidence in the file disqualifies Mr. Bohlen. Only last week he was saying that President Eisenhower would withdraw the Bohlen nomination if he would read the file.

Now Senators TAFT and SPARKMAN have read the summary. J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, has assured them that the summary faithfully reflects the contents of the file itself. On this basis, the Senators have stated that Mr. Dulles gave a complete and accurate report of the summary to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee before that group voted unanimously to recommend the Bohlen nomination.

So where does this leave Senator MCCARTHY and those Senators who trail along with him? Very much out on the limb, it would seem. In this instance, the question narrows down to whether one is going to believe Senator MCCARTHY or whether one is going to believe President Eisenhower, the Secretary of State, the Foreign Relations Committee, Senators Taft and Sparkman, and J. Edgar Hoover.

Most of the people who heretofore have been willing to believe anything Senator MCCARTHY said also have confidence at least in Senator TAFT and Mr. Hoover. Perhaps in the future these people will not be so quick to believe that a charge is true merely because Senator MCCARTHY makes it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I approach my task today without a written statement, with merely a few notes, and with a frank belief in my heart that perhaps I am unqualified to discuss foreign relations. I have all the respect in the world for our distinguished Foreign

Relations Committee. I have no animosity against any member of that great committee. I have never met Charles Bohlen. I would not know him if he should stand by my side at this moment. But, Mr. President, I have given great thought to the question before the Senate, which has caused me many sleepless hours, and I feel that I should make a few remarks consistent with the thoughts which have come to me.

Mr. President, I regretted last Wednesday that tempers seemed to get a little hot. Personalities probably were indulged in, but let me say to my colleagues that this is no time to become angry or to abuse each other. I may say to those on the opposite side of the aisle that if they are getting any hilarity out of the debate on this side of the aisle, they may well enjoy—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to assure the Senator from Idaho that so far as the Senator from Texas is concerned, he is not gleeful; he is not getting any hilarity out of what is taking place. The Senator from Texas is sad in this hour—

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yielded for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not going to make a speech, but I want to disabuse the Senator's mind that any Member on this side of the aisle is happy about the question which is raised on his side of the aisle.

Mr. WELKER. I happen to be of a different mind, and I merely want to say that if any Senators on the other side of the aisle are enjoying this little debate, we shall be happy to take them on in November of 1954. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I approach this task, as I say, realizing that I shall be classed as a diehard, a reactionary, a dissenter, one who wants to destroy the fine leadership of one of the greatest Presidents in the history of our land.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I want to see our President succeed, as I want to see John Foster Dulles succeed. I shall do everything in my power to help in promoting that result.

But, let me say, Mr. President, that as to those of us who have risen to speak on this side of the aisle, I defy anyone to name any person or group of persons who campaigned harder than did those of us who now see fit to dissent in connection with this nomination. It certainly involves not a personal problem; it is a problem which is deep in the heart of every one of us.

I am very sorry, Mr. President, that the security and loyalty angle of this subject had to be brought to the floor of the Senate. I am quite convinced that the distinguished Senator who is now presiding, the well-loved President pro tempore, had nothing to do with that, nor did I. I want to assure Senators that that question was brought up first by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY]. Then came the subsequent appointment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and our distinguished majority leader to evaluate the FBI file.

One may well draw conclusions from the evaluation. It may be that I would have evaluated it differently, because I happen to be a lawyer who has tried many cases. I accept the evaluation placed upon the file by those two Senators. I have no difference with them upon that point. I do want to make plain that in my remarks I am not referring to security and loyalty, and I hope that no Members of the Senate will see fit to hide behind that aspect of the case so that they may cast votes to confirm the nomination of a man who many of us think should not be sent as our Ambassador to Moscow.

Mr. President, accusations are easily made and are very, very difficult to disprove. From the State of Idaho, which is not too large, I have received a tremendous number of telegrams and letters. I have them here with me, if any Senators want to see them. I do not care to read them. The American people are thinking of what we are doing here today, Mr. President, and a great number are making known their thoughts to those who represent them.

I am mindful, Mr. President, of the fact that there will be only a handful of dissenters with respect to this nomination. It is always very easy to go along with the crowd, but it takes quite a bit of nerve to stand up and say, "I think we should dissent." To go along with 95 other Senators is the easy way out, but it is really difficult to stand up and state our case and be one of 5, 6, 7, or 10. I assure the Senate that when I dissent, I do it in a spirit of trying to help my country and trying to be a good Senator of the United States while I work for the State which sent me here.

I have, I might state at this time, received no communication from my State asking me to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Charles Bohlen.

Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] so aptly stated a few days ago, the fundamental basis of our Republic is the system of checks and balances. The advice and consent which we have to give with reference to the nomination of any man appointed to a position is something of a really serious nature. Certainly the Founding Fathers must have had some reason for providing for it in the Constitution. That is the reason why I have thought so seriously upon this matter. Should I advise that Charles Bohlen be our Ambassador to Moscow, and if I should so advise, should I cast my vote of consent? My answer has to be "No," for reasons which I hope to bring out.

Mr. President, in my heart I feel I have a duty to perform, as do the President of the United States and John Foster Dulles. If I am derelict in that duty, I do not deserve to be on the floor of the Senate, nor do I wish to serve in it. I am convinced that the people of my State would never send me back to the Senate if I were derelict in performing my solemn duty under the oath I took as a United States Senator.

As the able and distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] stated the other day, when he was acting majority leader, certainly there is always room on the floor of the United States Senate for honest differences of opinion.

With that statement I wholeheartedly agree because if a time should come when there never would be disagreement on this floor, it would be a very sad and dark day for our Republic.

No one questions the integrity or prerogatives of our President and our Secretary of State. Each represents the highest form of the American tradition of public honor. But I must say that I came to the United States Senate well-nigh solely because I had campaigned strenuously against the foreign policy of the prior administration. I campaigned against Dean Acheson, against the Yalta agreement, and all other agreements that have caused us the headaches we now suffer. I could not return to my home State and say that I voted to confirm the nomination of a man who still justifies and defends Yalta. I could never go back and expect to have the confidence of the people who gave me the great honor of sitting in this body. That is why I rise and tell the Senate, without malice, without rancor, and without bitterness, the reasons why I must oppose this nomination.

I think that every Senator should have and should exercise some independence of judgment. Why? Because in the case of this very nomination we are considering a man who it is expected will occupy one of the most sensitive posts and positions in the Foreign Service, namely, the position of Ambassador to Russia, at the most dangerous time in our history. We must pass—indeed, it is our solemn obligation to the American people to pass—the most careful and searching judgment on any such vital appointment.

I am sorry that it is necessary to have this debate. Certainly many Americans are alarmed about it. I may say that certainly many Russians are happy about it. In fairness to the nominee, I must also say that I feel that, by virtue of this debate, regardless of its outcome, we have, in effect, destroyed his effectiveness wherever he might serve the Republic as an Ambassador. I cannot for a moment believe that he will now have the power he ought to have if he goes to Russia after the debate we are having in the Senate. But I shall not compromise on the theory of advice and consent. I think it is fundamental and proper for the Senate to discuss this matter.

Perhaps it has been said that we who oppose this nomination want to harass and destroy career diplomats. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am no authority upon career diplomats. I have met only one, a man by the name of Loy Henderson, whom I admire very much. I wonder why he was not chosen from the career service to be sent to Moscow, because he impressed me, and many others, as being a man who would be feared by Communists and who would fight them down to the last ditch.

As I have said, my campaign was primarily against the Department of State and against agreements such as Yalta. That is how I came into politics. It is impossible for me, therefore, to agree that we should send to Russia a man who sat at Yalta, whose theories have carried great weight, and who still defends that infamous agreement. He has never varied in his basic approval of

policies that the American people, by the largest vote in history, overwhelmingly rejected last November. He has never wavered in his philosophy with respect to those policies nor has he ever said anything about changing it.

Last year I had the honor of campaigning all over the Nation. I can recall, among other trips, a 16½-hour flight from Elko, Nev., to the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. I really got to see America, and I saw it from every angle. I talked about Yalta, and I talked about foreign policy as I understood it. I promised hundreds of thousands of people, in small crowds and large crowds, at whistlestops and in great cities, that if General Eisenhower were elected President, the State Department would be cleaned out from top to bottom, and there would be a genuine new approach—an approach in the direction of a policy which the American people could respect and could and would admire.

How will it be possible to accomplish such a basic transition through the nomination of a man who sat at Yalta? Certainly there was an unholly mess in the State Department. Mr. "Chip" Bohlen, as he is known by his friends, has been in the Department a great many years, through the threat of depression, through the threat of war, through World War II, during an uneasy peace and another threatened depression, then the so-called Korean police action, and now the dilemma we face today. I am told that perhaps he should not, being a career diplomat, stand up and be heard upon the issues of the day.

Coming from the faraway State of Idaho, I can think of a man who has not been a career diplomat, but who has been, and is, a great American and a great soldier, and who now is out of work. On behalf of the people whom I, in part represent, I would like to suggest that General Van Fleet should be sent to Russia to represent the American people, and thus show Russia that we really mean business, because the Kremlin appreciates only one thing, and that is evidence of a force that is greater than that of the Kremlin.

I cannot help thinking that if the nomination of Mr. Bohlen is confirmed, we will be sending far from a strong man to Russia. Perhaps all the things that have been said about him are not true. But, as I said a moment ago, I believe any effectiveness he might have had has been destroyed and ruined, and that the American people are not going to have the confidence in him they should have.

The Kremlin rulers respect only an opposition of strength. They have been outtalking and outmaneuvering our great country for all these years. Witness the truce talks in Korea today. Is anyone proud of that dubious accomplishment? Certainly not.

I certainly think that if General Van Fleet is not the man for the post, then the strongest man in the State Department should be sent to Russia, a man in whom the American people will have all the confidence in the world. I have cited one such man in Loy Henderson. I thought the American people in 1952 voted out the philosophy of a foreign policy that has carried us through 20

years of dilemma. Yet, in my humble opinion, by virtue of this nomination, I think we would be giving right back to the American people that which they thought they had voted out.

Mr. Bohlen has stated that he would faithfully discharge his duties as Ambassador to Russia. But, Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions. Going back to the agreements made at Yalta and other agreements which made slaves out of some of our friends, I should like to ask the American people, What is the thinking of the millions upon millions of captive people beyond the Iron Curtain today, when they see a representative of the State Department who sat in at all those meetings go into one of the most crucial positions in the world? Does it give them hope? Does it give them faith for the future? I think not, Mr. President.

We have heard a great deal of talk to the effect that this nomination should not be contested, because it is not a nomination to a particularly responsible position. I do not concur in that argument. I think it certainly is the most important position in the Foreign Service today to be filled by our Secretary of State.

After 20 years with the prior administration, does Mr. Bohlen have the proper spirit? Does he have the change of heart which is necessary to give us the forthright, strong foreign policy and representation which we need in Moscow today? Let me quote some statements by Mr. Dulles. On January 12 my able friend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was examining into the qualifications of John Foster Dulles to be Secretary of State. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is one of the greatest cross-examiners I have ever heard in the field of law, and in debate on the floor of this body. He asked the following question:

Mr. Secretary, have you in mind any specific changes you would want to bring about in the State Department?

This is the answer of John Foster Dulles:

Well, I think the change that is most needed is a change of heart. You have got the machinery, but the spirit is the thing that counts. It is the spirit, and not the letter, as you know, which according to the Bible is the very important thing.

Again I ask, does Mr. Bohlen represent a change of heart and spirit? Does he represent the kind of thinking and conviction which reaffirm the spirit in which the American people voted last November? I think not.

Mr. President, if ever we needed firmness in foreign policy, it is now. The State Department must stand up and fight for a change for America. Within the shadow of this Capitol at this time there are printing presses spewing out Communist literature for the Soviet Embassy and for the Communist Party. Does anyone think for a moment that Charles Bohlen or any other representative of this country would receive such consideration in Moscow? Not a bit of it. If anyone thinks I am fooling, let him cross-examine me a little with respect to Communist printing presses operating not only in Washington, D. C., but

throughout this country. Does not this suggest that we need firmness today?

I have mentioned printing presses which have been spewing out Communist propaganda. In a moment I shall invite attention to certain pamphlets which have been printed for the Soviet Embassy and for the satellite countries. The operators of those printing presses are not only receiving money from Communist sources, but are receiving Government contracts, paid for by the taxpayers of the United States. That is why I say we should have an appointment to Moscow which represents a change of heart and a change in spirit.

I really do not care what the columnists have to say about me and how I vote. I have only one hope, and that is that when I leave here my people will say that I tried to do a good job. I do not want to hurt "Chip" Bohlen. I do not want to offend any member of the Foreign Relations Committee or anyone else. I do not want to hurt or embarrass my administration. However, I felt it was my duty to discuss with my colleagues the problems which have been on the minds of all of us for so many hours.

I was the first man to stand up on the floor of the United States Senate and defend an able Cabinet member, Ezra Taft Benson, when he was assailed—and I really mean assailed. I was the first one, for many days, to stand up and fight for a nominee of our great President. I will be the first to stand up and go down the line for our President when I feel he is right; but I feel that I owe a duty to myself and to my State. When I feel that a President has made a mistake in an appointment, I shall oppose that appointment.

No doubt in my short term in the Senate I shall have to differ again with the President. I hope not. It would be wholesome and wonderful if all 96 Senators could agree, and if we could vote with no dissension whatsoever. But it would be far from wholesome and wonderful if such condition was based upon an absence of individual conviction.

We come back to the question of party regularity. I have been classed by certain columnists as being a member of a certain segment of the Republican Party which desires to destroy it. I should like to have some of those columnists look into the RECORD. There is not a man sitting in the United States Senate on the Republican side of the aisle who has a better record for party regularity than has the junior Senator from Idaho, save and except my distinguished and able colleague, HENRY DWORSHAK, from my own State. His percentage of party regularity is 95, and mine is 94. I want to hear no more slander to the effect that I want to destroy the Republican Party. I am a regular Republican when the Republicans are right; but when I am honestly convinced that they are wrong I certainly must differ, as would the President or anyone else.

I do not think the President of the United States wants yes-men around him. I know him well enough, from my brief acquaintance, to appreciate that he admires people who stand up and try to explain their position, whether or not

he agrees with it. I shall continue to vote in accordance with my conscience as long as I am a Member of this body. When I cannot vote according to my conscience the people of Idaho will be doing me a great favor, and will be doing the State a great favor, by sending me back to the practice of law in Idaho.

Mr. President, it has been said here that Mr. Bohlen is one of the profound men when it comes to a knowledge of Russian philosophy and communism. The proponents of the pending nomination have advanced the argument that he is outstanding, and perhaps the only candidate in America qualified for the post of Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Our decision to give the advice and consent of the Senate to his appointment must be based upon his fitness and his own record.

I am mindful of the fact that it is very easy to find some mistakes in a man's public career. Heaven knows, I do not know how many mistakes I have made on the floor of the Senate, and so long as I serve here I shall probably continue to make some mistakes. But I cannot agree with those who describe Mr. Bohlen as the only man qualified for this post. I cannot agree with those who say that he will play no more than a mechanical role. I feel that Mr. Bohlen must have ability to judge; he must have fitness to evaluate; and his capacity to understand may decide for all of us the issue of war or peace.

In deciding how to vote on the nomination we must ask ourselves this question: Does Charles Bohlen understand the meaning of Communist policy, theory, and practice?

I am told that he is an expert on the Russian language and that he is profound in his knowledge of it. Mr. President, I have known of some very famous people who served overseas who have used competent interpreters when the circumstances required.

Does Charles Bohlen know the enemy? Does he understand what the aims of the Communists are? Does he have a thorough knowledge of the philosophy of communism? If he does, he has the basic qualifications, certainly, to be our Ambassador to Russia. If he does not have such knowledge, in my opinion, he is unfit and lacking in qualifications for the post to which he has been nominated.

As I have said many times, the Constitution places on us not only the vital task of giving our consent to the nomination, but the equally vital one of giving our advice.

The great volume of evidence presented so far shows that Mr. Bohlen does not have all the qualifications that have been argued by the proponents of the nomination. The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] placed in the RECORD facts which should have brought about, in my opinion, the withdrawal of the nomination. That is not all, Mr. President. There is other evidence also.

It is very easy, as I say, to pick out little mistakes made by a man, but I shall present certain evidence for what it may be worth. Judging the weight of the evidence and its credibility is in the hands of my colleagues, not in mine, but I shall give it to the Senate for what it

may be worth, and to get it off my chest. I intend to give the Senate a little evidence today about Mr. Bohlen with respect to his so-called profound knowledge of communism. In 1948 the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives was making an overall study of Communist theory and practice, as a part of its effort to promote the enactment of anti-Communist legislation. The groundwork laid by the committee in the Eightieth Congress resulted finally in the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950. As a part of its work the committee sought evidence to show that the Communist Party was not a legal political party, but a revolutionary party which seeks to advance its program by the use of force and violence to destroy the existing government and its institutions.

It is natural that in making that study the committee should turn to the State Department for information on the world Communist movement. The Department of State, with its responsibility of promoting the interests of the free world, was the logical center for information on what Communist theory and practice meant to the world as a whole. On January 12, 1948, the chairman of the committee wrote to the Secretary of State and asked, among other things, for "example of resort to force and violence by Communist parties in various countries."

The committee pointed out in its letter that it wanted to establish the fact that the Communist Party is an "organization which writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, or teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

On February 2, 1948, a most startling reply came to the House Un-American Activities Committee. It was over the signature of Charles Bohlen, this indispensable man, this man who, it is argued, is the best qualified man to send to Moscow, all of which has prompted me to say many times that if this man is so indispensable what a tragedy it would be for America if he should happen to die.

This is the answer which Charles Bohlen made to the letter, in 1948. Keep in mind, Mr. President, that the China revolution was going on at that time. People were being murdered and slaughtered by the thousands—yes, by the hundreds of thousands. This is his reply:

The information you seek is not susceptible to documentary proof.

The fact is, of course, that it would be a monumental task to find any standard work by a top Communist leader from Marx to Stalin which did not in very express terms advocate force and violence as a necessary tool of Communist seizure of power. As the original manifesto of Marx and Engels stated, Communists "openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

Mr. Bohlen was not very profound at that time, Mr. President. He said he had no documentary evidence to offer.

Communist literature printed right here in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, when our boys are being slaugh-

tered in Korea, could give hundreds of examples of their theory of overthrowing our country by force and violence, as I expect to show the Senate in a moment. The Communist literature is full of repetition and restatement of this basic philosophy of the Red terror. It would take no researcher of exceptional ability—one, let us say, who is considered as the most highly qualified expert on Russia—to cover dozens of pages with quotations from the demigods of communism expounding their devotion to force and violence as the sole means that communism can use to come to power. Of course, the best evidence is the practice of force and violence by the Communists. This is not in the realm of theory any longer, but in the practical realm of historic fact. It is not imaginable that a schoolboy with one semester of history should not be able to give several examples of the resort to force and violence by the Communists. Here are the major ones:

WORLD WAR I AND AFTER

The Russian revolution, the Communist revolution in Germany, the Communist revolution in Hungary, the Communist revolution in China.

WORLD WAR II AND AFTER

The Communist seizure of power in Yugoslavia, the Communist seizure of power in Bulgaria, the Communist seizure of power in Hungary, the Communist seizure of power in Poland, the Communist revolution in China, the Communist revolt in Greece, the destruction of Czechoslovakia.

This, Mr. President, is documentary evidence. I hold in my hand, and any Senator may ask for and see them, bulletin after bulletin of Communist filth and propaganda printed right here in the Nation's Capital, with picture after picture of violent revolution, of hundreds of people killed and murdered lying in the streets. Proudly these documents speak of "the great revolution that saved the common man." I invite my colleagues to look at them.

"Chip" Bohlen made a mistake on that one, Mr. President. He could provide no documentary evidence for a congressional committee. I am charitable when I say he made a mistake. As I have repeatedly stated, in a public service extending for 20 years or more it is very easy to let one's foot slip, but I am calling to the attention of my colleagues a failure of Mr. Bohlen's which cannot be gotten around.

In one of his works, Karl Marx stated his philosophy even more forcefully:

Combat or death; bloody struggle or extinction. It is thus that the question is irresistibly put.

To this let us add the voice of Lenin. From the hundreds of pages of his writings let me quote these words:

The replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without revolution.

Why, Mr. Bohlen, if you had such profound knowledge of Russia, did you not instantly cite some of these quotations? It did not take me long to find them and I have never been in Russia, nor do I speak the Russian language.

Quoting from Lenin again:

To deny or overlook civil wars would mean becoming a victim of the most hopeless opportunism and abandoning the social revolution.

Lenin went on to say:

It is well known that in the long run the problems of social life are decided by the class struggle in its bitterest, sharpest form, namely, in the form of civil war.

Mr. President, that is some of the documentary evidence which was overlooked by Mr. Bohlen in 1948. The amount of documentary evidence which I have presented at this time can very easily be expanded; I could continue to do so for hours, in going through the speeches of Lenin, Stalin, Foster, and many others, if anyone would care to listen.

Mr. President, the few quotations I have cited are only a drop taken from the floodwaters of Communist writings. They are the keystones of Communist philosophy. A person who is not familiar with all of them cannot understand Soviet Russia. Can we accept as the outstanding expert on Russia a man who tells us that there is no documentary evidence that communism means force and violence? I, for one, cannot.

Mr. President, I realize that those of us who are opposing confirmation of this nomination are playing a losing ball game; I realize that there is no chance to defeat confirmation of the nomination. However, I believe that these brief remarks will make a few persons think for a change, about communism.

Mr. President, the issue is not settled here. The volume of documentary evidence about communism is not confined to books. The story of communism has been the story of force and violence. Communism was conceived in blood. It feeds on blood. It wants to destroy all that is good in this world. It wants to destroy religion. So I could go on and on, in stating the evils of communism.

How did communism come to Russia? Of course, as almost everyone knows, it came by force and violence. Why did not Mr. Bohlen know about that? Every schoolchild in the United States knows of it. If Mr. Bohlen did know, what prevented him from citing it as an example of Communist force and violence? After all, the Communist record is written plainly in history, and the Russian revolution is known to every schoolchild in America.

So what prevented Mr. Bohlen from citing those things as examples of Communist force and violence? There was no reason to fear offending Russia, for the Soviet Government has publicly admitted, and with considerable pride, that it was conceived by force and violence. Countless books and other publications circulated in the United States by the Soviet Union tell us of that event. Copies of those books have been sent to the State Department, and are easily accessible to Mr. Bohlen and to anyone else connected with the Department. At least seven copies of the book to which I have referred have been in the Library of Congress, which is where I obtained the copy I examined. This, too, Mr. President, is documentary evidence.

However, this is not the full story; far from it. I ask the indulgence of the Sen-

ate while I review some of the milestones in the Communist history of force and violence which have occurred so rapidly during the past 20 years when Mr. Bohlen was in the State Department:

At the end of World War II there was a major Communist revolution in Germany, with armed conflict spread over the entire land. Fighting continued for months in the industrial areas. The end of the war also saw a Communist revolution in Hungary, where the Reds were able to seize power, for a time, by means of force and violence. That, too, Mr. President, is documentary evidence.

World War II saw the expansion of Communist terrorism over all of Eastern Europe. Yugoslavia fell to Communist force and violence. So did Poland. So did Bulgaria. So did Hungary. So did Rumania.

Mr. President, all these incidents are history. Where was Mr. Bohlen, the "outstanding expert on Soviet Russia," while all that was going on?

Let us not forget the outstanding work done by the Congress of the United States by means of the Greek-Turkish aid program, which was enacted months before Mr. Bohlen told the committee he knew nothing about Communist force and violence.

