SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1953

Dr. Joseph Simonson, executive secretary, division of public relations, National Lutheran Council, New York City, offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, O Lord God, in this important hour. We come in the calm confidence that no hopes or fears of man are foreign to Thee. Therefore, we dare believe that Thou art interested in what we think, say, and do here in the United States Senate. Conform us to Thy will, Heavenly Father, and to purposes and decisions which honor Thy name and help our fellow men. Only then will we be sure that any lasting good can come from our being here. Preserve us from the pettiness of small things in this great hour. Show us that we need fear no one or nothing—except Thee, O God.

Grant that Thy guidance may so illuminate and direct us here that no disappointed hopes for good shall follow in the wake of this day's session. To that end we commend into Thy hands the Vice President, the Senators, and all the officers of this legislative body, as well as the millions of Americans they represent. Into Thy hands we commend our Nation and its welfare. Into Thy hands we place our world.

In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 27, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

S. 1229. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954;

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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CHAVEZ were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week because of official business.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee investigating waterfront racketeering of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Improvement of Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

On request of Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Ammunition of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to sit for the next hour.

SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, last Saturday, March 28, was the 75th birthday anniversary of my very distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I know that all Senators join me at this time in extending to him very hearty and very sincere, though perforce belated, congratulations and best wishes. His service to his State and to his country has been unusually outstanding; and in this connection and at this point in my remarks I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of editorials which appeared in last Saturday's issues of the New York Times and the Washington Post, yesterday's issue of the New York Post, and this morning's issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

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

[From the New York Times of March 28, 1953]

SENATOR LEHMAN'S BIRTHDAY

Herbert H. Lehman, who reaches his 75th birthday today, has had three careers: one in private business, which he relinquished a quarter of a century ago; one in philanthropic enterprises, which goes back to the early days of his youth; one in public service, during which he has been successively lieutenant governor and governor of the State of New York, a director of relief and rehabilitation for the State Department, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and United States Senator.

To all that he has done he brought a keen intelligence, a humane spirit, and an urgent sense of responsibility. He has been a politician in the sense that he has voted and acted as a Democrat, and in his ability to be elected and reelected, but his public career dignifies an abused word. There was little artfulness in his four campaigns for the governorship or in his campaigns for the Senate. All he had to do was to present his record, his plans, and his hopes in the quiet and persuasive manner natural to him. He inspires trust. One may disagree with some of his views but never with his principles. When these are involved he will break with party, as he did when he opposed the Roosevelt Supreme Court plan.

His senatorial term has nearly 4 years to run. It is a pleasure to note that his health and energy are unimpaired. He is needed where he is, and good wishes for him are good wishes for his constituents and his country.

[From the Washington Post of March 28, 1953]

HERBERT LEHMAN: 75

Along with countless friends and fellow-citizens, we felicitate Herbert H. Lehman today on his 75th birthday. Senator LEHMAN is an ardent Democrat. But he is an American first, and his idea of being an American is enshrined in the Bill of Rights, and is, moreover, expressed in his humanitarian impulses. He has maintained an honorable and high-minded appreciation of the duties and responsibilities of a public official in a lifetime of service. His 10 years as Governor of New York were a model of efficient and progressive administration, and he gave to his work a painstaking and conscientious devotion which won him the regard of all New Yorkers regardless of party. May he have many more years of service to America and to the cause of freedom.

[From the New York Post of March 29, 1953]

TOAST TO A FIGHTING LIBERAL

We affectionately salute HERBERT LEHMAN on his 75th birthday. Too many people in public life grow weary, cynical, and indifferent to human suffering in their latter years; LEHMAN'S passion for justice and freedom seems to have grown more intense with the years. He was a good Governor; he has been a great Senator. Amid the timidity and irresolution that characterize so many men in Washington, he has conscientiously raised his voice on every momentous issue. No man has spoken out more forthrightly against the McCarthy madness; few have tried as hard as he has to make the Democratic Party fulfill its civil-rights pledges. No man is more deserving of the warm good wishes of American liberals.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 30, 1953]

MR. LEHMAN'S BIRTHDAY PRESENT

One must assume that the new study which Mrs. Lehman gave to her husband for a present on his 75th birthday was not an invitation to work; for over a long and successful career the Senator has shown himself one of the most indefatigable of men. As a place where mementoes of his years of public service may be stored, it will undoubtedly be well used. Few have gathered in more richly the fruits of experience. The quietness of the new study, moreover, may beguile him; though the arena of toil and conflict, where good causes have stood in need of a stout advocate, has been where he was most often found.