In China the revolution raged for well over two decades. While Mr. Bohlen was signing his name to a letter disclaiming all knowledge by documentary proof of Communist force and violence, what happened to China? The Red armies were advancing there, sealing the doom of that great, free nation.

Could Mr. Bohlen have been so unaware of that; or did he share the view—held by so many of his associates—that the Red terror in China was merely an agrarian reform movement?

All those things happened before the date on which Mr. Bohlen's letter was sent. Each of them is a matter of historic record. Each of them is an integral part of Communist and Russian history. And yet Charles Bohlen could tell a congressional committee that he could cite no documentary evidence that communism means force and violence.

Mr. President, you and my other colleagues have been most kind in listening to me. I am about to conclude. However, before doing so, I wish to state once again that in voting on this nomination I shall be voting according to my conscience. Each one of us, if he is to be sincere, must vote strictly in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience.

I wish to address my closing remarks to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I have no better friend in the Senate than that able man. I believe he will admit that he knows I am trying to speak from the depths of my heart, in the firm conviction that I should tell the American people why I shall vote "Nay" upon this nomination.

The senior Senator from New Jersey has placed in the RECORD certain letters from Mr. Grew, Mr. Gibson, and Mr. Armour, with respect to an explanation as to why there was a conflict in the testimony given in the debate on last Wednesday—a conflict in testimony which certainly did not do very much in favor of

the nomination. That conflict made the American people, or, at least, those who have communicated with me, wonder how such slipshod testimony and debate could occur.

In connection with that matter, I merely wish to say at this time that there appeared in the Boston Post of yesterday, March 26, an article by John Kelso, the Boston Post's Washington correspondent, in which he gives the substance of an interview he had with Mr. Gibson. I trust that my colleagues will bear with me for a few minutes while I read a part of the article into the record. I shall be brief.

I now read from the article:

Hugh Gibson, the New York business tycoon and retired senior foreign service diplomat, whose name figured in an acrimonious Senate wrangle during the afternoon—

The afternoon of Wednesday, March 25—

said flatly tonight, "I couldn't recommend Bohlen for anything—I don't know him well enough.

"I only met him once, and then only very briefly," said the 70-year-old intimate of ex-President Herbert Hoover, "so I cannot conceive of going into a fandango over him."

Of course, Mr. President, you remember the debate between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and our distinguished President pro tempore, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] about the testimony of "the man in the bathtub," and so forth.

I read further from the article published in the Boston Post on yesterday, March 26:

Gibson told this reporter tonight—

That would be the evening of March 25, the dateline of the article—

"Apparently there was the grandest lot of shenanigans about words and meanings on the floor of the Senate you ever heard of.

"As I recall it, though, the day I talked with Mr. Dulles, together with Mr. Grew and Mr. Armour, Dulles told us that certain appointments had already been made—those from London, Paris, Rome, Madrid, and Moscow."

Mr. President, was Mr. Gibson right when he gave that interview? Or who was wrong in the debate on Wednesday afternoon? How under the sun could Mr. Gibson ever give his approval to the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be our Ambassador to Moscow, when Mr. Gibson said, according to the interview from which I have been quoting, that the post at Moscow had already been filled?

I read further from the article:

"Well," Gibson said, "it now comes out that we recommended Bohlen. We certainly did not. At least, I did not. We certainly didn't consider the names of the persons down for the jobs in those places I mentioned—London, Paris, Rome, Madrid, and Moscow."

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by saying there has been doubt in my mind and in my heart with respect to the nominee. Whenever there is a doubt in my heart, I am going to resolve it in favor of my country. I shall always practice and follow that philosophy.

I certainly appreciate the courtesy of my colleagues in listening to me during the time I have spoken.

Mr. President, my vote on the question of confirmation of the pending nomination shall be "nay"—based upon the reasons I have stated here.

However, Mr. President, let me state now that if the nomination of Mr. Bohlen is confirmed, as it seems certain will be the case, he will have, when he serves as our Ambassador to Soviet Russia, my entire cooperation.

I thank the Senate for its courtesy in listening to me.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

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

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to commend the Senator from Idaho for what I consider a very impressive, very dignified, and very splendid address supporting the position he has taken in this matter.

I wish him to understand thoroughly from me that, although I do not share his position, and although I shall not vote as he has announced he will vote on the nomination, I respect his vote as much as I know he respects mine. The Senator from Idaho has convinced me of his sincerity.

I have talked to him before, and I wish again to make it perfectly clear that I believe that each one of us has the duty of voting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience.

I wish to say that in placing the two letters and the memorandum in the RECORD earlier today, namely, the letters from Mr. Grew and Mr. Gibson, and also the memorandum from Mr. Gibson—I did so after requesting them to make their own statements about the matter rather than attempting to quote them. There have been so many different interpretations of their views that I did not wish to try to quote them.

I did not wish to attempt to state that Mr. Gibson either approved or disapproved Mr. Bohlen for the ambassadorship. As a matter of fact, in the memorandum from him, he did not take a position. He simply said he did not know Mr. Bohlen well enough to feel qualified to express an opinion, inasmuch as he hardly knew Mr. Bohlen personally, having met him only three times casually, and thus he felt he could not pass on him one way or the other.

There was confusion as between the ordinary career nominations and the non-career nominations such as those of Mr. Dillon, to be our Ambassador to Paris, and Mrs. Luce, to be our Ambassador to Italy, and other nominations of that nature, which the Secretary of State said he had asked those gentlemen about, but which were not necessarily decided upon on the basis of their opinion. There was a difference of opinion between Mr. Grew and Mr. Gibson as to whether it was intended to include in that classification the nomination of Mr. Bohlen. That matter is pointed out in the letters, and I hope the RECORD will make it clear. I do not take issue with anything said by the distinguished Senator. He is entitled to his interpretation, as I am entitled to mine. I hope we can

all feel that we have endeavored in the very best spirit to debate this question before it goes to a vote.

Again, I thank the Senator for yielding to me before he began his remarks for the purpose of inserting the communications.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New Jersey, could not have made me happier than he has done by paying me this personal tribute. I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a series of letters and telegrams which I have received relative to the nomination of Mr. Bohlen as Ambassador to Moscow.

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

RENO, NEV., March 25, 1953.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We hope that you will oppose Bohlen's nomination as Ambassador to Moscow. Inasmuch as Mr. Bohlen was an associate of Alger Hiss and his type in the former administration we do not consider him as having the confidence of the American people to handle situations in Russia. Over 30 million people voted to get Truman, Acheson, and their group out of office, so why reinstall the very same ones. Of all the competent people in this country there certainly must be one who could replace him, do a better job, have a clear record and have the confidence of the American people. If Bohlen was so capable why wasn't he able to persuade Alger Hiss to benefit our side and if not able to accomplish that—why didn't he expose Alger Hiss for what he was. He surely knew what was going on and if he didn't, he'll be of very little good to us over there now when things are much worse.

Our side would win, Mr. MALONE, if you could convert just one-fifth as many in the Senate as I talked out of voting for your out-of-town opponent in the elections. And I didn't have to do much more talking than tell them of his being a newcomer to Nevada.

So do hope you will vote against Bohlen's nomination and bring a few more along with you.

Very sincerely yours,

FLORENCE HOFFMANN.
CHARLES B. HOFFMANN.

RENO, NEV., March 26, 1953.

Senator MALONE,
Senate Office Building.

In reference to the Bohlen confirmation, seems the leftwingers didn't do so well for us. Why not give the other side a chance?

Mrs. ROBERT FLICK.
Mrs. GENEVRA KIMPTON.

RENO, NEV., March 26, 1953.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Have followed closely all arguments pro and con on Bohlen. We are against his confirmation.

Mrs. P. PHILLIPS,
KAREN PHILLIPS.

RENO, NEV., March 26, 1953.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We and many of our friends are definitely opposed to the confirmation of Bohlen for Ambassador to Russia. In these serious times it would seem to us there should be

some man in this country able to handle the affairs in this delicate position who has not been involved in such frightful blunders as Yalta, and who has been so closely associated with the administration of the past 20 years.

HELEN and ROY CROSS.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., March 26, 1953.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Vigorously urge your opposition to confirmation of Bohlen. Regards.

AL CAHLAN.

MARLBORO, N. H., March 25, 1953.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONE: It certainly does not seem wise to confirm Mr. Bohlen, whose collaboration has been responsible for the sellouts which are the cause of so many American dead lying today in their graves. Besides having had the decidedly wrong slant with the Russians as a trainee with the Truman-Acheson gang, his confirmation will be misunderstood by the Russians as an O. K. for more of the same old give-away trading.

The American people want none of this same gang. The main proving ground is right in Washington. If America is to be saved, something better than business-as-usual must possess the Senate. This war, excessive taxation, and inflation (which were tools calculated to ruin us and make us dependent and helpless) are all but indications of how far we have been sold down the river. This trend must be stopped. And I cannot see how the way to do it is by confirming men favorable to Senators LEHMAN and HUBERT HUMPHREY. I hope you will see that we must make clean sweeping. It is indeed every Senator's duty to advise the President by this means as I see it (as Senator BRIDGES has said). If Mr. Eisenhower is the man he should be and that Americans expect him to be, he will accept this advice as a godsend from the Senators. This unnecessary and unholy mess which has befallen so many millions of American homes is not to be played along with. It is to be gotten out of, and certainly Mr. Bohlen does not merit either the honor nor has he the probable desired qualifications except to be agreeable to the Russians. I hope you will not confirm Mr. Bohlen.

Most sincerely yours,

JUDSON N. WALKER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 26, 1953.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Am concerned about Bohlen's appointment. Consider it unwarranted and unforgivable. Please do what you can to prevent it.

Mrs. G. B. SANDERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 26, 1953.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Greatly appreciate your courageous stand in opposition to Bohlen's appointment. American public certainly disillusioned at continued evidence unfriendly influences in high places. Even if you lose battle it is well worth fighting and you can be sure of heartiest support from all real citizens.

GEORGE S. MONTGOMERY, Jr.

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 26, 1953.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Am concerned about Bohlen's appointment. Consider it unwarranted and unforgivable. Please do what you can to prevent it.

Mrs. W. E. CLARK.

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 26, 1953.
 Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,

Washington, D. C.:
 Am concerned about Bohlen's appointment. Consider it unwarranted and unfavorable. Please do what you can to prevent it.

Mrs. ELIZABETH S. COWLES.

NORFOLK, CONN., March 26, 1953.
 Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
 United States Senator,
 Senate Office Building.

Grateful congratulations on your wise position in opposing Bohlen appointment.

Mrs. NATHALIE PALMER FABRIZIO.

Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. President, the question before the Senate today is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? The duty of the Senate to advise and consent to a nomination, or to refuse its advice and consent, is a constitutional duty resting upon each and every Senator. Article II, section 2, of the Constitution, describing the powers of the President, says: "and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors."

The function of an ambassador is not defined by the Congress through a statutory definition, nor is an ambassador a statutory officer. He is a constitutional officer. In international law, our ambassador is considered to be the personal representative of the President of the United States. He is, in effect, the hand of the President, or, let us say, the President's personal representative to a foreign nation.

One of the chief questions which has come into the debate on this floor in regard to the confirmation of this particular appointment is whether, by voting to confirm Mr. Bohlen, we would be approving what he has done in the past and the role he has played in our foreign relations. Did he have anything to do with the Yalta and Teheran agreements? If he did, was his conduct then such that a Senator could vote for his confirmation at this time? In the mind of the Senator from Michigan, there is no doubt that this is a question upon which reasonable minds may differ. I take it for granted, and I realize, that each Senator in the casting of this vote is basing his vote upon an analysis of the facts, and in the light of his conscience.

This, of course, requires us, when these questions are raised, to analyze what was done at Yalta and Teheran, and what was confirmed at Potsdam. After reading and analyzing those actions, I have no great difficulty in concluding that what was done by the United States at Yalta was not, in my opinion, good either for the United States of America or for the rest of the free world. There has never been a serious question in my mind but that the action taken at Yalta violated the very fundamentals of the Atlantic Charter of August 1941, at which time this Government and Great Britain undertook "to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world," declaring that

"they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

I believe that the Yalta agreement violated our previous treaty, the Nine Power Pact with China. In that pact, in 1922, we had agreed to respect the sovereignty and territorial and administrative integrity of China. The Yalta agreement violated one of the very fundamentals of this country's foreign policy by giving to a foreign power a paramount position in Manchuria. For almost half a century the possibility of the loss of these rights of China was regarded by the United States as a major threat to peace in the Far East. This was for almost half a century the major concern of American diplomacy in the Far East; and the actual loss of China's integrity was the first cause of World War II, so far as it related to the Pacific. The Yalta agreement violated this principle, and its effect was to repudiate the efforts of Hay, Knox, Hughes, Stimson, and Hull to safeguard the independence of China and to maintain peace in the Pacific. No one can dispute the fact that this principle is necessary for the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. The war in Korea, today, is sufficient evidence that the decision reached at Yalta in violation of this principle was not beneficial to America. It was the cause of the war in Korea and of the loss of China.

Now, Mr. President, let us look at the Yalta agreement. First, let us consider certain provisions of that agreement regarding the Far East. I read:

The leaders of the three great powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and Great Britain—have agreed that in 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated, the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies.

The agreement then stated the conditions imposed upon the territory of China, who was an ally of the United States, both China and America being then at war with Japan. China was not even present or represented at Yalta. Then the agreement provided:

The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence [of China] on advice of Marshal Stalin.

To carry out the agreement in relation to Russia's position in the Far East and China, the Yalta agreement further declared:

The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

In other words, Mr. President, we were making an agreement with Russia which concerned the integrity and the sovereignty of one of our allies in the Far East, namely, China, to give away, in violation of the very fundamental principles for which we were fighting in the Pacific, certain territory and rights, provided that Russia came into the war.

Mr. President, in the agreement at Yalta it is stated that these concessions were conditioned upon Russia coming into the war. Ambassador Harriman stated, in the hearings before the Foreign

Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, sitting jointly, known as the MacArthur hearings, that that was a condition. However, if we examine the original memorandum which was sent from our Embassy in Moscow by Mr. Harriman to the President of the United States, it will be found that there is no condition whatever in that memorandum; but that condition was demanded by Russia before she would enter into the war. Those were the political aims of the Soviet Union, and the instrument drawn up at Yalta, in violation of the very fundamental principles of American foreign policy, enabled Russia to achieve them.

Are we talking about the long dead past? No, Mr. President; we are talking about something which has extended itself into the living present. We are talking about something that will extend itself into the future. Therefore, what we say about the Yalta agreement and other agreements is not concerned with the dead coils of the past, but something which is alive today; and unless we, the representatives of the United States Government, and the representatives of the free world condemn what was done at Yalta, the evil effects will continue in the future.

We know that mistakes in foreign policy are costly. I do not suppose there has ever been a time in history when errors in foreign policy could affect the lives of so many persons, because what we do is of worldwide consequence rather than merely of consequence to America. So we cannot condone mistakes; we must be ready to see mistakes and to face them.

Mr. President, what were the principal things done at Yalta with respect to the Far East? We were to guarantee Russia the warm-water ports of Darien and Port Arthur and domination of the Manchurian railroad. This gave Russia extraterritorial rights in Manchuria, and, in fact, control of Manchuria.

There are some persons who even now contend that this was not a secret agreement. The agreement, so far as it related to the Far East, was signed on February 11, 1945, at Yalta, with the personal signatures of the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Prime Minister of Russia. It was not made public in the United States at that time. It was made public simultaneously in London, Moscow, and Washington on February 11, 1946, 1 year later. The heads of the Chinese Government did not know of the agreement until June 1945.

It has been stated that the reason for not giving this information to the Chinese Government, which was so vitally affected, was that we were at war, but we gave it to them in June when we were still at war and when Russia was not yet a party to the war. I have never considered that there was any valid reason why China should not have been notified immediately.

We made certain agreements with the Chinese at Cairo in November of 1943, when Russia was not present, but those agreements concerned not Russia, but the enemy of both China and the United States of America.

There is no doubt that we have violated agreements we had made with Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo. There are those who would argue that what we did at Yalta, as far as China was concerned, was affirmed and agreed to by the Nationalist Government of China in a treaty with the Soviet Union.

An examination of the record of the hearings in this particular matter will disclose editorials indicating that it was a great thing for Russia and China to make the treaty which was made in 1945, indicating that China had freely agreed to carry out the terms of the Yalta agreement, and that what was done by the United States of America was of no concern, because China later agreed voluntarily to carry out each and every one of the terms, in the treaty with the U. S. S. R.

It must be remembered that the Yalta agreement was not disclosed to the Chinese Government until June 1945, although the Cairo Conference was in November 1943, and the Yalta agreement was made in February 1945.

Mr. President, let us look at the facts as to why there was a treaty. Let us look at the facts as to how China was forced to make a treaty. I want to read the agreement, because in it we agreed with China that she would not lose her rights so far as Manchuria and certain other places were concerned.

The Cairo Conference reached an agreement as follows:

The three great allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan. They covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion. It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed. The aforesaid three great powers, mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent.

Let us look at the record, and at the statements of Walter S. Robertson, of Virginia, who was an economic adviser to the State Department from May of 1943 until 1946, and who was sent to China as the counselor of economic affairs with the rank of Minister.

I asked him this question:

You think, then, that we agreed, that is, America agreed, at Yalta, so far as the Far East was concerned, and Manchuria, to give certain rights to China which she was entitled to under the Cairo agreement? You believe that at Yalta we agreed to give Russia, and insisted upon her having certain rights in Manchuria which violated—

Mr. Robertson's reply was—
which violated our pledge at Cairo.

I asked him if he cared to name those rights, and he replied:

Well, I think that we violated it in two ways as far as China was concerned, and one terrific way so far as we were concerned. The Dairen and Port Arthur, and that is the only open port, and the railroads, the communications of the country were given to Russia. They were given to them under an

agreement where you had a joint operation, but it was always a Russian overtopper for the Chinese, so we gave Russia the grip on the communications in that country which, in effect was, in my opinion, complete control of it, and it proved exactly that way. China never had any sovereignty over Manchuria, after the Russians swept in there, of any kind or description. The Russians would not even let China use Dairen and the Chinese railroads to transport troops to take over after the surrender from the Japanese under the Potsdam Declaration. There was never a second from the time that the Russians moved into Manchuria where the Chinese had the slightest ability to carry out their rights; so, coming back we reimposed extra extraterritoriality upon Manchuria, transferred it from the Japanese to the Russians. The Russians had originally gotten it from the Chinese, and all of it at one time belonged to China. The Japanese were there. It was their base of expansion, and we thought that expansion there was a threat to our interests, an infringement upon the sovereignty of China, and as they expanded we protested all the time, so we, from the standpoint of the Chinese, in effect, reimposed extraterritoriality which violated the treaty with China, in January 1943, renouncing it. That is No. 1.

I think he meant November 1943.

No. 2, I think, from the other standpoint that the Chinese thought in any event that we had pledged the return to Manchuria by them at the end of the war, and they thought it was an open violation of the solemn agreement made there.

In connection with the treaty between China and Russia, I asked Mr. Robertson this question:

How do you account for the fact that China finally made the treaty with Russia?

He replied:

We forced her.

I asked him:

You figure that we did force her?

His reply was:

They first said they would not send emissaries. We were putting tremendous pressure on China to send these emissaries there, and when they got there all of the details of this agreement had been spelled out for them. Well, now, China was in the position of she had nowhere else to turn. She was in a desperate condition. All of her industries were destroyed, her commerce was destroyed, her transportation was destroyed, her agricultural land had had three armies living off them for 8 years, and she was rent by the civil war, and it was nowhere that China had any chance of getting help except from us.

Meaning from the United States of America.

I then asked:

Then this Government—

Meaning the United States Government—

did put pressure on China to have the Yalta agreement carried out?

Mr. Robertson replied:

Yes, indeed, we did; yes, indeed, we did.

It is claimed that China voluntarily confirmed Yalta in the treaty with the U. S. S. R.—but now we learn that the United States Government forced China into that treaty. It is also enlightening to have Mr. Robertson's testimony in regard to what happened when the news got to China of this Yalta agreement be-

tween the United States and Russia. The testimony is as follows:

Senator KNOWLAND. Was it indicated subsequent to that time that the President of the Republic of China himself had been shocked when he got the news?

Remember, it was not until June 1945 that it was learned that this agreement was made secretly in February 1945.

Mr. ROBERTSON. My knowledge of that situation was given to me by the Ambassador himself. He said he hit the ceiling.

Meaning that the Generalissimo of China hit the ceiling. During these hearings Mr. Robertson testified:

In 1943 we signed the solemn treaty with China renouncing extraterritoriality.

In the summer of that same year we ipso facto made China one of the five great powers of the world, with full responsibility for carrying on the war and organizing the peace, and we gave China a seat on the Security Council equal to our own, and then in Cairo, in December of that year, we specifically pledged to Chiang Kai-shek to return Manchuria, by name, to China at the end of the war.

Well, now, that was when we needed China desperately.

Then, 14 months later at Yalta, in February 1945, when it was thought necessary to bring, by some, Russia into the war which was proceeding.

Now, we granted that despite the fact that we were fighting the war ourselves, because we thought that the Japanese there were a threat to us, despite the fact that we had renounced by solemn treaty extraterritoriality, despite the fact that we had specifically pledged to Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo in December 1943, the return of Manchuria to China, and we granted that without the knowledge or the consent of China—the Chinese Government knew nothing about it whatsoever—and we were pledged there to carry out those terms unconditionally, so that with or without Chinese consent that was a deal.

Mr. President, that was a witness who was present in China, who had knowledge before the fact, and who has within the last week given before the Committee on Foreign Relations the testimony to which I have referred. So we have one person who is speaking from personal knowledge of what the Yalta agreement meant, and the effect it has had upon the world.

Mr. Robertson continued as follows:

T. V. Soong and another Chinese whose name I cannot remember went; he stayed some 2 weeks, if I remember correctly, and he returned to Chungking, and he said he would not sign that treaty, that no Chinese could sign it, and ever look another one in the face, and he finally as prime minister to keep from signing the treaty; he did not go back to Moscow.

Wang Shih-Chieh, who was the foreign minister, was sent in his place, and he signed the treaty, and every term of that treaty, according to our best information, had been worked out at Yalta without any consultation whatsoever with the Chinese, and so.

That witness was confirmed by the Senate today as an Assistant Secretary of State.

Let us look at only one European aspect of the Yalta agreement. Mr. Bohlen was an interpreter and adviser at Yalta. He was Under Secretary of State. What did we do to Poland at Yalta when the Polish Government was not present but in London directing its forces who were

fighting in the air and on land as our allies? We established a new government in Poland. We consented to the elimination of the Polish Government in exile, in London. The brave sons of Poland were going forth to help America and her allies. We consented to the establishment of a new government in Poland. We consented to the elimination of the Polish Government in exile in London.

There was a conversation between Mr. Hopkins and Stalin when Mr. Bohlen was present.

While we were doing business with the bona fide Polish Government in exile in London, we were selling them down the river to a Soviet puppet government, the Lublin committee. I shall show, from Mr. Sherwood's book, what we did about putting any of those who were in the London government in the Lublin government, which was the committee which Russia wanted to dominate all of Poland. Mr. Bohlen was present at this conversation as related by Mr. Sherwood.

I quote Harry Hopkins as related in the Sherwood book:

Mr. Hopkins replied that, as far as the United States Government was concerned, we had no interest in seeing anyone connected with the present Polish Government in London involved in the new provisional government of Poland, and he did not personally believe that the British had any such idea.

In other words, we found that in Mr. Bohlen's presence Mr. Hopkins was saying, with respect to the government of one of our allies in exile in London, "We will go along with the Soviets and create a new puppet government to take over the Polish people."

The same idea is repeated in the book on page 910. I had better read the paragraph:

His [Stalin's] reply to that was that he would take into consideration Russia's opinion, as well as America's opinion, and that it was the Russian forces that had liberated Poland, and said if they did not gain the victory in Poland with such a great loss of Russian life, nobody would be talking about a new Poland. He said several times that he blamed the British for conniving with the London Poles.

Let us look at another aspect of the Yalta agreement. As I have said, if this agreement were not still a living thing, presented to us today and extending into our future, there would be little use of discussing it here. But I believe that it is something that is alive today—something which penetrates the lives of all Americans and of all the free peoples of the world. It greatly concerns those who have been forced behind the Iron Curtain.

What did we do about the territory beyond the Curzon line, in violation of the Atlantic Charter? The United Nations and Russia, as parties to the Atlantic Charter, agreed to everything in the charter.

We established the Curzon line as the Polish east boundary, and this certainly violated the Atlantic Charter. We agreed to free elections in Poland and the other satellite countries. Will anyone now contend, who has any knowledge of communism, that Russia would

be a party to a free election? It does not take an expert on the Soviet Union to know that a free election to the Soviet Union is not a free election as we in this country would understand it. We agreed with Russia to give her Poland as a friendly nation. Is a "friendly nation" to Russia such as we in this country understand a friendly nation to be?

Could anyone who claimed to be an expert, who claimed to understand communism or the U. S. S. R., believe that when the Soviet Union was talking about a free election, and using the term "friendly nation," it meant the same thing as we understand by the term "free election," and the term "friendly nation?"

Russia now considers the slave puppet government on her border in Poland, as well as the other satellites, friendly nations. However, we know that while they must be friendly to Russia, so far as the people are concerned they are desirous of becoming free, as we understand the word. They want free elections, as we understand the term, but they are not permitted to have them.

Let us look at the statement of Ambassador Harriman, to see what he was thinking at almost the same time. He was our Ambassador and he was present, as Mr. Bohlen says, when the secret agreements at Yalta were entered into.

Let us look at what the late James Forrestal, former Secretary of Defense, had to say in his diary just a few months after the Yalta agreement. He said:

I had a meeting in my office this morning with Ambassador Harriman, Admiral Edwards (Vice Adm. Richard S. Edwards, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations), Vice Admiral Cooke (Charles M. Cooke, Jr., Chief of Staff to Admiral King). Mr. Harriman said he thought it was time to come to a conclusion about the necessity for the early entrance of Russia into the Japanese war. He said he was satisfied they were determined to come in it because of their requirements in the Far East. (He described the territorial concessions made at Yalta.) He said the Russians, he believed, much more greatly feared a separate peace by ourselves with Japan than any fear of ourselves about their concluding such an arrangement. He said he thought it was important that we determine our policy as to a strong or weak China, that if China continued weak Russian influence would move in quickly and toward ultimate domination. He said that there would be no illusion about anything such as a "free China" once the Russians got in, that the two or three hundred millions in that country would march when the Kremlin ordered.

That was in May of 1945, a few months after February 1945, when we made the agreement at Yalta giving Russia the very domination which was then being discussed. The same situation was true with respect to Poland and all the other satellites. They were taken over; and once Russia got the upper hand, there was no more freedom.

This same thing would and did apply to the so-called friendly Poland under the domination of Russia.

The man whose name is now under consideration for confirmation says that we did not change conditions at Yalta. But is it not true that we did permit by our agreements, and without protest, the changes made in the countries surround-

ing Russia, including Poland, Czechoslovakia, and, in fact, China, and the other satellites?

He says it would have come out the same way. Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference in morality, so far as a moral question is concerned, in agreeing to something immoral to be done and not protesting its being done. Here was an agreement.

Mr. Harriman was Ambassador to Russia at this time. Mr. Bohlen was an expert on Russia. They were the only two other Americans present when the far-eastern agreement was made in relation to China.

I have never agreed that the record shows Russia ever demanded as a condition for entrance into the war against Japan the concessions which were made to her. The original telegram from Mr. Harriman, as Ambassador to Russia, to the President in December 1944, at the most, sets out the concessions as the political aims of Russia in the Far East and not as a condition precedent to their joining the war against Japan.

The record in this case shows that Mr. Bohlen was connected with these fundamental errors of judgment. He professes to be an expert on communism, but says he was at most an adviser. We cannot afford errors of judgment on our foreign policy. That is why the people have placed Dwight Eisenhower in office as President and why the Senate has confirmed John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. Errors in foreign policy today cost American lives and lives of our allies, and a tax burden that the American public will be unable to carry, and burdens which other free people will be unable to carry.

This is the background against which we must consider the Bohlen nomination. We must determine whether he played a major role or a significant part in these and other decisions which have caused so much suffering and tyranny in the world, the cost of which cannot yet be determined.

The question boils down to whether he was merely an interpreter or whether he was an adviser who contributed to the making of these infamous agreements. Mr. Bohlen justifies these agreements, and defends them, on the grounds of military expediency and says he was just carrying out orders.

In the light of these facts, Mr. Joseph C. Grew, a Foreign Service officer for many years, but now retired, says:

No matter what phases his thinking may have passed through in light of other circumstances and other conditions in times past, there is no shadow of doubt in my mind that he is the right man and the best man for the job just now.

Mr. President, I realize that we have in this country a Foreign Service which, in effect, takes the place of civil service in our international activities abroad. We have set up in relation to our foreign activities, a continuing Government service whose duty is to help advise and help the President of the United States in conducting his foreign relations without regard to party. However, there is always involved the question of ability to carry out the policy as made by the President, or those who make it on the

advice of the President. I think it is a good thing to have a Foreign Service and career diplomats. I think it is well worth while. But, certainly we do not want to perpetuate errors of the past. Only those who can properly represent the administration in power and can help to carry out its policies should be continued in office. I believe that the actions of every man and woman are based on his past. That is life itself. The question is, Is Mr. Bohlen so fixed in the errors of the past that he cannot represent the President of the United States as his personal representative in Russia?

As I said, Joseph C. Grew, who was a Foreign Service officer for many years and an able and distinguished Ambassador, believes when he writes me to the effect that regardless of other circumstances and other conditions of the past there is no shadow of doubt in his mind that Mr. Bohlen is the right man for the job at this time.

This particular post as Ambassador to Soviet Russia is not a policy position, we have been told; that it is at most a mirror for the President of the United States. The question we must all decide is whether or not the images reflected by Mr. Bohlen in this mirror for the President of the United States will be true and accurate, or whether they will be tarnished and changed by previous opinions and vested interests in errors of the past.

I think that if they related to what took place at Yalta, if they related to what took place at Teheran—yes, if they related to what took place in the mission to China to consolidate the Communist and Nationalist Governments of China, and the consequent loss of China, we might expect that one could draw the reasonable inference that the mirror would reflect former thinking.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I am mistaken I hope the Senator from Michigan will correct me. However, my understanding is that either before the Committee on Foreign Relations or before another committee, Mr. Bohlen has within the past 3 days approved of the Yalta agreement. Am I correct in that statement? Does the Senator have such information?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have some information on the subject. I do not think I can answer the Senator's question categorically from the record.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I formed a very definite opinion of Mr. Bohlen's position. It was to the effect that he felt that from hindsight the Yalta agreement was a mistake; that in two important respects it was a mistake. However, he defended the good faith and the actions of those who made the agreement. I believe that was the substance of his testimony. He thought from the information they had at that time the judgment of those who made the agreement was correct. He felt that in the light of subsequent developments it was a mistake. However, he felt that they could not be blamed

for it. I do not agree with him, but that was his position.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is what I understand it to be from the record. I do not agree with Mr. Bohlen either.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. My understanding was that he said in substance that it was the best that could be done at the time.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That is an accurate statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my understanding. I did not hear him make it, but I understood that that was his statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Which, to my way of thinking, is by Mr. Bohlen a reaffirmation of his position at the time the Yalta agreement was brought about. One may sugar-coat it if he wants to do so, and say that now he has reformed and that now he is penitent, but it does not sound like that to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, Mr. President. My purpose in spending so much time on these agreements, in pointing out why I think they were so evil, was not to attempt in any way to sugar-coat or take away the responsibility of Mr. Bohlen insofar as the agreements are concerned. As I have just said, if he were to interpret or to act as a mirror, if he were to send back to the President of the United States reflections which would be looked upon as interpretations of the agreements, I would not trust the mirror, for I would think it would be so faulty that it could not be used.

But today I do not see that the present post of our Ambassador to Moscow is such that he could do anything except carry out the policy which he was instructed to carry out. In this connection I think it is only fair to quote Mr. Bohlen himself, for at the hearing I questioned him along this particular line. Of course, Mr. President, one way to know what a man believes is to ask him about it and allow him to answer, and, during the time he is answering, to watch his demeanor.

So, Mr. President, I wish to state that when Mr. Bohlen appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, I questioned him; and I now state his answers:

Mr. BOHLEN. I consider the role of the Ambassador as one to carry out the instructions he receives. No Ambassador has a policy-making decision. I would have the right of recommendation and suggestion but no power of decision.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you feel that in view of what has happened in the past, as a policymaker or as an adviser, your opinion would not be colored on the question of a new policy?

Mr. BOHLEN. I do not think so, no; because I conceive, as I did then, that the function of a professional Foreign Service officer, or an Ambassador for that matter, is that of an executor of policy.

He does not determine policy. Policy is determined by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, and the people legally established to be his advisers—for instance, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their military advisers. I doubt that any two persons would have to have total 100 percent agreement with every policy, and I do not think people are made that way. I was not 100 percent in agreement with many of the things I saw during the war, but I know this much, that my duty and my oath

of office made it perfectly plain that I carry out the policies laid down by the constituted authorities of the United States.

If I disagree so deeply with them, I always have the prospect of resignation.

Mr. President, in my opinion, there are too few Government officials who resign when they are of the opinion that they cannot agree in principle to the policies they are asked to carry out. The difficulty is that sometimes such officials look upon the posts they hold as mere jobs, and not as public service and public trusts. If they regard them as public service for the good of the entire United States, there will be more resignations from policy-executing positions, when those who hold such positions cannot agree with the policies they are asked to execute.

I shall quote further from the testimony given by Mr. Bohlen before the Foreign Relations Committee. I then said to him:

Senator FERGUSON. You have the right to resign.

Mr. BOHLEN. The right to resign, but I do not anticipate anything of that nature.

The function of an Ambassador is, first of all, to report to his Government the situation in the country as he sees it, based on the information he obtains; the second one is to carry out the instructions that he receives from the Secretary of State.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you not think, then, that he would have any vested interest in error that would influence his judgment?

Mr. BOHLEN. No, sir.

Mr. President, the President of the United States believes that, notwithstanding Mr. Bohlen's connections with former administrations' errors in foreign policy, he can act as an Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. and as the President's personal representative, to perform such functions as the President desires him to perform—not in carrying out the functions of a statutory official, but in carrying out the functions of a constitutional official.

Congress has conferred no duties upon an Ambassador. He performs the duties the President wishes him to perform in connection with the President's foreign policy.

Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that I should vote to allow the President of the United States, in this particular case, and under the particular circumstances, to name Charles E. Bohlen as his personal representative. I will, therefore, vote in favor of confirmation of this nomination.

But I do not consider that my vote in favor of confirmation of this nomination will in any way approve or condone the nominee's actions, or the actions of our Government, at Yalta or the other wartime conferences. I still vigorously condemn these mistakes for their serious effect upon our lives today and into tomorrow. Only by seeing these mistakes clearly can we move to correct and lessen their effect on civilization.

Mr. President, I believe the desire of the President of the United States is to have a new, firm, consistent foreign policy, and I believe he will attempt to carry it out in that way. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, the President may have this man to help carry out the policy in the case of this particular mission, that of our Ambassador to Russia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, after listening to my genial and distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], who addressed the Senate a short time ago, I am reminded of olden days, when I lived in a little town in Illinois, and when, along with a subscription to the local newspaper, one received a lovely chromo, or chromolithograph, and for 98 cents additional received a gold frame for it. For many years that humble piece of art hung in our kitchen, and I suppose it was the first piece of art with which I became acquainted. It showed a little group in the Colosseum in Rome, with a man with a white beard and dressed in a white tunic in the center. Each one in the group was supplicating Heaven just before the lions came out and enriched the spectacle. The title was "The Last Christian Martyrs."

I later discovered that the picture also had a Latin title, which, if I recall correctly, was "Morituri Salutamis," which is translated as "We who are about to die salute you." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, this will not be the first time, or the last time, either, when—as the result of a vote—I shall "die" on the floor of the Senate—and, of course, I may state that during my service in the House of Representatives I had similar experiences.

So, although I extend my personal sympathy and commiseration to the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I wish to tell him not to feel discouraged or gloomy today.

It runs in my mind that long ago Jacob said to the Lord, "O Lord, let me not die without suffering or illness."

Mr. President, how are we to go through this adventure of service in the United States Senate without a little agony now and then, whether it be political or otherwise? [Laughter.] There has to be something to act as savor and leaven for this great adventure. So I do not approach it from the standpoint of feeling badly about it, ethereally speaking.

My good friend the Senator from Texas raised a question about hilarity. Mr. President, I know of no hilarity in my soul; today I am neither happy nor unhappy about the approaching vote on the nomination of Mr. Charles Bohlen. It is a matter of duty. I believe that the one who most properly and most correctly discharges his duty in that connection is our great majority leader, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. We have never seen BOB TAFT interpret his duty in terms of whether he is happy or unhappy about it. He knows what his duty is, and he does it; and that is all that is necessary.

So I am going to perform my duty, and it will be a long time from now before I will even have opportunity to probe my soul and my spirit to find out whether I was happy or unhappy about it. It is merely a duty, and I want to do it; and I want to approach it as simply as I know how. Let me say to "BOB" TAFT, if I can be familiar for a moment, that his brother Charlie some years ago made a speech to the Federation of Women's Clubs. I read it in the RECORD, and for a time one line of it made me furious. The first line in Charlie's

speech was, "Nothing will ever be simple again." That really infuriated me, because I thought, surely, there is a way of reducing this or any other problem to a very simple common denominator. But I am not insensible of the fact that this rather big, bewildering, sprawling, labyrinthine Government of ours, with its multitude of functions, is not quite so simple. So I try to reduce it to simplicity as best I know how.

First, let me put aside what I think are the general considerations. I have a great affection for the President of the United States. I did my level utmost in Chicago to prevent his nomination—and I would do it all over again. I do not apologize to anybody for it. But I think he is a great character. He has a sense of sportsmanship and a quality of fairness, and I believe the President of the United States would be ashamed of a Senator if he had a conviction and did not stand up to express it. I cannot imagine a great President having any other attitude than that.

I have affection for John Foster Dulles, our Secretary of State. He is a great spiritual character, he is a great churchman in his own right, and he is a fine international lawyer. I learned to know him years ago, and my affection for him has increased with the lapse of years. But if I disagree with him, I think the Secretary of State would think unkindly of me, indeed, might consider it moral cowardice on my part, if I failed to utter my conviction and failed to express my responsibility as a Member of the Congress and of the Senate.

I am going to approach my vote on the pending nomination in just that simple fashion, and as I do so, let me remind my colleagues that once this nomination is confirmed, we will never get it back, it will not be recalled. When the heat was on Dean Acheson and the voices of the people of America were raised to crescendo to have him impeached, I thought, I wonder if the nomination can be brought back. Can it be reviewed after it has left this body? The Supreme Court said, "No." There are cases on that point. So this is a solemn business, Mr. President. We will never get it back, once it is done. If it is a mistake, we will have to live with it. And so it ill becomes us, of course, to be anything but sporting and fair and we must be entirely without venality and malice and willfulness.

It did not make me feel very happy to have a Member of this body quoted in the press recently to the effect that there were a few willful Members in the Senate. I had made up my mind on the question at that time, but I resent being called willful. I do not care who uses that language, whether it is a Member of the Senate or anybody else. I have reached an age of discretion. I have reached—God willing—an age of restraint, and so I hope we will not demean each other at a moment when we have a solemn responsibility by saying that some Member of the Senate is willful, or that some group is willful.

Mr. President, there was a President who, a good many years ago, referred to a group in the Senate as "willful and irreconcilable." Perhaps they were: But they went over the country and carried

the gospel and made that President eat his words before he got through. We cannot afford to have that kind of attitude in the Senate. Senators have fought other nominations, in other days. A few nights ago I was much interested when I read what Henry Clay said on the floor of the Senate about the nomination of Martin Van Buren to be Ambassador of the United States to Great Britain. There were a number of reasons why Clay opposed him, but the one that really entranced me was, as he said on this floor, that Martin Van Buren had espoused a political philosophy which called for the dismissal of people from the public service because of their politics. It was at that time that William L. Marcy, the Senator from New York, took the floor and coined the expression, "To the victor belong the spoils of the enemy." That was the first time it was uttered in the Senate, in 1832.

Other nominations, I assume, will be opposed; this will be neither the first one nor the last one.

An important consideration is, how much good will, how much confidence, will go with Mr. Bohlen if he becomes our emissary to Moscow? We know how the people feel about the Yalta agreement and that enters into the question of confidence. We cannot get away from it.

First of all, Mr. President, we made a recital in our platform of 1952. I am one of those who believe that a platform is a covenant with the people. That is a borrowed phrase. It came from the Democratic platform of 1932. In their platform, I may admonish Senators on the other side, it was said, "a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept." The only trouble is that, 30 days afterward, the Democratic Party threw it out the window, and it has not been discovered from that day to this. But nonetheless a platform is a covenant to be kept with the people. And, in the covenant, in 1952, we said:

The Government of the United States, under Republican leadership, will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings, such as those at Yalta, which aid Communist enslavements.

I campaigned on that platform, as did the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], whose fighting qualities and militant attributes I like. Herman, I love you. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] also campaigned on that platform. I was in 25 of the States in 1952, and I campaigned at that time with most of the Senators who are now present. And what a great and enriching privilege it really was.

I have approved and voted for all the President's nominations to his Cabinet, and I do not lightly, of course, oppose the pending nomination. My attitude toward the nomination is a matter of conviction with me. And it is impersonal. I know "Chip" Bohlen. He is a very charming and affable person. I know Mrs. Bohlen. We first met in Philadelphia a good many years ago in the course of a so-called seminar, when there was a national radio hookup. He was there, I was there, Clare Luce was there, Harold Stassen was there. We fairly made the welkin ring that night,

and I think we solved every domestic and international problem under the canopy of heaven. We had a grand visit, and I was fairly entranced when I heard Mr. Bohlen mesh a whole string of unrelated consonants into something that must have been intelligible in the Russian language. It cannot be denied that he is a great linguist; he is charming, he is personable, and I am confident that he is able. But there is something more than that that challenges our attention. We have to think of him as associated with an incident in our time and generation, and on that ground I intend to vote against the confirmation of his nomination.

Most of the attention has been given to what he will do when he gets over on the other side. I am more interested in the amount of American confidence that goes with him when he leaves for Moscow. The first line of defense in this country is not on the Rhine, it is not on the Yangtze, it is not in Indochina or Korea: the first line is here in America. It lies in our productive strength. It lies in the emotional and moral and spiritual harmony of the American people; and when that goes, then it would not make any difference if we sent St. Peter to Moscow, our line would be lacking in a very important element. So, what about the American people?

The Yalta agreement was one of the things we talked about in the campaign. I do not want to go back on what we said in our platform, and I will not go back on it. We said we would repudiate that agreement. We mentioned it specifically. There is no guesswork about it, there is no equivocation about the language. I accept it as a part of the political platform of my party, and so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to go back on it, because if it is repudiated, then we lose a great and vital and potential force. Do not be concerned about November 1954, my brethren. The issues will probably be altogether different by that time. But the one thing we have got to do is to hew to the line of moral conviction, we must never let it go out to the American people that we solemnly said one thing and that we so quickly threw it overboard, because that would be our undoing.

So we repudiated Yalta. We should have repudiated it, and should stand by that commitment for reasons best described by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Last week, Mr. President, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of the signing of the treaty with Riga. Everyone concurred in that treaty. But we asked no Pole to attend the Yalta Conference. There Poland was simply carved up and eviscerated, without a single Pole being present. I disavow it. I want no part of that kind of morality. I think the least a person can do is to repudiate, reject, and disavow anything like that. It took 2 years and 1 month for the State Department to get its message out in mimeographed form and signed, to show what had happened at Yalta. There we solemnly agreed to carve up Poland and take one-third of the Polish population and hand them over to the Soviet Union, into the brutal and bloody bosom of

Stalin. That is where they are today, along with other Polish people. We have to repudiate that agreement.

I want to say to my friend from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that I think he has rendered great service in laboring with the documentation of that record. I think it was necessary, and it was a very constructive public service.

If Senators will read the Rape of Poland, they will find on page 96 the deal was made in the presence of Averell Harriman and Molotov. Churchill said the deal was made at Cairo, and was ratified at Yalta. We cannot escape the record.

When it comes to China, there were no Chinese at Yalta. It became our bitter responsibility to tell them afterward. We agreed formally in writing to inform them and get their concurrence.

As we read the protocol, what do we find? We find one little sentence, the language of which we used in a number of specifications in that protocol. Here it is:

The preeminent interest of the Soviet Union in this port will be safeguarded.

That is what Hopkins, Harriman, and Stettinius agreed to; that is what Hiss agreed to, and "Chip" Bohlen was there. Do not forget it—Russia's preeminent interest in Port Arthur, Dairen, the China and Eastern Railroad, and the Manchurian Railroad shall be safeguarded.

We finally closed the door which John Hay and William McKinley opened 55 years ago. We closed it, and, furthermore, we agreed to keep it closed. There is the solemn language, in all its naked brutality, to haunt us.

There is no need of further laboring Yalta. It has been treated eloquently on this floor, and I see no reason why I should further labor it. But I come to the crux of it now. If we are going to disavow Yalta, how can we accept the architect? If the architecture must be rejected, how can we accept the architect? If we reject the structure, how can we accept the builder? If we reject the stone, how can we accept the man who hewed and fashioned the stone?

The Senator from Michigan said, and I hope I quote him correctly, that this is not a post with policy power. I am amazed that an ambassador and minister plenipotentiary does not have some policy power. On the executive calendar we see the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

If he has no policy power, we can send anyone there. If he has no policy power, maybe a clerk or a good administrator would do.

But that is not the crux of the matter, in my judgment. The Senator from Michigan said Mr. Bohlen will play no major role. That, in my judgment, is inconsequential. The dimension or the degree of his responsibility at Yalta is of no moment, although the record indicates that he was not only an interpreter, but was also an adviser. What is of importance to me—and this is the reason why I shall vote against confirmation—is that he has been associated with one of the greatest disasters in Ameri-

can diplomatic history. He has been associated with one of the greatest diplomatic failures in the history of the world. He has had emotional association with it and intellectual identity with it. He was there. How much he was there is not of any moment. He was there and was a part of it. If we are going to repudiate Yalta, then we should repudiate every one of the Yalta men.

Mr. President, would we vote for Harry Hopkins if his nomination were before us? Would we vote for Harriman? Would we vote for Hiss? Not I.

I do not put "Chip" Bohlen in that class, Mr. President. I like him. I think he is a man of character. But he was there; he had an association with the conference. How can we repudiate Yalta in one breath and say in the next breath that he has been cleansed and that, psychologically, it is of no moment? It is a psychological value with which we are dealing today. Do not forget that the mistakes of the past are the traps of the future. Once we have made a blunder and followed through, we have to defend it. That has been the logic of the State Department. Go back and read the white paper on China, containing 1,100 pages. It is very edifying. It is the greatest apologia in American history. When the Yalta mistake was made, the State Department had to defend it; they had to go through with it. There was no going back. What will Mr. Bohlen do in Moscow when this matter comes up? Will he do an about-face? Certainly not, if he is true to what he thinks are the key human instincts which we all have. The defense of Yalta becomes a trap into which we shall fall in the days ahead. We have got to divest ourselves of it.