At 75 Senator LEHMAN is in the enviable position of a man who has served with disinterested zeal and can look back without self-reproach on accomplishments of a high order. His advice to youth at this milestone is to shape for themselves the kind of government they believe to be good; and he is young himself in following this injunction.

A large public must wish for him many years to enjoy his new study—not as a place of retreat but as a place where fresh resolves are formed and new tasks undertaken.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF STATE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 115)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on the operations of the Department of State under section 2 of Public Law 584, 79th Congress, as required by that law.

The enclosed report contains a summary of developments under the program during the 1952 calendar year. It also includes texts of executive agreements concluded with foreign governments pursuant to this legislation, as well as listings of names of both American and foreign recipients of grants, a detailed statement on expenditures, various statistical tables, and other information concerning the operations of this program during the 1952 calendar year.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 30, 1953.*

(Enclosure: Report from the Secretary of State concerning Public Law 584.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration during the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 501 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO CRIMINAL SANCTIONS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, recommending, for the information of the Senate, enactment of legislation amending section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to change the criminal sanctions contained therein so that violations of the Communications Act will constitute, except in case of a subsequent violation of the same section of the act, a misdemeanor rather than a felony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution requesting Members of Congress to support the agricultural conservation program

"Whereas the topsoil of the Nation is one of its most important resources; and

"Whereas for the past 17 years the United States Department of Agriculture, through the agricultural conservation program, has done much to maintain and rebuild soils and also to make farmers and the public in general more aware of the need for such preservation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and the house of representatives:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to continue the agricultural conservation program; and

"2. That the secretary of state be directed to transmit duly attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, the Secretary of Agriculture, and our congressional delegation.

"CONSUELO N. BAILEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved March 25, 1953.

"LEE E. EMERSON,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 16

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for distribution of revenue derived from the development of oil and gas deposits of the United States to the several States and the District of Columbia for purposes of education

"Whereas oil and gas values under the Continental Shelf surounding the United States amount to some $70 billion; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has judicially determined that these oil and gas deposits belong to all the citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States certain proposals popularly known as the Anderson and Hill bills, which provide for distribution of the royalty derived from development of these oil and gas deposits among the 48 States of the United States and the District of Columbia for school purposes on the basis of school population with equitable provision being made for the special claims of the 4 coastal States adjacent to said deposits; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado, which presently faces a serious financial problem in meeting the cost of educating the children of Colorado, would receive over the years some $70 million of revenue under the provisions of the said Anderson and Hill bills: 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 the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact the said Anderson and Hill bills; be it further

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

"GORDON ALLOTT,
"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 joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Califorina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to requesting the Congress of the United States to adopt and submit an amendment to the Constitution pertaining to treaties and executive agreements

"Whereas it is essential to the welfare of the people of this Nation that the Constitution of the United States be amended to clarify its provisions regarding the effect of treaties with foreign powers upon domestic matters and also as to the making of executive agreements; and

"Whereas Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 has been introduced in the 83d Congress the text of which reads:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"'"SEC. 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

"'"SEC. 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

"'"SEC. 4. All executive or other agreements between the President and any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations proposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

"'"SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"'"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested and urged to adopt Senate Joint Resolution No. 1; and be it further

"Resolved That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the

House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial relating to the Interstate Commerce Act

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"A movement is under way to induce the Congress to repeal section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

"Arizona and its sister States depend upon the transportation system to keep in movement the flow of goods between the States.