Whether "Chip" Bohlen served under Franklin Roosevelt or Harry Truman is of no moment. I think he began his career under President Hoover. But that is not a matter that should have any consideration, because Bohlen is a career diplomat. Whether he disavowed Yalta or not is of no great moment. I am thinking of the psychological impact of this nomination upon the thinking of the American people in an hour of distress and anxiety.

I do not like to have my people at home read the newspapers and say, "Well, I see that our Senator voted to confirm the nomination of a man who was associated with Yalta, actively and otherwise. Are they not going to do what they promised to do prior to November? Are they not going to give us a little new life, new vitality, and new viewpoint?"

"Chip" Bohlen was at Yalta. If he were my brother, I would take the same attitude I am expressing in the Senate this afternoon. He was associated with the failure.

Mr. President, in the language of Missouri, the tail has to go with the hide. I reject Yalta, so I reject Yalta men. If I see "Chip" Bohlen around, I am sure there will be no change or alteration in the personal esteem and sentiment I cherish for him. But he was associated with something that was characterized by William C. Bullitt, a former Ambassador to Russia, as one of the most unnecessary, disgraceful, and potentially

disastrous documents ever to be signed by a President of the United States. That was what "Bill" Bullitt said with respect to the Yalta protocol.

"Chip" Bohlen, good fellow that he is, was at Yalta. That is unfortunate, but we are thinking of the people and of the impact of his nomination upon the folks back home.

Do not forget that while the people of the Nation were voting into office a Republican President, a Republican Senate, and a Republican House, they were voting out of office an administration, and all that went with it, that had somehow left them faint and weary in their convictions. They wanted to have clear thinking. Here was a chance to cleanse the temple.

I am sorry I have become hortatory about this matter. I am speaking, I hope, mainly for myself, because it is the business of each Senator how he votes. I am merely stating the simple premises by which I have come to my conclusion.

I may say to my good friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], "be not weary in well doing," because in my opinion we have a good function to perform. Besides, what kind of Senate would this be, what kind of country would this be, if there were no dissonance of spirit? There is one place where there is no dissonance, and that is Russia. God forbid that the Senate of the United States should reach the stage where we would all think through the same medium, through the same funnel, as it were, and all come up with the same conclusion. That would not be worthy of America. Let conscience and conviction have free play. Let heart and mind speak. While we are thinking about the man who goes as our Ambassador to the Soviet Union, let us think also of how much of the confidence of the American people will go with him. I should have preferred that someone else had been nominated.

So, while I reaffirm my affection for the President and my support of him and of Secretary Dulles, I cannot go along, and I will not go along with this nomination. I must let my convictions speak.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, it seems to me there is one point that could be appropriately added at this time to the discussion in regard to the confirmation of Mr. Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia. I believe this point needs to be made clear, and I should like to discuss it briefly, based on my experience of a little more than 1 year as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece in 1947 and 1948.

I feel that the people of the United States should know that we are not today being asked to confirm the nomination of a man who will formulate our Russian policy. Ambassadors to foreign countries are in large part reporters of what they see, hear, and feel in their particular outposts. By force of circumstance, our international policies must be made in Washington, and in the hectic world in which we live today, those policies must be made by the President of the United States. He requires help. He requires advice, and he needs

intelligent reports from the different embassies scattered all over the globe.

The development of international policy involves proper consideration of our military strength, our economic strength, and the international political situation.

An Ambassador can be useful, but he cannot formulate international policies. Anyone who feels that an Ambassador can do this does not understand the operations of the State Department, and certainly he does not understand the character and mentality of Mr. Dulles or the outstanding ability of President Eisenhower.

I did not fully understand this situation when I arrived in Greece in the summer of 1947. I had been accustomed to making decisions, and I expected in Greece to make more decisions than I actually did. When I began to see the full picture of what we were attempting in Greece, I saw that the decisions to be made depended greatly upon what was happening in Yugoslavia, in Turkey, and throughout the whole Middle East; but they also depended upon what was occurring in Germany and in China. Necessarily, the major decisions needed to be made by our Government in Washington.

By the traditions of the State Department, Ambassadors report to Washington and ask for instructions. I believe this tradition has been carried too far and that Ambassadors are not being given enough authority. I am hoping that Mr. Dulles will change this situation.

I remember well an early initiation which I received. A so-called political crisis occurred in Greece and the then Ambassador to that country and I, as head of the Military and Economic Aid Mission, held a conference to decide what our attitude should be. We were in full agreement and reached a decision. I rose and started to leave the room, making the remark that I would visit with a few men whom I knew quite well. But the Ambassador amazed me by saying that he would report our conversation to the State Department and ask for advice. I thought we had reached a decision and were ready for action, but I found that that is not the way the State Department operates.

In major matters, however, it is absolutely necessary that the decisions be made here in Washington.

Again referring to my experience in Greece, in the early days of my mission the military people in my group were equipping and assisting in training the Greek army. In the early fall of that year, I recommended that they be given additional authority so that they could also advise the Greek army in the field of operations. This was a major change in the foreign policy of the United States Government, and, very properly, the State Department, to whom I sent this advice, took it up at the highest level with the Chiefs of Staff and with the President, and it was only after a serious investigation and approval by the National Security Council that the plan was approved. A decision of that type was a considerable change in our policies and required the approval of the highest au-

thorities in our Government. No Ambassador and no chief of any mission should on his own authority make changes of that type.

Based on my experience, I can assure the Members of the Senate and the people of the United States that if Mr. Bohlen is confirmed as Ambassador, he will not be formulating our policies in connection with Russia.

In the Senate of the United States there are many men who will have much more to do with our Russian foreign policy than Mr. Bohlen can possibly have. Our distinguished majority leader, the able leader of the minority in this body, the chairman and the senior members of the Foreign Relations Committee, of the Appropriations Committee, of the Armed Services Committee, all of these men will have much to do with it by their official actions and by their advice; they will have much more to do with formulating our Russian policies than can possibly be done by any Ambassador residing in Moscow.

We are fortunate to have as President of the United States a man who fully understands the international situation. He will need the advice of his extremely able Secretary of State; and those of us who have visited with Mr. Dulles are constantly amazed by his great knowledge, by his grasp of the details of the different international treaties, and by his vision and imagination in international matters.

In formulating our policy with Russia the President will undoubtedly require the advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff. He will undoubtedly consult with our Under Secretary of State, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who has both a knowledge of our military strength and an extensive knowledge of Russia based on his experience as Ambassador to that country. The President of the United States will also need a full knowledge of our economic strength, which certainly he can get from other members of his Cabinet. He will, of course, need reports from an intelligent Ambassador in Moscow; but I say again that the policies will be established by one man and one man only, the President of the United States.

The new administration has sent a new and able Ambassador to Great Britain in the person of Mr. Aldrich. But actually the same situation prevails there. Our policies with respect to Great Britain will not be established by Mr. Aldrich; and I believe that fact is well proved by the recent visit to this country of Mr. Eden and Mr. Butler, who came here to visit directly with the President, with the Secretary of State, with the Secretary of the Treasury, and other important men in the new administration.

The new administration has sent a new Ambassador to France, in the person of Mr. Dillon; but the same situation prevails there. He will not formulate our policies with respect to France; and I believe that fact is proved by the circumstance that this very day we have visiting in this country the Premier and the Foreign Minister of France, who are meeting directly with the President, with our Secretary of State, and with other United States officials.

The decisions to be made in regard to our relations with Russia are the most important decisions that our administration will make. Reports will be coming into the State Department from Korea, from Japan, from Formosa, from India, from Iran, from all over Europe, and, of course, from Moscow.

There is only one place where the reports reaching our Government can be coordinated, and that is in Washington.

I personally believe it is best to appoint American businessmen or American political leaders to the important Embassies. The Foreign Service serves a very useful purpose in advising these Ambassadors. In other countries, the Ambassadors publicly meet and visit with businessmen and with political leaders in all walks of life. In Moscow, as I understand, that is not possible. Perhaps the best man we can send to Moscow is one who speaks the Russian language and can pick up some information by virtue of his knowledge of Russia and its language.

Certain Senators feel that they must vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen because he had some part in the so-called Truman-Acheson foreign policies.

The viewpoint is understandable to those of us who have gone through the recent political campaign, but I wish to point out—and this is directed to my Republican brethren—that the 1952 election is over. I believe it safe even for a freshman Senator to advise his fellow Republicans that Mr. Truman will not be the Democratic candidate for President in 1956.

In view of the fact that our Democratic colleagues did not mention Mr. Acheson's name at their recent national convention, I think it fairly safe to assume that Mr. Acheson will not be the Democratic candidate for President in 1956.

It is proper for a party in opposition to bring to light the mistakes of the administration in power, but I cannot believe there is much to be gained by us, as Republicans, from rattling the old bones of the Truman-Acheson administration. We must be thinking, instead, of how we can best serve the people of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, these are times that try men's souls. Decisions do not come easy. Facts are very elusive.

I have listened to and read everything that has been said on the floor of the Senate for and against Mr. Bohlen. I have likewise read many newspaper articles about this nomination.

At first it occurred to me that possibly the President had made a bad appointment. I continually thought until yesterday that possibly the President, due to the great amount of work before him each day and the pressure under which any President must operate, had not given the thought and consideration to the Bohlen nomination which he might otherwise have given. I first thought that he might have left the selection to others and that they, in their enthusiasm for one who had been in the Department for twenty-odd years, had recommended Mr. Bohlen to the President.

However, Members of the Senate—and rightfully so—called the Bohlen matter to the attention not only of the Senate but of the President and the American people.

This gave the President the opportunity to reconsider the entire Bohlen matter. I am certain the President did reconsider.

I was convinced that the President had fully and thoroughly considered all aspects of the Bohlen nomination when the President yesterday said he knew Mr. Bohlen; had visited in Mr. Bohlen's home; knew Mr. Bohlen's family; had played golf with Mr. Bohlen; and that he was satisfied that Mr. Bohlen was the best qualified man to represent the President in Moscow.

I am certain that he reconsidered the nomination after Members of this body called to the President's attention and to the attention of the American people certain circumstances involved in the career record of Mr. Bohlen.

Therefore, I shall vote for Mr. Bohlen's nomination with the knowledge that the President has had ample opportunity to reconsider his nomination and with the knowledge that the American people have been informed of the entire history and background of Mr. Bohlen.

The responsibility of serving the American people well in Moscow is now up to the President, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Bohlen himself. They will have my full cooperation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, day before yesterday I made a brief impromptu statement with respect to the pending nomination. There was some misunderstanding about one statement which I made. Some Members have come to me and asked me what I meant when I said that I waited until after the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee on the morning of day before yesterday. They have interpreted my statement as indicating that some particular thing occurred in the Foreign Relations Committee day before yesterday which finally resolved my doubts.

I wish to make it clear that such is not the case. What I meant was that I waited until all the avenues of information had been explored, which included the final meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee on the morning of the day before yesterday. That was the last function, the last hearing, the last presentation. I waited until it was all over. I wish to dispel any misinterpretation which may have been current as a result of my statement day before yesterday.

Mr. President, let me give a little further amplification of my reasons—many important reasons—for voting against Mr. Bohlen's nomination. As I said the other day, I have the utmost respect for the President and for the Secretary of State. I have known them both for a long time. Nothing would be more pleasing to me than to be able to support every action they take administratively. It is not easy, especially for a Republican who has been on the losing side nationally for a great many years—ever since his political life began—to vote against a nomination of this kind. I make no criticism of the attitude of any

other Member of this body. Every Senator must rationalize or act in accordance with the way in which the facts appeal to him. I give each Senator full credit for acting sincerely and according to his own conscience.

Mr. President, not only last year, but 2 years before that, and 4 years before that, I, too, went up and down the States of the United States. I condemned the sellout at Yalta with all the force I could command. I not only condemned it, but I condemned the judgment of the men who, as I have said time and again, in their stupidity brought these diplomatic disasters to the United States and sorrow to the world, at a time when we had hoped to have peace. I said to my people in Iowa and I said to people in other sections of the United States that, so far as I am concerned, those who had any substantial part in the nefarious operations at Yalta must go, and that I would do everything I could in my power to see that they did go.

Mr. President, in my judgment the President and Mr. Dulles do not approve of the secret Yalta agreements with regard to the disposal of the property of other nations in various parts of the world. I am sure they do not agree and that they do not condone, and, in fact, that they condemn, the agreements. By the same token, I am convinced that the President and Mr. Dulles do not believe that Mr. Bohlen had an influential part in reaching the momentous decisions at Yalta. I believe they are convinced that Mr. Bohlen did not have such a part.

But in reading the RECORD, not only of the past few days, but what Mr. Bohlen has stated time and time again, beginning in 1946, it appears that he has defended his activities at Yalta, he has defended almost in terms of a brilliant diplomatic victory what I consider to be a diplomatic disaster, and he has criticized severely those who have criticized what was done at Yalta. I know in my own mind at least that at Yalta he was one of the motivating influences which laid out the pattern on which those agreements were made. I am certain that he was one of the men who was convinced that we must get Russia into the war by any possible means, and therefore he was one of the important experts who guided the destiny of this country at the time. I am convinced of that, Mr. President. I am sorry I cannot agree with other Senators who are not so convinced, or who are convinced the other way; but that is my conviction.

I have said to the people of my own State and to the people of the Nation as a whole that we must have no one in a responsible position who took part in bringing about the disasters in the late days and at the close of the war.

I do not criticize anyone else, but I could not in my own mind and in my own conscience vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, because I would be in the position of having promised one thing to the people to whom I talked last year and doing the opposite at the first opportunity to act upon the proposition. I could not bring myself to do that.

Mr. President, much argument has been had on the floor and various reasons have been presented. I do not necessarily associate myself with any of them, and I do not necessarily disassociate myself from any of them.

There may be some other reasons which, cumulatively, strengthen my conviction that I should vote against this nomination, but it is good and sufficient at this time for me to say that I have pledged my word, on the public platform and otherwise, that I would do all I could to rid our Government and its officialdom from the canker of the Yalta stupidity and of those who had anything to do with it. Therefore, when the time comes to vote, I shall vote to keep my word as I understand I have given it to the people, and I shall, though with great regret, have to vote against the nomination, because I believe it is the only thing I can do.

Mr. President, I do not follow the philosophy that Mr. Bohlen is the only man in the United States who is able to represent the United States at Moscow. I have never followed the indispensable-man theory; I do not believe in it. I believe there are many men in this country who are fully capable of giving us adequate representation in Moscow. But that is beside the point. Were it not for the fact that honorable conduct demands that I vote my own conviction, I could very well rationalize. Had I said nothing last fall or over the past years, had I not been critical of those who led us into this diplomatic trap, had I said nothing about it, had I not pledged my word that I would do my best to sanitize the diplomatic situation if it could be done, then I might easily rationalize and say that, because the heads of our Government desire to appoint this individual, I will go along and place the responsibility on them. But I am only assuming this afternoon the responsibility in conscience that I believe is mine, and which I believe is mine alone to exercise; and, therefore, with the deep regret that I must do so, I shall vote "nay" on this nomination.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from South Dakota has taken no part in this debate up to this time. I have been trying to do my best to winnow the wheat from the chaff, to try to add up the arguments on both sides and to arrive at a decision which I consider to be both consistent and constructive.

It happens that the senior Senator from South Dakota was a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; as a member of the majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee during the 80th Congress, when action by our committee at that time, and for the first time, forced the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, over his bitter resistance, to give the American public its first glimpse as to what actually was contained in the Yalta agreement. He had come to the House, as the body of the Congress which first passes upon appropriation bills, and to the committee of Congress which deals with foreign affairs, to present to us his request for appropriations for what was then known as Greek-Turkish aid, a program which I thought to be wise then and which I now think was

wise, a program which, as I look backward, has served the American people well.

Secretary Acheson had come to us asking for funds to implement the program. The Republican majority of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs decided in a one-party caucus that while in the main our committee would go along with the program, it provided an opportunity to decide whether or not American foreign policy shall be determined in the open or in secret, and whether or not Members of Congress and the country had a right to know anything about the Yalta agreement, which everyone was then discussing, but which no one in Congress then really knew anything about.

Action by our committee was held up for about 2 weeks, until finally, reluctantly, Secretary of State Acheson said he would disclose the terms of the Yalta agreement. The first disclosure was then made, and subsequent disclosures have been made since, until now pretty well most of the public knows most of what was done at Yalta.

The Senator from South Dakota has been more or less quarreling with that Yalta agreement from that early day, and the more he learned about it, the more violently he began to quarrel with its conclusions. Its secret commitments were what I consider to be an outright betrayal, not only of American interests, but of the interests of the entire free world.

Consequently, now being confronted with a decision, as each Senator is confronted, to give his advice and to grant his consent to the Executive on the appointment of an ambassador, I must ask myself some questions.

Does it mean anything in the Constitution of the United States when it says the Senate is to advise and to consent to nominations, or does it mean nothing at all? I am one who believes that the Constitution of the United States does not contain superfluous language, but that everything written in the Constitution was written therein for a purpose. I believe all of us have a responsibility as Senators when we are confronted with the challenge of what it is that we are going to advise and what it is to which we are going to give our consent as executive appointments are made. Since we have this responsibility, we should measure up to it courageously and with clear convictions. Just as the Secretary of State has a responsibility to suggest to the President, and the President to suggest to us, the names of persons for important posts, each one of us has a responsibility vested in the Constitution, in conformity with his own conviction, and in consonance with his own position, to try to give intelligently that advice and to grant thoughtfully that consent.

I believe the Senator from Iowa is correct when he says the easy thing, the gracious thing, and the politic thing to do, the thing that all of us would like to do because we so admire our President and because we have confidence in him and because we have confidence in his Secretary of State, would be freely and willingly, and without much thought, simply to grant the consent unanimously and to convey vicariously the advice,

"Anything you suggest, sir, will be all right with us."

However, Mr. President, I do not believe that would be as American in character as it would be pleasing in practice. I think we have a greater responsibility. In the long run I believe the President and the Secretary of State will serve the country better if they discover that there are in this body some who will say, "We have this responsibility; and, if necessary, we are going to vote against our party and against those in its leadership in order to carry out what we believe to be our sincere convictions." I believe they like that kind of attitude. I think that type of advice will serve them better.

It seems to me that some of us who are associated with the opposition to the pending nomination may find ourselves, 2 weeks or 3 weeks or 4 weeks later, vigorously, vehemently, and courageously pounding the tom toms for an administration measure which will be opposed by other Republicans, who now are associated with the President's point of view. I hope that is true. I believe that is good Republicanism and good Americanism. I believe it is a wholesomely refreshing change from the situation in the past 20 years, when there was too much of the rubber stamp, too much acceptance of the theory that "the king can do no wrong," when in my opinion there were too many who were willing to go along, rather than to rattle the water, too many who were anxious not to run the risk of encountering the displeasure of a strong Executive.

There are those who say, "It is nice to go along with the White House." I hope to do so in the future many, many times. I hope very frequently to express myself in conformity with the views asserted by the President and the Secretary of State. I hope to be able to do that perhaps 85 percent, 90 percent, or 95 percent of the time.

However, when the President and his Secretary of State arrive at decisions in regard to matters on which a Senator is expected to grant or to withhold consent, I shall exercise my right of opposing those that I believe to be wrong, and I shall exercise that right just as strongly as I shall exercise it in supporting those that I believe to be correct and justified.

I make this statement, Mr. President, without any desire to influence any of my colleagues, without any desire other than to state for the record the reasons for the vote I shall cast on this nomination.

It is easy to be misunderstood in this debate. There have been rumors in the cloakrooms and hints and innuendos around the floor. I know Chip Bohlen; and in voting as I expect to vote, my vote will not mean that I am trying to validate or justify any of the rumors I have heard.

Those who have seen the files of the FBI must assume the responsibility of interpreting what they have seen in those files. I have not seen them. Those who have seen the raw files and who have evaluated them carefully are men of high repute, men for whom I have great admiration. They have the responsibility for the decisions they

have made in reaching conclusions about the files which they have seen. I, myself, am not passing on anything contained in a file which I have not seen. My vote has nothing to do with the questions of security or loyalty insofar as they may reflect upon Chip Bohlen. My vote will not go to matters of his character as reflected in files which I have not seen.

My vote will be cast in part on a matter which has been referred to ad infinitum and ad nauseam in this debate, namely, Yalta. Some Senators have said that we discussed Yalta in 1952; but, Mr. President, I believe we shall be discussing Yalta in the future, too, because it was a tremendous turning point in history; and from the day when we first smoked out, over the entire opposition of the then State Department—then including, I assume, Chip Bohlen; and that action was taken in the 80th Congress—and from the moment when we finally gained the point that Congress has a right at least to have a keyhole look at what is in the Yalta agreement, from then until now I have become increasingly disillusioned about what I have learned about the contents of the Yalta agreement and about the persons who were at Yalta.

It happens that at that time I was chairman of a committee, on which I served along with the present distinguished occupant of the chair, our distinguished Vice President, who, I know, today at least wishes he could be here on the floor of the Senate discussing these matters, instead of holding the distinguished office of Vice President. At that time we had an opportunity to go into various matters in regard to the persons who were at Yalta. One of the authors of the Yalta agreement will not be given the post of Ambassador to Moscow, Mr. President, because he is now in the Federal penitentiary. I refer to Alger Hiss. Part of the work he did was to bring into being the things which are contained in the Yalta agreement.

Please understand me correctly, Mr. President. I make no association between Alger Hiss and Chip Bohlen. The one is a Communist. No one has alleged or hinted, even by innuendo, that the other is. But the point I make, Mr. President, is that we need clear-headed, stout-hearted men in the post at Moscow. Chip Bohlen, who was at Yalta with Hiss, either did not see or did not comprehend, or lacked the power to convince his superiors about the bloody work which was being undertaken at the crossroads by some of the subversive influences at Yalta, including Alger Hiss and a little coterie of four other men whom he had so skillfully trained at Malta for 2 weeks, as they prepared the agenda for the sellout at Yalta.

Certainly, Mr. President, having discussed that matter up and down and throughout the length and breadth of our land, in campaign time and out of it, I see no way by which I can say with honesty and conviction to the President of the United States, "My advice is that this man, who did not see or did not comprehend or did not protest vigorously at Yalta, should be made our Ambassador to Moscow."

I say that with every regard for his ability, his social graces, his education, his patriotism, and his heritage, and without any regard, as I have said, for the talk we have heard bandied around the cloakrooms. But I say that because it seems to me, Mr. President, that a career officer in the Foreign Service is supposed to be a policy-forming man, insofar as giving suggestions to his chiefs is concerned. If there is any place in the world where today we need a policy-forming man, one who can make some suggestions and can give us a new sense of direction and can change capitulations into success, it certainly is with regard to our foreign policy with regard to Russia.

I am sure that anything Chip Bohlen has to offer has been offered long ago. He has been in the Foreign Service all these years. Since 1944 he has been in high office in the State Department. For many years he was chief of the desk which deals with Russian affairs. If he has good advice to give, Mr. President, it has long since been given and rejected. If he has had no good advice to give, he will think of nothing new on this 7th visit that he makes to Moscow. And we need something new; we need something better; we need something more constructive; and we need a foreign policy toward Russian communism which will cease to capitulate to communism and will cease to lead us into wars like Korea and to the brink of wars in other areas of the world. I am sure Bohlen has tried hard. I think he basically is a fine American.

But I point out, Mr. President, in the cruel light of logic, 1 of 2 things must be true: Either Chip Bohlen as an expert in Russian affairs was wrong in his policies, because our policies have been wrong—nobody in all this debate has said, "Well, I think we ought to vote for Chip Bohlen, because our Russian policies are so good, and he is a man who talks Russian, and has been talking to us wisely about Russian policy." Nobody has said that, that I have read, that I have ever heard. I have not read that in the printed testimony. The Secretary of State does not believe that, because he thinks we ought to have a change in our foreign policy; and I agree with him, and I think he is going to bring some splendid constructive changes.

But I point out, Mr. President, that either Bohlen's advice on Russian affairs has been wrong or he is so weak an advocate that his advice has not been followed. I do not care which horn of the dilemma I am compelled to take. If his advice is bad, if it has been bad, I do not want him representing me in Moscow. If his advice is good, but if he is so weak an advocate, so puerile a persuader, so ineffective a proponent for a point of view that for many years he has not been able to sell something fine and constructive and positive and peace-preserving and communism-defeating to the preceding administration or to Congress, I doubt whether he has recently taken any courses on "How to win friends and influence human behavior," which will now enable him to sell what he could not sell during the past two decades.

So I find myself unable to advise, with my lone vote, the President or the Sec-

retary of State, "This is your man," because it seems to me that logic dictates that in some place and in some way he failed in his position; either he failed to map out and bring in and provide good, sound policy suggestions, or, if he did that—and he may have; I do not know—he failed to make suggestions which were convincing enough and persuasive enough to have them adopted, either by the preceding administration, or even to have them presented so far as I know to our present Foreign Relations Committee here in the Senate of the United States.

And so, Mr. President, I say that, simply, but so that my friends at home and in America will know why it is that I am voting against Chip Bohlen. I cannot even say I am voting against Chip Bohlen reluctantly. I do so with confidence in my conviction that I am casting a vote which is correct. I disagree with the President reluctantly. I disagree with the Secretary of State reluctantly. I expect to have to disagree with both some time again. But simply because reluctance is involved, it seems to me, is no reason that we should vacate the responsibilities which we have. And, as I say, I am sure that many of my associates, now, in good conscience, who are voting "yea" on this, on some other issue will vote "nay," when I am voting with the President, and that they will then grant to me what I now grant to them, complete acceptance of their sincere position. Each of us has lived with Yalta a little bit differently. Each of us has had a little different relationship with some of the nefarious characters who sneaked and crept across the Yalta horizon—in my contacts with Alger Hiss, my realization of how hard it was to extract the first glimpse of information out of Yalta, my information of the close cohesion of the then State Department team, each like a member of a Chinese tong, trying to keep anybody outside the State Department clique from knowing what was in the nefarious agreement that has begun to pay off in America; it has led me to disapprove of those who helped shape that section of our foreign policy. There must be others better able and better qualified than Mr. Bohlen, for this important position which he undertakes.

Let me say but one other thing, Mr. President, in disagreement with what some have said here. I believe Chip Bohlen is going to be a better ambassador because of this debate than if we had not had it. I know he is going to be confirmed. He is going to be overwhelmingly confirmed. I cherish the hope that our great gathering of Democratic friends, who, in such near unanimity will vote for Bohlen today, will continue with equal unanimity to vote for the policies of Eisenhower and Dulles, as they come down to us from week to week and month to month. I think that would be fine. But I am not at all disturbed because we have had this ventilating of our disagreements here on the Senate floor. Because some have said, "I am for Chip," some have said, "I am against Chip today," I do not think that that is at all going to weaken him in his capacity in Moscow. If those of us who fear his advice has either been wrong or impotent are in

error, and he does help formulate new and fine and valuable and constructive foreign policy, he will do it, not because of any ability to sell Malenkov and the Politburo ideas, but because of an ability to pick up information and bring it back and help direct the thinking of those who shape foreign policy here. I think, Mr. President, it is good that we have had this debate. I think it is good for two basic reasons. I think it is good that the rest of the world knows that when we meet in the Senate of the United States it is not a meeting of the Czechoslovakian Parliament or of the Presidium in Moscow, where newspapers report "The executive has spoken, and the legislators have automatically and unanimously echoed 'yes'."

That is not going to happen, Mr. President, with a Republican Congress and a Republican Executive, and I am sure that on most issues, in order to avoid unanimity, we are not even going to have to call upon the ever-willing and available Member of our new third party. [Laughter.] I think we are going to find others, on many issues, who will be willing to see to it that the news does not go out that here in the United States a legislative body is simply a unanimous body, even as far as the majority is concerned. I think that is good for the country to understand, and for the world to know, that we are going to have a screening process here, that there are differences of opinion, that men may disagree without becoming disagreeable, that those who agree one day may disagree the next, and then may agree again the third day; that each tries to arrive at a verdict on the basis of the evidence available. I think that is wonderful news, and I hope the Voice of America broadcasts it to the world, that after a bitter, grueling debate, the Ambassador to Moscow was confirmed by an overwhelming vote—which he surely will be—and that a small handful of what may well be dubbed "die-hards, and willful men"—I suppose we will be so-called—voted in opposition. I think it is good. I hope we have more of it. And I think it is good for a second reason, Mr. President, and that is, I think it good now for the country, here, to know that Republican majorities working with a Republican Executive are thoughtful, analytical, and, I hope, a reasonable majority; but they are not majorities that are whiplashed into action, that can be pushed around, so that it can be decided on Monday what they will be expected to do on Friday; that Republican majorities are majorities that can be persuaded by reason, and which have a proclivity to cooperation, and which are reasonably open to logical arguments. But I think it is good for the country to know that rubber-stamp government in America died when President Eisenhower took office, and that we are not going to have—and I am sure we are not going to have from our distinguished majority leader—pleas that the Republican majority support a particular point of view because of blind partisanship. With all his capacity of logic, with his great ability to think things through, he probably will persuade us many times against our will, but not because he says, "This is the thing to

do, because you belong to the same club or the same team or the same party."

I think that is a refreshing deviation from something which has been occurring, in my opinion, alarmingly for 2 decades, something which, as a member of the minority, I criticized frequently among the members on the other side during our last two administrations, and on which, in simple honesty, I am sure I have not changed my position, now that I am a member of a majority, which I hope will long continue to maintain its majority position in America for many, many years.

Also, Mr. President, I think this debate will have a salutary effect on Mr. Bohlen after his confirmation and while he is in Russia. Chip Bohlen will know that here in the Senate he is being carefully watched by some who voted against his confirmation but who wish him well. He knows our skepticisms and our reasons for them. He knows our doubts and what gave rise to them. He knows he can expect from us friendly but also firm and constructive criticism if his activities prove ineffective or ill-advised. He knows, also, that we shall join in supporting him in any programs, plans, or policies which give promise to weaken communism and give fresh hope and strength to the free world and a promise of peace for all mankind.

So, Mr. President, without trying to persuade anyone, I want my vote to be understood. I want to be understood as one who expects to support the man whom I consider a great President, for whom I did a considerable amount of work in the campaign, and a Secretary of State who, I think, has started out splendidly. I find no fault with any of his early policy decisions. I hope he becomes one of our great American Secretaries of State. I say that because it seems to me that in good conscience and in clear consistence, I must support a policy which I began to enunciate in the Republican 80th Congress and by so doing vote against Chip Bohlen for the reasons I have given.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have followed the debate, pro and con, to the best of my ability. I have studied all the testimony I have been able to find relating to the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Russia, and I cannot find that Mr. Bohlen is guilty, from the mere fact that he has been employed in the State Department, or from the mere fact that he was in attendance at Yalta. I condemned Yalta in the past campaign.

I have condemned the reaction of our State Department and our administrative officials of the Government who were present at the Yalta Conference. I shall not go into detail as to why I condemned the Yalta agreement. That has been very ably discussed on both sides of the issue. But I cannot find that Mr. Bohlen is guilty by the mere fact that he has been employed in our diplomatic service. Surely, Mr. President, a man who has served mankind all his adult years, as President Eisenhower has, could not in any sense have overlooked any facts in the record of Mr. Bohlen, if there were any facts which show that Mr. Bohlen has been responsible for any

of the shortcomings of the Yalta agreement.

I have reached my conclusion after having studied all the facts, knowing that the Foreign Relations Committee, after a lengthy study, finally agreed and voted unanimously to report favorably the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, though it is true that one member of the committee withdrew his support of Mr. Bohlen after the Foreign Relations Committee approved his nomination. Later, when there was some question as to what might be contained in the FBI files concerning Mr. Bohlen, two distinguished Members of this body, the majority leader [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], examined the FBI files and reported to us that they did not find within those files any justification for rejecting the nomination of Mr. Bohlen. Considering that fact and the fact that Mr. Dulles, our Secretary of State, a great international lawyer, who has served his country and the Government so well has found nothing in the FBI files that would convince him that the nomination of Mr. Bohlen should be rejected, it is my pleasure, Mr. President, to support and to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Russia.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, many Senators have expressed a desire to vote. Some of them have told me that they hoped we might have a vote because they would like to leave town over the weekend. If any Senator has any remarks on the subject, I hope they will be brief. I do not want to cut anyone off.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I desire to give my reasons why I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, and I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record a brief statement giving my reasons.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Charles Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia. In casting my vote for Mr. Bohlen I want it understood that I am in nowise approving all of his views on foreign policy and his argument made before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate in support of the actions of President Roosevelt at Yalta and the other conferences where international executive agreements were entered into by the President.

I am accepting at face value the explanation of Secretary Dulles that Mr. Bohlen will not be in a policy-forming position when he is made Ambassador—that he will be simply acting as a career diplomat who is sent to observe and learn what he can in Russia and report what he learns to the Secretary of State and President of the United States, and that on the positive side his duties are to carry such messages as this Government wants conveyed to the Government of Russia.

I have read carefully Mr. Bohlen's statement to the committee supporting the Yalta agreement. The argument is far from convincing. The Yalta agreement was to all intents and purposes a treaty which, under the Constitution, should have been submitted to the Senate of the United States for approval or disapproval. That there were in such agreement some matters which were proper to be disposed of in executive agreement does not alter that fact.

It is my considered opinion that the failure on the part of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman to observe the Constitution of the United States has been a heavy contributing factor to our international troubles and emergence of Russia as a dire threat to the peace of the world. Framers of the Constitution wisely provided a check on the actions of the President in making treaties. It may be inconvenient at times for Presidents to submit agreements which are in effect treaties, to the Senate, but that inconvenience, great as it may be considered at the time, should not outweigh the very real need for a check on the President as provided in the Constitution.

I believe Mr. Bohlen has the technical qualifications for the position of Ambassador. Nothing has been brought to the attention of the Senate which would indicate that he is in any sense disloyal to his country. Neither has there been any competent evidence, so far as I know, that indicates that he is a bad security risk. President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, seem to be convinced that he is the best possible man available for the job. I want to cooperate in helping the new administration to carry out its policies. Under the circumstances I can see no good reason why I should not vote to approve Mr. Bohlen. On the other hand, there are strong reasons why a vote of approval should be given.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Green	McCarthy
Barrett	Griswold	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Hunt	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Schoepfel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smathers
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
Gillette	Martin	Wiley
Goldwater	Maybank	Williams
Gore	McCarran	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, it was my intention to address the Senate this afternoon on the subject of the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be United States Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But I wanted to cooperate with the distinguished majority leader, who was desirous to have a vote as early as possible. Thus, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, immediately preceding the vote, the remarks I had intended to offer for the consideration of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

With some reluctance, I am casting my vote for the confirmation of Charles E. Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia.

It is not merely "blind" faith to follow the leadership of the President of the United States in an Executive nomination. President Eisenhower and his associates have all the facts on Mr. Bohlen, and they have repeatedly reaffirmed their faith in their interpretation of these facts. The basic issue, then, is this:

Does the Senate have faith that intelligent and intellectually honest men in the executive branch know whether a nominee to high office is capable of carrying out his duties in a loyal and efficient manner? My own answer is that I must have that faith, or I greatly weaken my confidence in orderly government and substitute instead a philosophy which subscribes to an improvisation of our constitutional system. As a Senator, with many legislative duties to perform, I have not the time to do all the President's investigating for him in the matter of Executive nominations, nor is it within my jurisdiction so to do.

Mr. Bohlen was at Yalta, and he later testified to the Senate, "We tried to do the best we could with what I think were the instrumentalities available to President Roosevelt." He is evidently not a security risk, even in the eyes of his most vigorous opponents. Thus, my reluctance to support his confirmation wholeheartedly is based solely upon his previous associations with, and acquiescence in, the worst aspects of the Roosevelt-Truman foreign policy, especially when one considers that former Ambassador George Kennan did not allow his position as a Foreign Service career officer to stop him from sounding off publicly against Secretary Dulles' opinions of the old foreign policy of containment.

Torn as I am, my decision to vote for confirmation is rooted in my abiding faith in government by law and order, within the spirit of the Constitution, a belief in a government of laws rather than a government of men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

Mr. TAFT and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] would each vote "yea."

I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is absent on official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr.

HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—74

Anderson	Griswold	Millikin
Barrett	Hayden	Morse
Beall	Hendrickson	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bush	Hill	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Capehart	Ives	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kerr	Sparkman
Duff	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Symington
Ellender	Kuchel	Taft
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Gore	Maybank	Young
Green	McClellan	

NAYS—13

Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Schoepfel
Dirksen	Malone	Welker
Dworshak	McCarran	
Goldwater	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—9

Aiken	George	Langer
Clements	Humphrey	Monroney
Daniel	Jenner	Smith, N. C.

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of this nomination.

NOMINATIONS FOR PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have lie on the desk a group of officers' promotions below the rank of general officer or flag officer. I also send to the desk and ask to have printed on the Executive Calendar a group of flag and general officer promotions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be received. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The nominations reported by Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, or held at the desk, are as follows:

Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted, for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army; placed on the calendar; Maj. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve

commissioned officers of the Army; placed on the calendar;

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Air University, with rank of lieutenant general; placed on the calendar;

Lt. Gen. James Harold Doolittle, and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force; placed on the calendar;

Brig. Gen. Leonard Ewing Thomas, and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force; placed on the calendar.

Thomas Gabriel Hepner, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force; ordered to be held at the desk.

David A. Broad, and sundry other officers for permanent appointment in the Navy; and Norma C. Furtos, and sundry other officers for permanent promotion in the Navy; ordered to be held at the desk.

Vice Adm. Francis S. Low, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Western Sea Frontier, and commander, Pacific Reserve Fleet;

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 (Operations);

Vice Adm. James Fife, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as United States naval deputy commander in chief, Mediterranean;

Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air);

Rear Adm. Roscoe F. Good, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics); and

William O. Brice, and sundry other officers for permanent and temporary appointment in the Marine Corps; placed on the calendar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed immediately following the list of officers a brief statement which I shall not read, but which is explanatory of the promotions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from South Dakota would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services when it is proposed to bring up for consideration the list of Reserve officers which he has just submitted?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my colleague and committeeman that I intend to bring them up when the Executive Calendar is considered on Monday.

Mr. CASE. I thank the chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

The majority of these nominations consists of 374 names ranging from commissioned warrant officer to commander in the Navy or major in the Air Force. I ask that these names not be printed in the Executive Calendar, but be permitted to lie on the Vice President's desk for examination by

Members of the Senate until the next call of the Executive Calendar.

The remaining nominations consist of names of 197 flag and general officers, and I request that their names be printed in the Executive Calendar.

Of this number, only 21 actual promotions are involved—2 brigadier generals and 3 colonels from the Reserve components of the Army and Air Force, 6 brigadier generals and 9 colonels in the Marine Corps, and 1 rear admiral from the Navy.

The remaining 176 include 5 transfers of 3-star officers from one 3-star position to another of equal rank, and 171 reappointments of general officers in the Army and Air Force Reserve.

The reappointment of these 171 Reserve officers involves no promotion or advance in grade—the individuals already hold the grades to which they are being nominated.

However, present commissions were granted to them under the terms of the National Defense Act of 1916, which limited such appointments to periods of 5 years as contrasted with the indefinite-term appointments used by the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve.

In an effort to standardize the methods of appointment in the various Reserve components the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 did away with the 5-year Army and Air Force Reserve commission and required that such appointments be made for an indefinite term. It is this requirement of the law which accounts for the substantial number of these names now before the Senate for consideration.

I think it would be helpful at this point in the record to insert the pertinent provisions of section 224 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act. The language reads as follows:

"Sec. 224. After the date of enactment of this act, all appointments of Reserve officers shall be for an indefinite term. * * * Each such officer not holding an appointment for an indefinite term on the date of enactment of this act shall be given an opportunity for an indefinite term in lieu of his current appointment if such officer, after written notification by competent authority which shall be given within 6 months from the effective date of this act, shall agree in writing to have his current appointment continued for an indefinite term."

With respect to the qualifications of the officers recommended for indefinite term Reserve appointments, I wish to make it perfectly clear that these individuals are already holding commissions in the identical ranks, but that their present commissions terminate either on April 1 or at the end of a 5-year period. The transition from the 5-year appointment to the indefinite term appointment is purely for the purpose of complying with the Armed Forces Reserve Act and was not intended by the Congress to be a device for reexamining the qualifications of all of the officers of the Reserve and National Guard of the Army and the Air Force.

With respect to what happens if these nominations are not confirmed, it is difficult to give a specific reply inasmuch as the Department of the Army informs us that the effects vary in each individual case.

An officer currently serving on active duty with an AUS appointment would not be adversely affected except that he would lose his Reserve status.

A Reserve officer not on active duty, for example a major general commanding a Reserve division, would lose all status as an officer on April 1.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONTINUANCE OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, which was to amend the title so as to read: "An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senate passed Senate bill 1229, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954. By mistake the Senate omitted to correct the title of the bill. The House has corrected the title, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader if he intends to press for a vote on Reorganization Plan No. 1 today?

Mr. TAFT. No. The program today will be to dispose merely of Senate Joint Resolution 57, dealing with emergency powers. On Monday we shall have morning business and a call of the calendar, and then take up Reorganization Plan No. 1, relating to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I think that will probably be all. There may be a few other matters of minor importance. On Wednesday we hope to proceed with the tidelands bill.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S HOPE TO INSPIRE SPIRITUAL REAWAKENING IN AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, not long ago I heard one of the great women of the world say, "It is a time for greatness." May I paraphrase that statement and say that it is time for great leadership. America is blessed by having a man at the helm who is demonstrating by his daily living the leadership which we need.

Yesterday he was asked by the press regarding his position on the Bohlen nomination. He frankly told the press that Bohlen was his choice, that he knew him, had visited with him, and had played golf with him. He stated that he felt he was the best man for the job. Then someone asked him, "What do you think of the opposition?"

He said, "It is the right of the opposition to think as it will."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks an article entitled "What the President Wants," written by Stanley High, and published in the April 1953 issue of the Reader's Digest. In

the heading above the title of the article there is the following:

Above and beyond politics, Dwight Eisenhower hopes to inspire a spiritual reawakening in America.

That to me is the new leadership.

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

WHAT THE PRESIDENT WANTS

(By Stanley High)

In the vast flow of words that have been written about Dwight Eisenhower, one aspect has received little attention, his long-time hopes and purposes for America. Better than administrative policies or legislative prescriptions, those hopes and purposes reveal the stature and character of the man we elected President. They are a guide to what, above and beyond politics, may take place during his Presidency. His commitment to them is deeper and more determined than to any partisan objectives, and he believes they are the terms by which, in history, his administration will have to pass muster.

There is nothing off the record in what the President himself calls his long thoughts about America. They are the plainest thread that runs through all his speeches. They are the most frequently recurring theme of his conversations. He has made them the solemn basis of his charge to the men and women he has called to be on his team.

By some current standards, the President is old fashioned in what he most deeply believes. He is as out of date as the copybook maxims he stressed in his campaign:

"Honesty is the best policy"; "He that goes a-borrowing, goes a-sorrowing"; "A man is known by the company he keeps"; "Birds of a feather flock together"; "A penny saved is a penny earned."

Perhaps these homilies have not recently been fashionable in Washington, or elsewhere, but who can read them without feeling that it would have been good for all of us if they had been?

In today's atmosphere of pseudointellectualism, the President's profoundest beliefs perhaps seem corny. He is no doubt corny when he talks, as he has, about "the extraordinary virtues" of his parents; of the fact that they were thrifty, economical, honest; of the lusty influence of the Bible in their lives; of "how I sat at my mother's knee"; of the story of Abraham Lincoln walking miles to return a few cents he had overcharged a customer that day in the store.

The extent to which these homely virtues are out of date is proof to the President of what has happened to this country. He believes that what has been wrong with the American Government is only symptomatic of things gone wrong in America and with Americans. He knows the symptoms require immediate treatment. He believes the cure requires basic changes in American thought and direction. These changes will produce political and economic consequences. But they are not, themselves, political or economic. They are moral and spiritual.

In one pre-convention conversation General Eisenhower remarked: "From the way I'm talking and from what I'd like to see happen, it looks as though I should have been a preacher." In a nonecclesiastical sense, it is a preacher's job he has cut out for himself.

What President Eisenhower wants for America is a revival of religious faith that will produce a rededication to religious values and conduct. He wants this, first, because he is a religious man. He is not outwardly pious, and he seldom talks about religion in personal terms. I do not know how he prays or how often. But from his unembarrassed expressions of belief in prayer, I am sure that he does pray. I do not know how often he reads the red-leather Bible he keeps by his bed. But from his

familiarity with the scriptures, I am sure he reads it. His regular attendance at church is not because of his public position. It is a lifetime habit, and it is more to him than a formal, Sunday gesture.

The inaugural service of worship was not, as has hitherto always been the case, limited to the President-elect and his family. His Cabinet members and advisers were expected to be there with their families. They were—180 of them.

He has said that in selecting the members of his Cabinet he wanted to find out not only what their abilities were but what, as men, they were dedicated to. And his inauguration prayer, written in longhand after that morning's service of worship, was not alone for himself but for "my future associates * * * that Thou wilt make full and complete our dedication."

The President's top associates can have little doubt about the spiritual purposes to which he believes his administration must be dedicated. On January 12 he called his Cabinet and chief assistants into a pre-inaugural conference in New York. When they were seated at luncheon together, the President-elect arose at the head of the table. He expressed confidence in the capacities of the people assembled there. He felt they were among the best America could provide for the job ahead. But he was sure they would agree with him that, for even the best, the job ahead was too big to undertake without the help of Almighty God. He then turned to his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, and asked him, a prominent Mormon, to lead them all in prayer.

But it is not only because he is personally religious that the President gives first importance to the reviving of religious faith. He believes that the "godly virtues"—those extolled in the copybook maxims—account for America's beginning, its growth in strength, material well-being, and social progress. He believes that, except in a renewal of that faith and those virtues, there is no answer for the future.

"You can't explain free government in any other terms than religious. The Founding Fathers had to refer to the Creator in order to make their revolutionary experiment make sense; it was because 'all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights' that men could dare to be free. They wrote their religious faith into our founding documents, stamped their trust in God on the faces of their coins and currency, and put it boldly at the base of our institutions. And when they drew up their bold Bill of Rights, where did they put freedom of worship? First, in the cornerstone position. That was no accident."

Before and during the campaign Eisenhower frequently talked about the strength America must have if our freedom is to be preserved and extended. In his three kinds of strength, he insisted that the spiritual should come first, not as a possible climax after the economic and military.

"Our forefathers proved," he said, "that only a people strong in godliness is a people strong enough to overcome tyranny and make themselves and others free. Today, it is ours to prove that our own faith, perpetually renewed, is equal to the challenge of today's tyrants."