"The economy of the State of Arizona is to a very large extent dependent upon the reasonableness of its freight costs. The long-haul and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act has protected Arizona and its intermountain neighbors against rate discrimination since 1915. The continuance of this protection is of vital concern to Arizona.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress leave in status quo section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, in the interests of equity and well-established need."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana, and to the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Representatives in Congress from Montana, requesting passage of legislation and a supplemental appropriation to provide adequate facilities and operating funds so that veterans in need of treatment for tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric conditions, and domiciliary care can obtain treatment in Veterans' Administration facilities in Montana

"Whereas there were less than 20,000 veterans in the State of Montana following World War I, and the Government provided at that time approximately 435 hospital beds for these veterans. Following World War II, with over 78,000 veterans in Montana, the Government provided 365 hospital beds in Montana, and today, with the Korean conflict in existence, we anticipate at least an additional 10,000 to 15,000 veterans in Montana, or a total of approximately 88,000 veterans in this State, with still 365 hospital beds, of which no more than 250 can be utilized because of lack of personnel; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States, by appropriate legislation, has acknowledged responsibility for the care of disabled veterans whether they be mental, tubercular, general medical, or domiciliary type; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration in the State of Montana has had to forego the treatment of eligible veterans, and the State of Montana taxpayers are being required to pay for the care and treatment of psychiatric cases in Warm Springs, tubercular cases in Galen, and domiciliary cases at Columbia Falls, Montana Soldiers' Home (domiciliary home), when, in fact, Congress has passed laws and has taxed the people of the United States, and in particular, the people of Montana, for the care and treatment for which the State of Montana is now being forced to pay because of reduction in Veterans' Administration facilities and services in Montana; and

"Whereas with more veterans in Montana than ever before, Montana naturally needs more hospital beds; however, Congress saw fit to reduce the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration by $40 million on July 5, 1952. This tremendous reduction in appropriations has reduced the funds available in Montana by $92,500 quarterly. This reduction has adversely affected the use of medical consultants, medical supplies, services, prosthetics, etc., (including beneficiary travel), medical fee-basis funds, medical examinations, and treatments, dental-fee funds—examinations and treatments of local doctors. Both inpatient and outpatient services to Montana veterans have been radically curtailed. In Montana today, there are no Veterans' Administration facilities set up to care for veterans in need of treatment for tubercular, neuropsychiatric, and those veterans in need of domiciliary care. Veterans' Administration medical personnel in Montana, inadequate for years, has been cut by 25 positions in the last quarter of 1952, therefore affecting number of admissions to VA hospitals in Montana. Medical outpatient service has been cut by one-third and dental outpatient service has been reduced by 80 percent; leaving four-fifths of Montana's veterans without outpatient service, as provided by law; and

"Whereas the State of Montana is now being forced to spend many thousands of dollars for the care and treatment of these veterans at Montana institutions and hospitals due to the failure on the part of the Veterans' Administration to care for Montana veterans in Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America for the passage of legislation and provision of a supplemental appropriation, which will provide adequate Veterans' Administration facilities in Montana; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the secretary of the State of Montana, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Congressmen from Montana, and that they be requested to use all honorable means within their power to bring about the enactment of necessary legislation.

"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"LOU E. BREZTE,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Memorial 15

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would establish an American Foreign Legion

"Whereas the demands upon American manhood resulting from the many and scattered campaigns against communism have deprived the young men of America of their rights to obtain an early education and from establishing their homes while they are still young; and

"Whereas many persons of other nations of the world would join the fight against communism but are unable to do so since their homelands are not members of the United Nations, or such homelands are unable to sustain adequate armed forces; and

"Whereas there are many armies in the field which are fighting against communism with arms and supplies furnished by the United States but with no control over such armies by United States commanders; and