At one point in the campaign, some of his associates were a little concerned by what they regarded as too much religion in his politics. Lest he be accused of overdoing it, they urged him for a few speeches to skip the spiritual note. At that proposal the general was first puzzled and then irritated. "Gentlemen," he told them sharply, "you misjudge the American people."

"I am sure of one thing," he has said. "There is a great spiritual yearning, a hunger among the people of this country. And I meet more and more people who are not ashamed to express it."

In the political sense, General Eisenhower had no ambition for the Presidency. In the political sense, he now has no ambition simply to go through 4 or 8 years and thence into history as the 34th President of the United States. He does, however, have one consuming ambition: He is determined to use his influence and his office to help make this period a spiritual turning point in America, and thereby to recover the strength, the values, and the conduct which a vital faith produces in a people.

For such a new era much more will be required than the President's own dedication, more than his declarations and example—powerful and, in recent history, unprecedented as such White House leadership will be.

A great deal will be required of all Americans who believe as the President believes and who want, for themselves and America, what he wants. It is not too soon for these Americans to make it clear that, for them, last November 4 was more than just another election, and that the man they elected must not be cut down to the size and shape of partisan politics.

EXTENSION OF TIME LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 105, Senate Joint Resolution 57.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 57) to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on April 1, 1953, the Emergency Powers Continuation Act will expire unless Senate Joint Resolution 57, which has for its purpose the continuation of the act beyond that date until July 1, 1953, is enacted. We have received, and there has been inserted in the RECORD, a letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, and also excerpts with respect to the various powers which we hope will be extended by the Congress at this time. That material was printed in the RECORD of March 13, 1953, and I assume that all Senators have read it. However, I think it would be well, drawing upon the text of that letter, to explain the joint resolution.

I may add that the House of Representatives has passed House Joint Resolution 226, which is the companion resolution.

Senate Joint Resolution 57 would, with certain exceptions, extend from April 1, 1953, to July 1, 1953, those emergency powers which were previously extended by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act—Public Law 450, 82d Congress.

On February 19, 1952, the President transmitted to the Congress a draft of

the Emergency Powers Continuation Act to extend certain emergency powers for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and for 6 months thereafter, in order to insure the continuation of those powers during the period of international tension while the Nation was mobilizing for defense. The Congress after hearings approved the Emergency Powers Continuation Act and extended the authority under 45 statutory provisions until April 1, 1953, rather than for the full period requested, which was for the duration of the present national emergency plus 6 months. The reason for so limiting the extension is stated in the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary on House Joint Resolution 477—House Report No. 2041, 82d Congress—as follows:

The committee was chiefly interested in satisfying itself that there was justification for continuing the provisions until such time as the Government agencies concerned could seek, before the proper congressional committees, legislation either on a permanent basis or for a further extension on a temporary basis.

At the time of the congressional hearings it was felt by the committee that such legislation could easily be obtained by April 1, 1953.

In consonance with the expressed desire of the House Judiciary Committee, as stated above, the agencies of the Government desiring the continuation of the statutory provisions concerned have prepared and submitted to the Congress, or are in the process of preparing, separate drafts of legislation for the consideration of the appropriate committees which would amend, extend, or make permanent the various emergency powers for which there is a continuing need.

Since the enactment of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act there has been a delay which probably was not anticipated when the date of April 1, 1953, was selected. This delay was caused by a change in administration of the Government and a concurrent change in the appointed officials of the Department of Defense, with the natural requirement of a review of all pending programs by the new officials. Such a review, of course, has included a study of the emergency powers. As a result, not all of the individual items of proposed legislation are in a form ready for submission to the Congress. Moreover, as to those bills which have been introduced in the Congress, action by the committee concerned has been delayed pending decision by the appropriate executive branch officials as to the desirability of continuing the various powers. In view of that situation, it is not likely that any appreciable number of individual bills will be enacted into law by April 1, 1953.

Senate Joint Resolution 57 is but a temporary expedient and will not alter the affected authorities, except as to the date of the termination of their effectiveness, and is intended only to give the responsible departments sufficient time in which to make their presentations to Congress. I point out to Senators that last Friday the Senate passed, under the able management of the junior Senator

from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] the extension of one of the powers sought to be extended by this joint resolution; and proposed extensions of other powers are on the calendar today under separate legislative headings.

Proposed for the 90-day extension under the joint resolution are 31 provisions of law of primary concern to the Department of Defense. There are also included for temporary extension 8 provisions of law affecting other agencies of the Government which the Bureau of the Budget has requested the Department of Defense to include in this joint resolution, so as to permit the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Agriculture, the Veterans' Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make proper representations to the Congress for continuation or for permanent provisions to replace the temporary provisions affecting their departments. The joint resolution would, by section 2 thereof, exclude from the effect of its temporary extension 6 provisions of law dealt with by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act. Four of those provisions of law have been repealed; 1 of them has been amended so as not to be covered by the extension contained in the Emergency Powers Continuation Act; and 1 of them is no longer needed because of changed conditions.

Mr. President, when this matter came before the Committee on the Judiciary last Wednesday the chairman of the committee appointed a subcommittee of three members, of which I am the chairman, to study the proposal and to report back to the full committee. I met with the interested parties from the Department of Defense and have studied the various proposals. I have not, however, asked for a detailed justification of each item, for two reasons:

First. Each of these items has been in effect for many years. All of them were minutely examined by Congress at the time of the extension of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act of last year. In addition, a review of each one was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1953.

Second. Each of these items is now or will be in the immediate future the subject of inquiry of the standing committee to which it is referred.

The Committee on the Judiciary unanimously reported the resolution.

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the House has passed a joint resolution which is word for word identical with Senate Joint Resolution 57, now under consideration. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion; that Senate Joint Resolution 57 be indefinitely postponed; and that the Chair now lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 226.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is that the same joint resolution which the distinguished Senator from Maryland has discussed?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes. It is exactly the same, word for word. The House has already passed House Joint

Resolution 226. The two joint resolutions are identical.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In that connection, I believe Senators should know that when a similar joint resolution was passed the last time by the Senate it provided for an additional extension of 6 months. That provision was stricken out by the House. Therefore, what is proposed to be done today is merely to put back in the joint resolution what was contained in it when it was passed by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct. The joint resolution would extend the emergency powers to July 1, 1953, in order to give various committees of Congress time to examine the powers in detail and to bring appropriate legislation to the floor for enactment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary was unanimous in reporting the resolution, as I understand.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It was unanimous.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from Ohio?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950, which was read twice by its title.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 57 will be indefinitely postponed.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, during the adjournment period, bills and joint resolutions found duly enrolled.

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

COMMITTEE REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I should like to inquire whether the distinguished majority leader has had transacted all the business he has in mind for today?

Mr. TAFT. All the business I had in mind has been transacted, and I shall return in a few minutes to hear the Senator's committee report.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very delighted to have him hear my report. First, I wanted to make sure that the business for today had been transacted.

Mr. President, before I deliver my major speech so far as the Independent Party is concerned, this afternoon I want to take up a few committee matters as a member of the committee of the whole.

First, I wish to comment on the problem of the Independent Party, with respect to cloakroom discussion of the so-called seating issue.

When the Independent Party respectfully suggested that a section of the Senate should be designated as the Independent Party section, the representative of that party did not feel that any great state issue had been raised, or that the suggestion should create any major problem in the Senate. The Independent Party was satisfied that its representative was not asking to have the Washington Monument moved or to have the Capitol dome cut down. He simply made the suggestion—and did so quite respectfully, I thought—that, for good and valid reasons, a section of the floor of the Senate should be set aside for the Independent Party, as a matter or right.

But, lo and behold, Mr. President, after I made the suggestion I discovered that I was about to engage in negotiations which made some of the highly complex labor negotiations in my professional experience look very simple indeed. Letters had to be written. In fact, a letter was drafted for the Independent Party, and it was suggested that its representative follow the form of that letter in writing to the Rules Committee. But the Independent Party representative did not oblige in the premises.

The Independent Party representative did write a letter to the Committee on Rules and Administration, but on his own terms. Without taking time to read the letter, Mr. President, because now the letter is out of date, the representative of the Independent Party requests unanimous consent that his letter, under date of March 24, 1953, to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Is there objection?

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

MARCH 24, 1953.

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: I am sure that you and the other members of the Rules Committee are aware of the fact that I have expressed a desire on the floor of the Senate to move my Senate seat from the Republican side of the aisle to the last row of the Democratic side. It is my desire to have my desk placed at the end of that row.

I have discussed the matter with both majority and minority leaders, and they do not have any personal objections to my moving my seat. As I understand it, the minority leader has discussed the matter with the Democratic policy committee, and the members of that committee have no objections, but seem to be of the opinion that under rule XXXIV of the Senate, it is a matter which falls to the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee.

Therefore, Senator JOHNSON suggested that I take the matter up with you. I told him I would be very glad to do that, but I wished to make clear that under rule XXXIV I do

not think the Rules Committee would have jurisdiction to deny to a representative of the Independent Party the right to occupy a desk space on the floor of the Senate not presently occupied by either one of the major parties. By that I mean that I do not think the Rules Committee would have the right to require the representative of the Independent Party or of any other minority party to sit in any specific spot on the floor of the Senate, if the representative or representatives of that party desired to sit somewhere else and by so doing would not in any way interfere with already established rights or interests of one of the major parties. I make that point on the basis of the constitutional guarantee that each State is entitled to equal representation in the Senate, and that it automatically follows that its elected representatives are entitled to sit in accordance with party membership at desk locations in the Senate set aside for members of that party, in accordance with Senate agreement and policy.

Thus, if my party had 3 or 4 members, instead of 1, it would be obvious that we would be entitled to have an area of the floor of the Senate set aside as the Independent Party side of the Senate as a matter of right in keeping with the equal-representation principle.

Therefore, as I explained to Senator JOHNSON, I do not feel that my desire in this matter places upon me any obligation to make any request to the Rules Committee for the right to sit in a separate area on the Senate floor designated for the Independent Party.

However, I do think that under rule XXXIV I should clear with the Rules Committee in respect to the question as to whether or not the space for my desk which I am asking for would in any way interfere with any vested interest of rights now possessed by anyone else or any other party in said space. As I indicated in my speech on the floor of the Senate last Friday when I discussed this matter, I think the Independent Party as a matter of senatorial courtesy is entitled to sit wherever it wants to on the floor of the Senate, provided it does not seek to interfere with established seating rights of any other Member of the Senate.

Therefore, I would appreciate it very much if you would take this matter up with the Rules Committee and advise them of my desire to move my seat to a space on the floor of the Senate not now occupied by either Republicans or Democrats.

I take it for granted that as a matter of senatorial courtesy no question can or will be raised as to my right to move my seat as a member of the Independent Party to such a space on the floor of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence, the letter points out that under the equal-rights provision of the Constitution, insofar as the rights of a sovereign State in the Senate of the United States are concerned, the representative of the Independent Party did not recognize in the Committee on Rules and Administration any jurisdiction to designate by mandate where any minority party in the Senate shall sit. But in the letter, as a reading of it will show, the Independent Party took the position that all it needed to do was to ascertain from the Committee on Rules and Administration whether a given number of square feet on the floor of the Senate was being occupied by a representative of any other party; and if it was not occupied by a representative of any other party, and if that square footage comprised, architecturally, space designed for occupation by a Senator's chair and desk, then the

Independent Party had a right to direct the Sergeant at Arms to move to that spot the desk and chair of the representative of the Independent Party.

I take that position, Mr. President, because I believe we had better never establish the precedent that the Committee on Rules and Administration has a right to tell the representative of any minority party where he must sit on the floor of the Senate, for if we ever accept that principle, there are many places on the floor of the Senate where one might be ordered to sit, although he might not care to sit there.

But, Mr. President, I hope I am a sufficiently good lawyer to recognize that if that power were granted, once it were granted, there would not be much that one could do about its exercise by a Committee on Rules and Administration which might rather arbitrarily and capriciously engage in the exercise of discretion. I could direct the eyes of my colleagues to very many places on the floor of the Senate where I believe they would agree with me—and I am now talking about a principle—that, if a Committee on Rules and Administration should ever be recognized as having the power to tell a Senator that he would have to sit there, it would not be very desirable to sit there, for instance, in one of the corners. Or for example, who would appreciate having to sit at the Official Reporters' table if a Rules Committee should so direct?

However, if the Committee on Rules and Administration is ever recognized as having the power to issue such an order, and if you, Mr. President, ever were in the minority, as I am, you would be in a fine fix, would you not?

Of course, I did not walk into that trap in respect to an alleged jurisdictional power of the Rules Committee, as my letter will show. Although there has been much discussion about the letter, I stand on the premises of the letter.

But even after the letter was received, Mr. President, there was an inclination on the part of my good colleagues to try to work out some arrangement with the Independent Party. I believe it would have been worked out except for an event which occurred the day before yesterday. I refer to a column published in the Washington Times-Herald. I shall read only the part which refers to me, and shall not read the part which refers to my colleagues, although in fairness to them I wish to answer the part which refers to them.

The references to me in the column do not bother me. It does not bother me to read what is said about me in that column, for, contrary to the opinion of the author of the column, my hide is quite thick in respect to what he wrote about me.

The article states, in part:

WASHINGTON, March 24.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, the political zip, the whatzit from Oregon, has asked permission to switch his seat from the Republican side of the Senate Chamber to the Democratic side. He told Senate leaders he wished to make the change for personal reasons.

I'll say the reasons were personal.

The odd Oregonian begged to be moved because, thick in the hide as he is, he couldn't take it any longer.

Ever since he ran out on the Republican Party, under whose standard he was elected, MORSE has called himself an Independent. But he continued to occupy his front row seat on the GOP side of the Senate floor.

Loyal Republicans didn't want him there because they felt he was giving the GOP side a bad name. But it isn't practical to take a duly-elected Senator by the scruff and pitch him from one side to the other. So they resorted to other methods to make life miserable for the deserter.

They started a whispering campaign.

But it wasn't the kind of whispering campaign you might imagine. The whispering was done within earshot of the victim.

The last paragraph of the article—and in a moment I shall return to the intervening portions—reads as follows:

At last it became too much even for the most insulted man in Congress.

MORSE pleaded for permission to move.

Mr. President, that is funny, so far as I am concerned, and the entire article would be funny if it did not do a grave injustice to two colleagues. The article then went on to quote, supposedly, but completely without any basis whatsoever in fact, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

I wish to say that the quotations imputed to those Senators in the article are completely beyond my knowledge, and I am satisfied they have no basis in fact. The entire article is written on the assumption that I overheard the remarks which these two Senators are supposed to have made about me from time to time.

Mr. President, I fight fairly, so far as my intentions are concerned. If any of my fighting could ever be interpreted as being unfair or as violating the rules of good sportsmanship, at least it could never be charged that the dereliction on my part was intentional. I may have great differences with a colleague in the Senate—and, unfortunately, with a few of them personal differences have developed, and I regret very much that situation, and it saddens me; but, Mr. President, I wish to say there is absolutely no basis in fact for the quotations attributed to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], insofar as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned. At no time did I ever hear either one of those two gentlemen ever say what is quoted in the article. Even when men are against me, I propose to do what I can to protect them when I think they are unfairly attacked.

The only one of these two gentlemen who has spoken to me about the matter is the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. I told him that never did I hear him make any such statements as are imputed to him in this article, and that I intended to say so on the floor of the Senate.

I have not talked to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], but, in fairness to him, I want to say for the record that I have never heard the Senator from New York make any such statement as is attributed to him. I also desire to say, in fairness to the Senator from New York, that I know of nothing that would indicate that he has ever had any intention or desire to move me from my seat in the Senate of the United States. It

is true that the Senator from New York and I have some personal differences, and I regret them. They are of his making, not mine. But irrespective of what the personal differences are, I have a great admiration for the Senator from New York, and when I see unfair statements about him published in the press, linked to my name, I shall always do what I can to correct such statements by making a statement of fact.

In view of what I consider to be this great injustice to these two Senators, and in view of the fact that, since this great "seat issue" has arisen, a considerable number of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle have come to me to urge that I not move my seat, I am not going to go into any detail other than to say that I appreciate the sincerity of their statements and the sincerity of the friendship which they have expressed to me in making the statements. But in the light of that situation, and because of the misrepresentation in the newspaper article to which I referred, and the wrong which I think was done to two of my colleagues by imputing to them statements they never made, I wish to say here publicly what I have said to the Republican leader and to the minority leader that, as for now, we will postpone the matter of moving the seat until I can discuss the contents of my letter with the Committee on Rules and Administration; and I am confident I can discuss with that committee what I think are some of the broader implications that have now resulted from my raising this issue in the first instance.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that the rules of the Senate need to be modified so that the kind of doubt as to what prerogatives and powers exist in the Committee on Rules and Administration in respect to Senators themselves, as distinguished from the powers and prerogatives of that committee in respect to other personnel of the Senate, can be cleared up, because, when we consider rule XXXIV it is very easy to read into it, as some of my colleagues have done, that the Committee on Rules and Administration has the same prerogatives and powers over Senators that it has over page boys, clerks, and personnel of the corridors, the restaurant personnel, and all the other employees of the Senate. I do not accept that view, Mr. President; because, under the equal-representation rights of a State in the Senate there are certain inherent rights of a Senator with which no committee of the Senate may possibly interfere. They are not subject to the power of the Senate as such, but they spring from the inherent rights of the sovereign State a Senator represents in the Senate of the United States, and no combination of Senators has the power to infringe upon the sovereign rights of a State, manifested through the representation of one of its Senators.

Later this afternoon I shall discuss in some detail the historical development of the equal-representation right of a sovereign State in the Senate of the United States, and relate it to another issue which concerns the Independent Party, namely, its right to assignment to committees in the Senate of the

United States. But, with that explanation—knowing full well that those who want to misinterpret it will misinterpret it—I wish to say that for the time being I shall postpone final action on the seat issue and remain at this desk. I shall stay here until I feel that sufficient time has elapsed to correct the injustices done the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] by the newspaper article I have referred to. I do not want the impression to go abroad that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] conspired to drive me from this side of the aisle. That is an injustice to them because they did not do so. Also, I want opportunity to discuss the broader implications of this issue with the Committee on Rules and Administration, and to discuss it further with Republicans who want me to remain in my present seat. So we will hold in suspension the question of moving the seat of the Independent Party.

THE LUCE PUBLICATIONS

Mr. President, the next item I desire to take up as a committee item in the work of the Independent Party is the quality of journalism which characterizes the Luce publication—L-u-c-e, I want to make it clear, Mr. President, although it might be spelled l-o-o-s-e, too. Of course, I refer to the house organ of the Eisenhower administration, Time magazine. I refer to that publication as a house organ which follows the journalistic practice of reputation assassination by use of snide, ad hominem adjectives. It is not even clever journalism. It is not ethical journalism. It is dirty journalism, so typical of Time magazine. It was applied—and I say it with a sense of humor—to the junior Senator from Oregon in the issue of Time magazine for March 23. In making these comments today, Mr. President, I am aware that they may not do the junior Senator from Oregon any good; indeed, they could do him a lot of harm, for anyone who has ever picked a fight with a powerful medium of misinformation such as Time magazine, or with any yellow newspaper in America, has learned that such publications always have the last word, and that they will get you if they can. Their belt of scalps is pretty long and full. But, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon does not care about that, so long as he is satisfied he is right and so long as he is satisfied that the public should be warned about such things, because he intends to continue, as he has throughout his public life, to advocate what he believes to be for the public interest. The public ought to be told that the dirty journalistic tactics of the Luce publications include deceit by language forms designed to destroy the reputation of people whom the particular periodical is out to get. That is why we read the kind of story we read in the March 23 issue of Time magazine with regard to the junior Senator from Oregon.

I was rather pleased to find the subconscious confession on the part of the editor of Time magazine when, in one sentence, he said: "Then he rose and yammered about what the New York

Times politely called a variety of subjects."

The reference of Time magazine in its article to the New York Times amused me. I have observed that when one deletes from Time magazine the heavy-handed wisecracks and attempts at the use of snide insulting adjectives all that is left in most stories is a rewrite of news articles which have been very well written in the New York Times. Except for their rewriting of New York Times news stories the writers in Time magazine apparently try to outdo each other in the cleverness of their pinpricks, and in dipping their pens in the blood of public officials who they know follow a course of action which does not bend the knee to the reactionary philosophy of the Luce publications. That comprises really the journalistic endeavor of the editors of Time. Whatever meat they get into the sheet they simply insert by way of a rewrite from the New York Times and then becloud it with their attempts at reputation assassination.

Well, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I would not mention it at all if it were not for the sad effects I think this kind of journalism has on American public opinion. It is surprising to know that many persons seem to think that if they read it in Time it must be so. I say to the American people, "If you read it in Time, do not take it with a grain of salt; use the whole saltshaker," because I have known of so many incidents, Mr. President, about which I know all the facts, and then I read Time magazine's account, and I have great difficulty in recognizing that I am reading about the same incident. If one reads this particular issue of Time he will find a good example of my point.

So I say, Mr. President, that so far as I am concerned, I would not answer Time magazine because of any personal considerations, but I make this point simply because I think the reading public is entitled to have someone, at least, who dares to stand up and say that Time magazine is not a good representative of accurate journalism.

Thomas Jefferson, as I recall, answered that kind of journalism very well. I shall not take the time, because of the lateness of the hour, to read his comments on the kind of journalism represented by Time magazine but I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at this point in my remarks some excerpts from Edward Boykin's book entitled "The Wisdom of Thomas Jefferson." Jefferson's comments on disreputable journalism are worth reviewing whenever one reads such articles as the one I have referred to in Time magazine and which is so typical of the journalism of that periodical.

The words are found on pages 143 to 145 of the book, under the heading "How to Conduct a Newspaper."

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

HOW TO CONDUCT A NEWSPAPER

To your request of my opinion of the manner in which a newspaper should be conducted, so as to be most useful, I should answer, "by restraining to true facts and

sound principles only." Yet I fear such a paper would find few subscribers. It is a melancholy truth, that a suppression of the press could not more completely deprive the Nation of its benefits, than is done by its abandoned prostitution to falsehood. Nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle. The real extent of this state of misinformation is known only to those who are in situations to confront facts within their knowledge with the lies of the day. I really look with commiseration over the great body of my fellow citizens, who, reading newspapers, live and die in the belief that they have known something of what has been passing in the world in their time; whereas the accounts they have read in newspapers are just as true a history of any other period as of the present, except that the real names of the day are affixed to their fables. General facts may indeed be collected from them, such as that Europe is not at war, that Bonaparte has been a successful warrior, that he has subjected a great portion of Europe to his will, etc., but no details can be relied on. I will add, that the man who never looks into a newspaper is better informed than he who reads them; inasmuch as he who knows nothing is nearer to truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors. He who reads nothing will still learn the great facts, and the details are all false.

Perhaps an editor might begin a reformation in some such way as this. Divide his paper into four chapters, heading the first, Truths; second, Probabilities; third, Possibilities; fourth, Lies. The first chapter would be very short, as it would contain a little more than authentic papers, and information from such sources, as the editor would be willing to risk his own reputation for their truth. The second would contain what, from a mature consideration of all circumstances, his judgment should conclude to be probably true. This, however, should rather contain too little than too much. The third and fourth should be professedly for those readers who would rather have lies for their money than the blank paper they would occupy.

Such an editor too, would have to set his face against the demoralising practice of feeding the public mind habitually on slander, and the depravity of taste which this nauseous ailment includes.

Defamation is becoming a necessary of life; inasmuch that a dish of tea in the morning or evening cannot be digested without this stimulant. Even those who do not believe these abominations, still read them with complaisance to their auditors, and instead of the abhorrence and indignation which should fill a virtuous mind, betray a secret pleasure in the possibility that some may believe them, though they do not themselves. It seems to escape them, that it is not he who prints, but he who pays for printing a slander, who is its real author.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD another profound statement of wisdom by Thomas Jefferson on the newspaper and journalistic problem, which, interestingly enough, existed in the time of Jefferson as it exists today. One would think that over all the years the journalistic profession would have washed itself up a little bit, but the accounts of Jefferson, who recognized that it was as dirty then as it is now, are a pretty sad commentary on some forms of journalism. So I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, other statements of Thomas Jefferson under the heading "A Truthful Press Essential for Good Government."

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

A TRUTHFUL PRESS ESSENTIAL FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT

No experiment can be more interesting than that we are now trying and which we trust will end in establishing the fact that man may be governed by reason and truth. Our first object should therefore be to leave open to him all the avenues to truth. The most effectual hitherto found is the freedom of the press. It is therefore the first shut up by those who fear the investigation of their actions. The firmness with which the people have withstood the late abuses of the press, the discernment they have manifested between truth and falsehood, show that they may safely be trusted to hear everything, true and false, and to form a correct judgment between them. As little is it necessary to impose on their senses or dazzle their minds by pomp, splendor, or forms. Instead of this artificial, how much surer is that real respect which results from the use of their reason, and the habit of bringing everything to the test of common sense.

I hold it therefore certain that to open the doors of truth and to fortify the habit of testing everything by reason are the most effectual manacles we can rivet on the hands of our successors to prevent their manacled people with their own consent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is another excerpt from Jefferson to which I think it is well to refer at this time. It is to be found on page 176 of this book, and is headed "Calumny in Public Life Should Not Be Answered." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

CALUMNY IN PUBLIC LIFE SHOULD NOT BE ANSWERED

At a very early period of my life, I determined never to put a sentence into any newspaper. I have religiously adhered to the resolution through my life, and have great reason to be contented with it. Were I to undertake to answer all the calumnies of the newspapers, it would be more than all my own time, and that of 20 aids could effect. I have thought it better to trust to the justice of my countrymen, that they would judge me by what they see of my conduct on the stage where they have placed me, and what they knew of me before the epoch since which a particular party has supposed it might answer some views of theirs to vilify me in the public eye. Some, I know, will not reflect how apocryphal is the testimony of enemies so palpably betraying the views with which they give it. But this is an injury to which duty requires everyone to submit whom the public think proper to call into its councils. Though I have made up my mind not to suffer calumny to disturb my tranquillity, yet I retain all my sensibilities for the approbation of the good and just.

I laid it down as a law to myself, to take no notice of the thousand calumnies issued against me, but to trust my character to my own conduct, and the good sense and candor of my fellow citizens.

My rule of life has been never to harass the public with findings and provings of personal slanders. * * * I have ever trusted to the justice and consideration of my fellow citizens, and have no reason to repent it, or to change my course.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, Mr. President, I recognize that there are great exceptions to what might be interpreted as

a rather general blanket condemnation which the junior Senator from Oregon has made against the journalistic profession today. To be fair about it, I say, in all honesty, that I think the exceptions really are so numerous that they are the rule, which is proved by the exceptions. By that I simply mean that there do not have to be very many rotten apples in the journalistic barrel to injure the contents of the entire barrel. Of course, qualitatively, a few powerful periodicals and newspapers can do much more harm than a much larger number of good periodicals and newspapers, adhering to the standards of journalistic ethics can do good. That is the point I want to make. Too frequently it is the few but powerful media of public information, through the press and the periodicals, that color public opinion for a given time and destroy the reputation of good men. Of the good and right, ethical newspapers and periodicals in America I would not start to name one, because I would be doing injustice to many others by not mentioning them. But I have sought today, Mr. President, only to dare to mention critically a powerful publication source known as a Luce publication, to which I referred as the house organ of the Eisenhower administration, as representing the kind of inaccurate journalism which I think at the present time is doing a great injury to American public opinion.

INFORMATION AS TO INCOME OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

As my next item of business today, I wish to discuss a comment I made a couple of Fridays ago, when I discussed on the floor of the Senate my desire to elicit from my colleagues in the Senate support for a bill I have introduced for the past several years, calling for the publication in January of each year of information as to the sources and the amounts of incomes of public officials receiving salaries of \$10,000 or more. I have had a hard time with that bill. I have had a terribly hard time with it, in the sense that I have not been able to have any hearings held on it. The bill seems to be one of the untouchables.

As the representative of the Independent Party, I have the same personal judgment—and it is personal to me—as to why I cannot get any action on it as I expressed a few days ago, when I tried to have the Senate include, in a resolution that sought to investigate for subversive activities the employees of the Senate, Senators themselves.

An interesting point about that defeat is the many people from whom I have heard, who, like me, could not see any reason why Senators should not be investigated if Senate employees were to be investigated; who, like me, could not see any logical reason at all why, if the purpose of the investigation is to protect the security of the country—and the reason given for the investigation is that Senate employees have access to security information—the same procedure should not be followed in the case of Senators, because they also have access to security information. These people who have written and talked to me agree that we have no right to take a holier-than-thou

attitude here in the Senate and exclude Senators from being investigated.

I should be surprised if there were any security risks in the Senate among Senators, but it all depends on what is meant by subversive organizations, which I think should be subject to investigation by the Investigation Committee itself. However, I should like to see a list of memberships of the various organizations to which all Members of the Senate belong, or to which they have belonged in the past, and then let the public decide, once that kind of information was fully disclosed, whether or not it might have any bearing upon the security risks the people may run, even with elected officials.

I have indicated that I was for this kind of an investigation; in fact, I have volunteered that it shall apply to my office, including the Senator from Oregon, and I thought it would be only fair to apply it to Senators if it is to apply to employees.

So I am as much at a loss as to why I could not get support for that proposal as I am as to why I cannot get support for the bill to have Members of Congress and other public officials who receive salaries of \$10,000 or more a year required to publish, at the first of each year, the sources and the amounts of their income.

Some news from Kansas came over the ticker tape today which I think further illustrates my point. I mentioned the Kansas situation the other day, when my good friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was so disturbed about the fact that some high-placed Democrats were taking annual accumulated leave money. He announced that the appropriate Senate committee would investigate those high Democrats. I said that I thought that should be done. I am all for it. I said I would stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator with respect to that matter.

I then expressed to the Senator from Kansas my wish that he would give me some support in the matter of publishing the incomes and sources of income of public officials. I called his attention to the fact that my bill covered the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

I further called his attention to the fact that although he was very much concerned about the mess in Washington, I was somewhat interested in the mess in Kansas, because I thought it was a rather sad and unfortunate circumstance, and disturbing to the confidence of the American people in our political system, that the head of the Republican National Committee should find himself confronting a legislative investigation for what was at least alleged to be—I do not know what the facts are—conduct that might find him somewhat involved with the laws of Kansas. I still do not know all the facts, but I again call attention to the ticker tape as evidence which I think justifies my continuing to fight in the Senate for early hearings and ultimate passage of my bill, which would require disclosure of the amounts and sources of income. I think it would have an inhibitory effect on tempted people.

I read the news item from the ticker tape, as follows:

In its findings, based on a 10-day inquiry, the committee said:

"Your committee is constrained to the view that while there is doubt there was a violation of the letter of the law, the committee is firmly convinced that there has been a violation of the spirit of the law.

"The protection which it (the lobbying law) was designed to afford for the people of this State was deliberately and intentionally frustrated by Wes Roberts and Edgar Bennett."

Bennett is grand master of the Ancient Order of United Workmen, an insurance order which engaged Roberts to sell the building to the State.

The committee report, presented to both houses of the 1953 legislature which had ordered the investigation, said:

1. Roberts did not register as a legislative agent.

2. Roberts was employed by the AOUW for the principal purpose of effecting the sale of the AOUW building to the State.

3. That from the inception of such employment it was known to Bennett and Roberts that such sale could be accomplished only through an act of the legislature.

4. That the AOUW had an interest in the sale and purchase of the building on the State sanatorium grounds at Norton, Kans., separate and apart from the interest of the people of Kansas.

5. That Roberts approached and met with members of the State board of social welfare for the purpose of securing from the board its official recommendation to the house ways and means committee during the 1951 session that the AOUW building be purchased by the State.

6. That Roberts approached the chairman of the ways and means committee during the 1951 legislature and made inquiry concerning possible consideration of a proposal to make the purchase. From this conversation the chairman took it for granted that Roberts was representing the State.

I have another similar news-ticker item on the Kansas mess, this one being from the United Press. I ask unanimous consent that, without my reading it, it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TOPEKA.—A State legislative investigating committee charged today that Republican National Chairman C. Wesley Roberts "deliberately and intentionally frustrated" the law of Kansas.

The committee, in a report of its investigation, said Roberts violated at least the spirit of the law when he helped negotiate the sale of a \$110,000 hospital building to the State, although he was not registered as a lobbyist.

The committee said there "is doubt that there was a violation of the letter of the law."

But it said, "There has been a violation of the spirit of the law and the protection which it was designed to afford to the people of this State was deliberately and intentionally frustrated by Wes Roberts and Edgar Bennett."

Bennett is grand master of the Ancient Order of United Workmen, a fraternal insurance order which in 1951 sold to the State a hospital building it erected in 1928 at Norton, Kans., on State-owned ground.

Roberts got an \$11,000 fee for his part in the transaction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the conclusion I would draw is that there is needed on the statute books a disclosure law which, before the fact, will

protect the public from conduct that may bring a great party or a public body into disrepute. I am sad about the Kansas mess. It may be asked, "Why are you sad? You no longer belong to the Republican Party." But I do belong to the country. I am as sad about this as I was not so long ago when a Democratic national chairman was also involved in what I heard referred to on this side of the aisle in such terms as "shenanigans," "corruption," and "dealings of disrepute." I think it is a very sad thing when the chairman of the national committee of either party follows a course of action which shakes the confidence of the American people and causes more and more of them to say, "What is the matter with politicians?" I say there is nothing the matter with the overwhelming majority of them, from the standpoint of ethical standards.

Mr. President, this does not make very pleasant reading. I again recommend to the Senate early hearings on my bill, because I believe legislation such as that would be helpful. I do not say that it would end the evil. I simply say that it would be helpful as a preventive so far as the financial operations of public officials are concerned when such operations tend to bring discredit either upon a great party or upon the Government as a whole.

My bill is Senate bill 334, and I highly recommend it again today.

EQUAL REPRESENTATION OF STATES IN THE SENATE

I now turn to the last item of committee business which I wish to discuss today as a member of the Committee of the Whole. It deals with a relatively brief discussion of the subject of equal representation of States in the Senate. On this subject my text is the Constitution of the United States.

It is often necessary to return to our basic charter and the history of its provisions. This is so because we are prone to forget the emergencies which shaped the instruments and principles of government under which we operate today. We are disposed to take for granted the institutions established by our forefathers and to ignore the reasons for their adoption and the purposes they were designed to serve.

The provisions of the Constitution cannot be separated so lightly from their historical bases. For it is a compact which harmonized conflicting contentions and interests. It must be read and applied with full regard to the promises which made its adoption possible.

Article I, section 3, provides:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State . . . for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Article V provides in part:

No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The simple historical truth is that without those provisions the Constitution of the United States would not have been adopted in 1789.

This is the unanimous conclusion of the historians of the Convention.

So, Professor Farrand in the Framing of the Constitution, Yale University Press, 1926, observes:

So on June 27, when Rutledge made the motion, the Convention voted unanimously to proceed at once to the resolutions involving "the most fundamental points, the rules and suffrages in the two branches" (p. 93).

When the Convention finally got at the question of proportional representation, nearly 3 weeks were spent in reaching a conclusion. More than once any satisfactory solution of the difficulty seemed impossible, and the Convention was on the point of breaking up. Gouverneur Morris afterward said that "the fate of America was suspended by a hair" (p. 94).

Sunday intervened, and the first thing on Monday morning, July 2, the question was put on giving to each State an equal vote in the Upper House. The vote was a tie, 5 States being in the affirmative, 5 in the negative, and 1 divided (p. 96).

The Convention was now at a standstill. After 1 or 2 suggestions were made that did not seem to meet with any particular approval, General Pinckney proposed a committee of 1 from each State to try and devise a compromise . . . the Convention generally approved and voted for the proposal by a large majority (pp. 97-98).

On July 5, the compromise committee presented its report, recommending two propositions "on condition that both shall be generally adopted." The substance of these proposals was: 1. That in the first branch each State should have one representative for every 40,000 inhabitants, counting three-fifths of the slaves, and that money-bills should originate in the first branch and should not be amended by the second branch. 2. That in the second branch each State should have an equal vote. Immediately the debate broke forth again and recriminations were indulged in (p. 99).

On Monday morning, July 16, the whole compromise was adopted (p. 104).

This is the great compromise of the convention and of the Constitution. None other is to be placed quite in comparison with it. There have been many misunderstandings of it and many false interpretations placed upon it, but with the detailed sequence of events that has just been given it seems as if the main points should be clear. The important feature of the compromise was that in the upper house of the legislature each State should have an equal vote (p. 105).

The great compromise gave the small States an equal vote in only one branch of the legislature, but it was enough to reconcile them to the new plan, and they became warmer and warmer advocates of a strong national government (p. 113).

When the great compromise was adopted, many of the delegates had supposed that the voting in that house would be by States, but since the main point of equality of representation had been gained, there was little objection to allowing the members to vote individually. Three members from each State threatened to make the ultimate number of members in the second branch too large, and after it was decided in favor of two members, it was readily agreed that they should vote "per capita," Maryland only being found in the negative (pp. 121-122).

Charles and Mary Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*, MacMillan, 1931,

volume I, pages 317-318 concur, as follows:

In its final form the Constitution, so far as the structure of the Government was concerned, was a bundle of compromises. It was more. It was a mosaic of second choices accepted in the interest of union and the substantial benefits to flow from union.

One of the compromises, fundamental in character, occupies a high place in treaties on the Constitution; that was the adjustment between large and small States. . . . And through many exciting sessions the debate over this issue ran on fiercely.

More than one dissolution seemed imminent. . . . In the end they agreed upon a national legislature of two houses; in the Senate, with greater powers and dignity, the aspirations of the States were to be satisfied by equal representations.

Then we see another expert historical authority in the work of Norton—The Constitution of the United States, Little, Brown, 1930, page 17. In his annotation to article I, section 3, Norton wrote:

The provision for two Senators from each State, regardless of size or population, while population was to determine the number of members in the House of Representatives, was agreed to so that the smaller States might not be overborne in both Houses of Congress by the votes of the larger States. Besides, it was desired that the States as political organizations be represented in Congress. So at loggerheads over this were the large States and the small States that more than once the Constitutional Convention was at the point of breaking up . . . Lord Bryce says that the Americans invented this plan of having one House represent the people directly on the basis of population, and the other (the Senate) represent the States on the basis of State equality as autonomous communities. He believes that it was this device which made federation possible in the United States.

That, Mr. President, is what Norton says on the issue which I raise this afternoon. It follows that these key-stone clauses must be given full effect.

The principle embodied in the great compromise is that there shall be equal representation for each State in the Senate.

Mr. President, there can be no argument about degrees of equality. There are no degrees of equality. Equality either exists or it does not exist. For it to exist in the Senate of the United States the representatives of each State must be accorded the same rights as every other Senator. Rules governing the service of Senators must be applied with uniformity. I repeat that, Mr. President. Rules governing the service of Senators must be applied with uniformity. Whenever they are not so applied there is not equal representation in the Senate in accordance with the guaranty of the Constitution to every sovereign State in this land.

Lacking that, equality—the equality without which the Constitution would not have been promulgated and ratified—cannot be said to exist.

The assignment of Senators must follow rules of uniform application.

On January 13 and again on March 13, I described the history of the rules for the assignment of Senators to committees. It was demonstrated that with only one lapse in 1871, the rule of senior-

ity has been inflexibly applied and that no Senator has been involuntarily removed in violation of his seniority from a committee on which he has served. It has not happened since 1871, and it did not happen before then.

Mr. President, if you tell me that the equal-representation principle of the Constitution has been lived up to in the Senate, to the benefit of a million and a half people of the great sovereign State of Oregon, I will tell you to look at the record. It just "t'aint so." The Senate is going to hear me weekly on this proposition, Mr. President, from now until Doomsday, if I am here that long, fighting for a million and a half people of the State of Oregon, for their equal representation in the Senate through their junior Senator, whom they have elected to represent them in part.

What other Senators may think of the junior Senator from Oregon is beside the point, because the people and not the Senators have sent me to this body, and the people of my State, I am confident, will return me, too. I know whereof I speak, as the mounting mail day by day coming into my office shows. The people of my State know that a Republican majority in the Senate has denied to them equal representation in the Senate. The Republican Party within the State of Oregon will hear about it from the people of Oregon.

I know my people, Mr. President, and I know just how impersonal they can be on a great issue. This is an impersonal issue. This issue has not anything to do with WAYNE MORSE as WAYNE MORSE. This issue has to do with whether or not the Republican Party can justify to more than a million and a half people in the State of Oregon the laying down of a precedent on January 13 of this year, which denies to the people of my State equal representation in the Senate.

Weeks have gone by, Mr. President, and dust has been gathering on my resolution in the Committee on Rules and Administration, with no evidence having been given to me to date of any attempt to discuss my resolution, which calls for protecting the rights of a million and a half people in the sovereign State of Oregon and assuring them equal representation in the Senate.

Oh, Mr. President, I know that on January 13, in answer to a question, it was stated on the floor of the Senate that probably it would take a long time to consider the resolution, and many Senators laughed. But the people of Oregon are not laughing about it, Mr. President. As increasing millions of people across the country come to understand the abstract principle of constitutional law which the Senator from Oregon discussed on January 13, and which he has continued to discuss Friday after Friday since January 13, they are going to realize what its import is.

Oh, Mr. President, I am going about the country these days, and in every State into which I go—and every speech I give is a public forum speech—one of the first questions asked is about the committee fight. There is a notable reaction on the part of the people when they come to grips with the point the junior Senator from Oregon is making

this afternoon. They say, "What do you mean when you say it has not been done since 1871?"

I say, "I mean exactly that."

They know it not only violates the equal representation rights under the Constitution, but it also violates the rule of the playground; namely, the rule of fair play.

I have not been very kind to the Democratic side of the aisle about this matter, in the sense that I have pointed out to them that, as a minority party, they had the clear moral responsibility, in my judgment, of protecting minority rights on the floor of the Senate by acceding to what the majority leader was willing to accept on January 13, namely, the adding of 1 Republican Member to the Armed Services Committee and 1 Republican member to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so that the representative of the Independent Party could remain on those two committees, thus not upsetting the many years of seniority precedents of the Senate. That is why I have said in some speeches that I did not intend to let the Democratic Party "off the hook" on this matter, either, because it was the minority leader, speaking for the Democratic side of the aisle, who on January 13 objected to the immediate consideration of my resolution which, if adopted, would have prevented what I consider to be this violation of equal representation in the Senate of the United States.

But that does not excuse the Republican Party, Mr. President, because on January 13 and at every session since then, the Republican Members of the Senate have sat here with votes sufficient to adopt the resolution. Here again we hear interesting rationalizations about why the majority party does not do it. Some of its members say to me, "But, Wayne, it is necessary to get along with the minority. We have to do business with them; we have to work out understandings with them. Just because we have the votes is no justification for beating the minority over the head with them."

Mr. President, I must confess that I have been so politically naive that I never have been able to understand that language; it is political Chinese to me. You will note, Mr. President, that the first part of their premise is irreconcilable with the second part, for the first part of their premise, figuratively speaking with a hand on my shoulder, they tell me, "Don't rock the boat. We will work this out some way, at some time."

How much time do they need? Should not 10 weeks have been sufficient time? I should think so, for that is a long time during which to deny to 1½ million people, the inhabitants of a great, sovereign State, their full representation in the Senate of the United States.

In a few minutes I shall close my speech today with a specific announcement about what my next step in this fight will be, for I intend to serve due notice; I intend to be fair about it.

I do not intend "to take it lying down," Mr. President, because 1½ million people in the State of Oregon do not expect me "to take it lying down," and I am going to be true to them.

I might add to the history of the seniority rule in the Senate by observing that there are now sitting in the Senate of the United States three Senators whose seniority rights were observed in their assignments to committees, despite the fact that in 1948 and in 1952 they campaigned against the nominees of their parties. So we have to add the action taken in the case of those three Senators to the long list of precedents which heretofore I have cited in my speeches about what has happened since 1871 in building up the record, in which a single exception cannot be found to the fact that all insurgents, liberals, rebels, independents, or whatever one may choose to call them, who have bolted their parties in various degrees, have not received discipline in the Senate, from the standpoint of having their seniority rights, earned on the floor of the Senate, taken from them. We had to wait for the Republican Party in 1953 to do it, Mr. President; and I do not think that was to its credit.

I do not contend that the seniority system for committee assignments is perfect. I do assert that in 164 years no better plan has been devised. It certainly insures that the representation of each State shall be equal, for the rule requires uniformity in the treatment of each Senator. At any time I shall be willing to join in a resolution proposing the modification of the seniority rule in the Senate. I have so advocated in the past, including my advocacy of a change which would call for the election of the chairmen of committees, instead of having them become chairmen by means of seniority. However, my position is that the treatment shall be uniform, that the rule shall then become applicable to all, that no one Senator shall be singled out for different treatment.

Whenever a Senator is singled out for different treatment, the equal representation principle of the Constitution is violated, because Senators do not sit in the Senate as individuals, although we get in the habit of personifying or personalizing our jobs. However, we as individuals have nothing to do with the matter of service in the Senate. We are but vehicles of sovereignty; we are but spokesmen of sovereignty. For a short period of time we simply are entrusted with the obligation of protecting the sovereign rights of the people of our sovereign States. We must be impersonal about it if we are to live up to the spirit, the intent, and—yes—the letter of the Constitution.

On January 13 this body denied to the State of Oregon its equal representation in the Senate, to which I contend it was entitled by the Constitution of the United States, when this body laid down the application of a policy not consonant with the seniority policies of the Senate, and singled out the representative of one State, and said to him, "You will receive different treatment." Mr. President, there is no equality about it; there is no uniformity about it; there is no basis for reconciliation with what was done on January 13 with the sovereign right of the State of Oregon to receive equal representation, through its junior Senator, in the Senate of the United States.

Senators can rationalize about it all they wish; they can alibi about it all they wish. They can try to fall behind the alibi which was given to the press, namely, that the junior Senator from Oregon said he did not want to be assigned by the Republicans. However, Mr. President, such rationalizations do not come anywhere near meeting me on the issue.

Of course, I said I did not wish to be assigned by the Republicans or by the Democrats. I said I wished to be assigned by the Senate, because I can read the rule and rule XXIV says that is the way the assignment shall be made. Implied in that rule, and in every other rule of the Senate is the principle of equality and uniformity of treatment. Senators cannot get away from it; I do not intend to let them. They cannot have one rule for the junior Senator from Oregon and another rule for 95 other Senators, and live up to the requirement that there shall be equal representation of the people of Oregon in the Senate of the United States through its junior Senator. Oh, I know it will take a long time, to get that abstract principle of government understood; but I can be patient, too, and I intend to use every legitimate device at my command, in the Senate, parliamentarily speaking, to focus attention on it.

I refused to waive the reading of the Journal in the Senate a few days ago, and I was very frank in stating my reason. I wanted to focus attention on the fact that equal representation was not being given in the Senate. I took that action in that instance because the parliamentary courtesy had not been extended to the junior Senator from Oregon of having an opportunity to study a bill. So far as I can recall, that courtesy has always been extended to every other Member of the Senate, when there was no emergency that called for the immediate passage of a bill on the unanimous-consent calendar. All I asked for was that the bill go over until the next calendar day, so I could study it. That request was denied, in spite of the fact that I had said, with complete politeness and, I think, dignity, on the floor of the Senate, that while I might be completely wrong about my suspicions regarding the bill, I sought time to study it, and the admission was obtained from the proponent of the bill that it did not have to be passed until April 1. We have had another calendar day since then, when it could have been passed.

So I had to demonstrate my position, as I shall demonstrate it in the future—Mr. President, mark you this—time and time again, if necessary. When I feel that rules are being applied against the representative of the people of the State of Oregon in a nonuniform and unequal way, then I will use the rules of the Senate to direct the attention of the Senate to the rights of each Member of the Senate. Let me tell you, Mr. President, you have not seen anything yet when it comes to this matter of applying rules, if it is necessary to do it in that way. Criticism will not stop me, ostracism will not stop me; because, in my judgment, there is a principle involved in this fight, and I am going to make

the record on this principle. Adjectives are not going to stop me. We are going to find out, before this question is settled, whether the Republican majority in this body wants to apply the rules equally and uniformly, without discrimination, among the Senators as the vehicles of State sovereignty, or whether it wants to discriminate against a sovereign State merely because it has a representative who does not hesitate to dare to stand for what he thinks is right, although it may be unpopular at the moment. I think the Republican majority is going to learn something about what is popular and what is not popular, too, once the people come to understand the principle involved.

I would point out, Mr. President, to the Senate this afternoon that every provision, line, and phrase of the Constitution of the United States is subject to amendment under the procedures prescribed by article 5 except one: that providing that "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The Senate cannot amend that section of the Constitution without the consent of each and every State. That is how basic this principle is. We are here dealing with the principle that, had it not been adopted, the Constitution of the United States would have been non-existent, and the Union, say the historians, would never have come into being.

Certainly the Senate should be most circumspect to avoid doing by omission, inaction, or so-called party machinery what cannot be done even by amendment to the Constitution.

It is perfectly clear from the law that the term "suffrage" may not be narrowly construed. The case of *Smith v. Allwright* (321 U. S. 649 (1949)), I think is a striking argument by way of analogy in support of this phase, and only of this phase, of my argument. It goes to a matter of definition, to a definitive phase.

It declared that the guaranties of the 14th amendment, and the 15th amendment giving protection to vote regardless of race or color, applied not merely to the right to vote in the general election in Texas but also extended to the Democratic primary. The Court reasoned that this was so because in Texas the Democratic primary is usually dispositive of the final result in the general election. Moreover, the Court held that the primary had such official status under State law and procedure that exclusion from the primary by the party was tantamount to State action.

Describing its earlier decisions, the Court said:

This Court went on to announce that to deny a vote in a primary was a mere refusal of party membership with which the State need have no concern, *loc. cit.* at 55, while for a State to deny a vote in the general election on the ground of race or color violated the Constitution.

In announcing its new rule the Court stated:

It may now be taken as a postulate that the right to vote in such a primary for the nomination of candidates without discrimination by the State, like the right to vote

in a general election, is a right secured by the Constitution.

When primaries become a part of the machinery for choosing officials, State and national, as they have here, the same tests to determine the character of discrimination or abridgment should be applied to the primary as are applied to the general election.

The United States is a constitutional democracy. Its organic law grants to all citizens a right to participate in the choice of elected officials without restriction by any State because of race. This grant to the people of the opportunity for choice is not to be nullified by a State through casting its electoral process in a form which permits a private organization to practice racial discrimination in the election. Constitutional rights would be of little value if they could be thus indirectly denied.

Mr. President, you might ask, what does the decision, having to do with the election laws of Texas, have to do with any of the rules or bylaws of the Senate in respect to equal representation? Let me try to show what I think is clearly the analogous connection.

I think the analogy is twofold. In the first place, the case stands for the proposition that the protection of the right to vote extends to all procedures which make the right to vote meaningful. And secondly, the delegation of power over electoral machinery to a political party does not relieve the Government of its constitutional obligations.

So it is clear that "suffrage" must include participation in all of the provisions which provide and shape the final selection to ballot. And the Senate may not shuffle off its constitutional obligation by permitting party caucuses to select the membership of its committees.

Mr. President, you have heard me say many times on the floor of the Senate that we cannot separate substantive rights from procedural rights. I am applying it analogously, to what I think is a comparable situation. We cannot separate the substantive rights of the people of the State of Oregon on the floor of the Senate through their vehicle of sovereignty, their junior Senator, from the procedures of the Senate. It cannot be done. It was tried on January 13, and the effect has been wrongful and in violation of equality of suffrage in the Senate, equality of representation in the Senate.

I say, Mr. President, that the Senate may not shuffle off its constitutional obligations by permitting party caucuses to select the membership of its committees.

I would recommend to the Senate some pertinent dictum in the Supreme Court's decision in *Coyle v. Oklahoma* (221 U. S. 559, 580 (1911)):

The constitutional equality of the States is essential to the harmonious operation of the scheme upon which the Republic was organized. When that equality disappears we may remain a free people, but the Union will not be the Union of the Constitution.

I say, Mr. President, that when the Senate follows the principle which it adopted on January 13 of this year, in contradiction of the long-established seniority rights of Members of this body for decades gone by, it violated the rights

of equal representation in the Senate of the United States by the sovereign people of a sovereign State, my State.

It is within the Senate's power to rectify its earlier error by adopting Senate Resolution 32, which would maintain majority control of the Armed Services and Labor Committees and also continue the junior Senator's membership on those committees in recognition of his seniority as a representative of his State.

That resolution has been lodged in the Rules Committee for 2½ months. I think it is time, Mr. President, to get it out of the Committee and vote it up or down on the floor of the Senate. Let us get on with making the RECORD, and then let us go on, depending on what that record is, with the next step.

So I serve notice today, Mr. President, that a week from today I shall offer the following resolution, if, in the meantime, action has not been taken by the Senate on the other resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and hereby is, discharged of further consideration of Senate Resolution 32, temporarily increasing the membership of the Committee on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, and the amendment proposed thereto.

I think that is not only the fair thing to do, but I owe it to the people of my State. That amounts to 11 weeks of time allowed the Committee on Rules and Administration to pass on this matter, and it is difficult for me to believe that the majority leader, when on January 13 he said, in effect, that it would take some time to pass on the resolution, thought that 11 weeks was not adequate time. I mention it as no threat, because I do not threaten; I simply say what I am going to do. I say, Mr. President, that I shall offer that resolution a week from today.

My attention has just been called to the fact that next Friday is Good Friday, and the Senate will not then be in session. So I shall offer it on the following Monday.

I want the RECORD to show, Mr. President, what the parliamentary situation will be when I offer the resolution.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEES FROM A SUBJECT

Paragraph 2 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate provides that—

All * * * motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of a subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Except by unanimous consent, the resolution cannot be brought up for consideration until the first morning hour following an adjournment of the Senate, and as distinguished from recesses.

Immediately following the order for introduction of concurrent and other resolutions, if reached, the resolution will be laid before the Senate by the Presiding Officer and the question will be on agreeing to the resolution, which is debatable. It is subject to certain motions, under rule XXII, which have precedence in the following order, namely: first, to lay on the table; second, postpone indefinitely; third, postpone to

a day certain; fourth, to refer; and fifth, to amend. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

If the resolution has not been acted upon or disposed of by the end of the morning hour, which is 2 hours after the meeting of the Senate, it is placed on the Senate Calendar, whether or not there is unfinished business to be laid down at that time. The rules of procedure governing the consideration of bills on the calendar are then applicable to the resolution; that is a motion can only be gotten up for consideration by a majority vote of the Senators voting, a quorum, of course, being present. Such a motion at that time is debatable without limitation, subject, however, to the presentation of a cloture motion thereon. In the event the motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the question of agreeing to the resolution itself is debatable. If the resolution to discharge the committee is agreed to by the Senate, the resolution itself is placed upon the calendar and, under rule XXVI, cannot be taken up for consideration until another legislative day. The same procedure is required to secure consideration of the resolution as was the case with the resolution to discharge the committee.

The motion to take up the resolution is debatable, and if it is agreed to, the resolution itself is debatable and subject to amendment as in the case of any other resolution. Debate is unlimited except in case a cloture motion should be presented on the resolution and adopted by the Senate, which vote must be by two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate. Unless cloture has been adopted, a resolution could be superseded at any time by a majority vote of the Senate to take up any other matter except a privileged matter.

Mr. President, I have set forth in detail the parliamentary situation which would be created, because I want all those opposed to me on this matter to have available to them in ready form information about the parliamentary barriers they may construct if they want to. I have set it forth also, Mr. President, so that they are thereby served notice that I am familiar with the parliamentary situation which will be created by the filing of my motion, and I am perfectly willing to let that parliamentary procedure run its course, with full notice. It does not make any difference what parliamentary tactics some Senators may want to use against the junior Senator from Oregon with respect to this matter. His fight for equal representation for the people of the State of Oregon is not going to be stopped by parliamentary difficulties.

So in a very friendly spirit I close my committee work of the Independent Party this afternoon by repeating a bit of advice I gave to my colleagues 2 weeks ago, when I said, "You ought to relax. You must come to grips with this situation sooner or later. You will have to make up your minds whether you are going to assign the junior Senator from Oregon to committees on the basis of a garbage-can-disposal principle, or whether you are going to assign him to his committees in keeping with all the

historic precedents of the Senate since 1871, in respect to his seniority rights."

"It is your record," I say to the Republicans in the Senate today. "You, the Republican Party, are writing the record on this matter."

To the Democrats I say, "You ought to rededicate yourselves to the Jeffersonian principle of protecting minority rights." You ought to recognize all, Republicans and Democrats and Independents, alike, that when you begin to trample minority rights on the floor of the greatest parliamentary body in the world, you are doing a great injustice to the sovereign rights of a free people in every sovereign State of the United States.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE'S speech,

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose my rights to the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I had hoped to have an opportunity this afternoon to speak against Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. Obviously it is now going over until Monday, at which time I shall not be able to be present, in view of the fact that I am on the Small Business Committee, which will be holding hearings in California. I had wished to state my opposition to it. It does not follow the Hoover Commission recommendations. In essence, it is the same plan which was voted down in 1950. It would create a gigantic superstructure, and a greater bureaucracy. In principle the plan is just as bad now as it was then, even though the personalities have changed somewhat. Even though the principal personality is now a charming, gracious, and able lady, nonetheless the principle is the same.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a statement in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

I realize the futility of the Senators attempting to oppose the final passage of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. For it is already clear it will be adopted by an overwhelming vote. However, I think, for the record it should be made clear that some few of us do oppose it and for the following reasons:

First, this proposed reorganization plan does not conform to the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission; many of the general public, many doctors, and even some Senators are laboring under that illusion. A brief look at the record, however, shows that the Hoover Commission recommended that there be created a separate Department of Health and at no time, nor in any place, did the Commission recommend the lumping together of health, education, and welfare into one single department. If we look at the report of the hearings on the Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950, on page 17, we find where the senior Senator of New Jersey, in his statement said this,

and I quote: "The Hoover Commission did recommend the establishment of a Cabinet department embracing education, security, and Indian affairs. It also recommended the establishment of a United Medical Administration as a separate agency embracing the functions of public health services and overlapping hospital programs of several Government agencies."

In this connection, the Hoover Commission report on medical activities found that "only the creation of the United Medical Administration can remedy the weaknesses of the present organization and give the leadership urgently needed."

On page 37 of the hearing on the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 there is submitted by Dr. Shearon the report of the task force on Federal medical services. A letter of transmittal dated March 5, Washington, D. C., signed by Herbert Hoover, Chairman, follows:

"The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES.

"DEAR SIR: In accordance with Public Law 162, approved July 7, 1947, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government submits to the Congress herewith a supplemental report on the medical services of the Federal Government.

"The Commission's own report on Federal medical services is submitted to the Congress separately.

"Faithfully,

"HERBERT HOOVER,
"Chairman."

"SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON AN INDEPENDENT
MEDICAL AGENCY

"Proposal to set up a United Medical Service Organization as an independent administration, reporting to the President, instead of as a bureau of a department of health, education, and security: As our committee had been instructed to assume that any consolidated health organization would be a part of a new Cabinet-level department embracing health, education, and security, which the Commission would recommend, our main report contained on page I the following statement: "The above instructions excluded from our consideration the question as to whether a separate Cabinet department would be established for health alone, as urged by professional groups. However, should this be done, the organization which we are proposing would be adapted to such plan with only a few changes in nomenclature."

"Thus, we answer in the affirmative the question as to whether the organization which we originally designated as the National Bureau of Health, could function as an independent department or agency.

"It remains to consider whether such an alternative would be preferable. This question has been fully considered by our committee, and we have reached the conclusion that such an independent organization would be preferable to placing this function in a larger department, as the Commission originally proposed.

"In favoring this, we recognize that such an organization would create some additional problems. For example, the administration of health and welfare require close coordination in certain areas. Their separation would require an adjustment of the dual functions of the Children's Bureau and of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. These, however, can be solved without undue difficulty.

"The advantages of an independent agency are:

"(a) The health agency, if submerged within a multipurpose department, would be more likely to find its health functions impeded by collateral considerations pertaining to welfare and insurance.

"(b) Appropriations for health should, if possible, be clearly identified as such and not

confused with those for social security, welfare, or other social programs.

"(c) Other departments, such as the Armed Forces, using the medical service agency would be concerned only with its health functions as such and would thus be protected from any collateral and irrelevant considerations having to do with welfare, social security, etc."

Those who drafted the Hoover Commission reports on Federal medical practices always enunciated one underlying theme—a fear of putting together in one department the welfare programs and the health programs. They could see in such a coalition the possibility of eventual socialized medicine. It was stated in the debates of 1950 on this same reorganization plan over and over again that there was great danger in the lumping together of these two departments.

The American Medical Association, in 1950, was violently opposed to putting these two departments under the same head. An examination of the hearings on Reorganization Plan 27 of 1950 reveals on page 86 the statement by Louis H. Bauer on behalf of the American Medical Association the following:

"Within recent years, this represents the fourth time we of the medical profession have presented to the Congress our judgment as to the inadvisability of creating an executive department in which would be associated or combined health, educational, and welfare functions."

On page 88, Dr. Bauer again expressed his disapproval of this program and made the final statement:

"They would all combine in the executive department functions relating to health, welfare, education, and social security. We feel it would not advance adequate and proper Federal programs to stimulate improvements in the health of the citizens of our country, but it would tend to subordinate health problems to those related to other aspects of our national welfare, and that would be quite unfortunate."

Now I know that the proponents of the present reorganization plan state that the American Medical Association is now for this plan. However, it seems as though the American Medical Association only decided to be for this plan after they had been paid a personal visit by President Eisenhower and when he assured them that they were in no danger. We all know of the President's great charm and persuasive ability, but I frankly believe that the doctors are already beginning to regret the fact that they so quickly yielded to the persuasions of the President. On page 26 of the hearings of the 1953 reorganization plan, Dr. Deogenes quoted Dr. Bauer as he spoke to the delegates of the American Medical Association and he said Dr. Bauer said this: "But, gentlemen, this is going to be adopted regardless of what we do."

The implication is clear that, well, it was going to be adopted anyway so why should they oppose it.

I personally think the medical profession will regret their retreat from their long stand in opposition. The Dentists Association is still opposed to this plan, although I am examining the record of the hearings before the Senate which lasted 2 hours and 15 minutes, and there is not any evidence of how the dental profession stands. In the hearings on the reorganization plan of 1950 we find on page 107 that Dr. Harold Gal made this statement:

"Let me make it clear at this point that the American Dental Association has no opposition to the elevation of the Federal Security Agency to Cabinet status, but it believes that the elevation of that agency with the health organizations of the Government as a component part of the new department is inconsistent with the health needs of this country."

Now the proposal for reorganization of the Federal Security Agency was offered in 1950 by the Democrats sought to lump together

under one Cabinet head the department of health, education and welfare. It was bitterly opposed by the then minority party, the now majority party. The leadership stated at that time that this was an open invitation to socialism. In 1950 the proposal was also opposed by many of the Democratic Party. All of us who opposed it at that time feared that it would do more evil than good, would open the doorway to eventual socialized medicine. From the hearings as they appeared in the 1950 report, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Ohio stated he did not like that proposal because he felt the health department would be dominated by the welfare department. He had no objection, as I read his testimony, to lumping all these departments together under one Cabinet head but he apparently felt that there was not enough autonomy given to the health department. The Senior Senator from New Jersey, the junior Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and other Senators, rather openly stated their opposition to the proposal to lump together health, education and welfare. The same reasons on which they based their opinions in 1950, I based mine. I voted against it in 1950 more as a matter of principle than of personality. Of course, Oscar Ewing didn't do anything to help the passage of the Reorganization Plan of 1950. But arguments used against the plan of 1950 were made on the premise that it was dangerous and socialistic to put health in with the department of welfare.

As I look at this present reorganization proposal of 1953, I see no basic difference in this plan and that of 1950. The only difference to me is that under the present proposal there is to be a special Administrative Assistant to the Under Secretary who will be directly in charge of health and who can deal directly with the Cabinet members. In the 1950 proposal, the Surgeon General was authorized to deal directly with the Secretary himself. So I don't believe there is any basic difference in these reorganization plans. I hear many Senators say that they were afraid of Oscar Ewing, but not afraid of Mrs. Hobby. Certainly that can well be true for who could be afraid of Mrs. Hobby, as gracious and lovely as she is. However, is Mrs. Hobby to hold this Cabinet job forever? Who will succeed her? The Republicans must realize the Democrats will not be out for as long as 20 years, and, indeed, it will sound a little flat to hear them holler about socialism in 1957 after they have voted for this plan in 1953.

I feel confident that once this plan is put into effect, the doctors who had given it their reluctant approval, will discover they have been sold a bill of goods; they will realize they will never have an independent department of health. They will wish they had not deserted the stand which they had taken in previous years on this proposal.

Another reason why I oppose this present reorganization plan is that there is no evidence it will result in any savings to the taxpayers. As a matter of fact, Mr. Dodge, Director of the Budget Bureau, testified that the cost of the new Cabinet officer and assistants would result in \$32,500 a year. This, mind you, is just the salaries of the Secretary and assistants. It does not include new employees that will have to go to work for the Secretary and the assistants. There is no evidence that by lumping three departments together more efficiency will result, or a better program of health, of education, of welfare, will result. The only conclusion that can be practically drawn is that a new superstructure of bureaucracy will be erected over the departments which now already exist, that there will be expense added to the cost of government, that the welfare department being so much larger than the other departments will soon dominate them all and that Mrs. Hobby will have Cabinet rank with all the privileges, emoluments, and the prestige, that goes with that lofty position.

In summary, I feel that by coalescing the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare under one department, will endanger the independence of each one. We are opening the gateway to the road to socialized medicine and if we do that today because of the beliefs of Mrs. Hobby, how do we know that we are not creating the structure and machinery which will enable it to be brought about by one of her successors?

We are not following the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and we are adding expense to the Government at a time when we have just finished telling the people of America that we all would work for less bureaucracy and less expense. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall continue to oppose this reorganization plan, for if it does not come to a yea-or-nay vote, my opposition will hereby at least be on the record.

APPOINTMENT OR RETENTION OF CERTAIN FEMALE RESERVE PERSONNEL WITH MINOR OR DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I rise to acquaint my colleagues with the story of a remarkable young woman, whose diverse talents, high idealism, and strong sense of duty to her country for too long have been wasted—and are being wasted—by a shortsighted personnel policy sponsored by the Department of Defense.

The history of this lost service is embodied in the case of ex-Army Major Alba Martinelli Thompson, of East Orange, N. J., but it applies to many unheralded women who have lost the opportunity to serve their Nation for one basic reason—they become mothers.

This able young woman, the wife of an Army officer, gave birth to her first-born after World War II was concluded, and after she had served the Army brilliantly in many capacities, particularly in Korea, where she had acquired an intimate knowledge of both the language and conditions in that torn country.

Mr. President, when Major Martinelli joined the ranks of this other kind of army—the vaster and, I dare say, more important army of mothers—she was involuntarily discharged from the Women's Army Corps.

Now Major Martinelli, from my knowledge of her excellent character, would be the last woman on this earth to shirk the duties of this old army which she joined in motherhood. She made that clear in her testimony before a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate last year—testimony which, I am certain, was a strong factor in convincing the Senate that my proposed legislation in the last Congress was a necessary directive to the Department of Defense. My amendments to the Reserve Act, incidentally, were not finally adopted by the Congress as a whole.

Major Martinelli had this to say, in part:

I propose simply that experienced woman-power be stockpiled, maintained, and cataloged in a standby Reserve from which the Nation could draw in the event our very homes were threatened with destruction.

Practically no expense to the Government is involved. This would seem to be a practical and economical measure.

It cannot be denied that any organization comprised exclusively of women must face the inescapable facts that a great many of

its young women will marry and will become mothers.

This is not to say that motherhood renders them a complete loss to the service, no more than having children makes them a liability in the business and labor world.

A realistic attack of this problem would have faced the irrefutable facts and would have brought into being regulations which safeguard health, provide for pregnancy leaves, and protect seniority and retirement benefits.

Most important of all, a conscious attempt would be made to utilize to the fullest extent possible the invaluable training and skills of these women, so that the richest return on a considerable national investment should be realized.

None of these things has been accomplished by the Army.

It is evidently easier to discard this wealth than it is to work out an equitable set of rules governing servicewomen with minor children.

All of these women could have been, and should have been, utilized within the continental limits of the United States where their knowledge and experience is in such short supply.

It was evidently easier to discharge them than it was to draw up realistic regulations to continue them in service. Easier, perhaps, but certainly not cheaper.

We are all the poorer because their talents willingly offered are not available to the armed services.

How long we shall be able to afford such uneconomical and unwise handling of personnel is a moot question.

Mr. President, the bill which I offer today is simple. It would put a premium on the services of capable women—enlisted women as well as officers—who feel that they can do their job in periods of emergency and should not be penalized because they happen to be mothers.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference my bill proposing amendments to the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

The bill (S. 1492) to require the establishment of adequate provisions relating to the appointment or retention of certain female Reserve personnel with minor or dependent children, introduced by Mr. Hendrickson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I had the honor of being chairman of a subcommittee which conducted hearings last year on the reserve bill. I was very much impressed by the ability of Major Martinelli, and I thought then that there was much merit to the argument she made that Reserve officers and enlisted personnel should be retained, even though they may be mothers; whenever ways can be worked out whereby they can be of service to their country.

I can not help realizing that if we are forced into another world war, it will undoubtedly be a total war for all our people. I believe it is shortsighted for the Armed Services to refuse to recognize that women of the ability of Major Martinelli are willing to serve and can serve their country very ably in the event we are forced into all out war.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the junior Senator from Louisiana. I believe he recalls distinctly the testimony of Major Martinelli and her demeanor,

high character, and fitness for her work. I am certain that the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me that Major Martinelli made a marvelous record in the Army of the United States.

Mr. LONG. I certainly do agree with the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I think the Senator from Louisiana will probably recall also that he agreed with me to take my amendment to conference.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct. The amendment was lost in conference. I suspect that it was lost partially because there was so much resistance from the Pentagon. However, I believe the amendment had merit. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will be successful in obtaining early hearings on the bill, and that we will have the privilege of voting on it.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 30, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 27, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

John Roger Lewis, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Raymond Blattenberger, of Pennsylvania, to be Public Printer.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the remainder of the term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1955.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Ray M. Gidney, of Ohio, to be Comptroller of the Currency, in place of Preston Delano, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 27, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Walter S. Robertson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Edward Lumbard to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

GUAM

Ford Q. Elvidge, of Washington, to be Governor of Guam.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 27, 1953:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Wilson L. Townsend, of Maryland, member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.