"Whereas a chance would be given to such eager young men of other nations to join the fight against communism and this country could gain some control over such persons in the field by forming and maintaining an American Foreign Legion: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation establishing an American Foreign Legion which would be open to applicants from any country of the world, within reasonable security measures; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the proper officers of Congress and to the President of the United States.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 11th day of March 1953.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Memorial 7

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide that the first $1,000 of personal income shall be exempt from taxation by the Federal Government

"Whereas the country is passing through a period of heavy inflation resulting in higher prices on basic necessities, thus placing a tremendous burden upon persons receiving small incomes; and

"Whereas the $600 tax exemption on personal income provided by the income tax laws has become completely inadequate in the light of such heavy inflation to relieve any burden placed by inflation upon such low-income groups: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation which would amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that the first $1,000 of personal income shall be exempt from taxation by the Federal Government; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the proper officer of the Congress of the United States and to the President of the United States.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk."

Two resolutions of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Senate Memorial 9

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide a system which would permit persons absent from this country on election day to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States

"Whereas many persons are absent from the United States on Presidential election days through no fault of their own; and

"Whereas such persons are either in the service of their beloved country or upon important business missions which are absolutely necessary for the economic health of this country; and

"Whereas the present role in which this country is cast in the fields of international politics will result in an increasing number of such persons being absent from the United States on the day their President and Vice President are elected; and

"Whereas the persons absent from this country and unable to vote on election day would desire very much to participate in such elections; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has the power to provide for a system of absentee voting which affects national officers of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation which would establish a system of absentee voting for persons who are absent from the United States on election day so that such absent persons may vote for their President and Vice President; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the President of the United States.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 3d day of March 1953.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

"Senate Memorial 8

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for a system of absentee voting which would permit persons who are absent from their home States on any presidential election day to vote for their President and Vice President

"Whereas since this Nation has essentially a transient population, many people are absent from their home States on the day the President of this country is elected; and

"Whereas many States do not now have any system of absentee balloting which results in disenfranchisement for thousands of people upon every Presidential election day; and

"Whereas since the ability to vote by every single person in a State is the nucleus of any democracy and nation dedicated to self-government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation establishing a system of absentee voting whereby persons absent from their home States on any Presidential election day may, nevertheless, vote for their President and Vice President; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be duly presented to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Memorial 4

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Senate of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the cost of food, clothing, and other commodities necessary to sustain life are much higher in Alaska than in the continental United States; and

"Whereas the United States Government has already recognized this fact by granting a 25-percent cost-of-living salary increase to Federal employees in Alaska; and

"Whereas this action on the part of the United States Government grants relief to only a portion of the population of Alaska; and

"Whereas the entire population of Alaska need some tax relief in order to increase the general standard of living in Alaska.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States amend the Federal income-tax laws to provide that Alaskan taxpayers receive a $1,200 personal exemption and a $900 exemption for each dependent."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 12

"To the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, and to the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas from the principle that the United States cannot be sued without its consent the general rule has been derived, and adhered to constantly, that agencies and instrumentalities of the United States are not subject to garnishment for moneys due their employees; and

"Whereas such a rule not only makes it difficult for creditors to reach lawful claims, but also frequently deprives a creditor from any recourse whatever in realizing on his claim; and

"Whereas there are many instances where individuals have left non-Government employment to work for the United States with the sole purpose of avoiding payment of their just debts; and

"Whereas a rule which exempts from attachment the pay of Federal employees is grossly unfair and discriminatory, since the wages of non-Government employees who perform work identical with that of employees of the Federal Government, and often in the same location, are subject to attachment by garnishment of the employer.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully requests that appropriate legislation be enacted authorizing the attachment of moneys owed by Federal agencies and instrumentalities to their employees.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Passed by the senate February 20, 1953.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relating to an immediate appropriation for the construction of that portion of the central Arizona project known as the Bridge Canyon Dam and Bridge Canyon powerplant; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCCARRAN on March 18, 1953, p. 2034, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the California Petroleum Distributors Association, Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the limitation of imports of crude oil or petroleum products; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the St. Paul Association of Commerce, St. Paul, Minn., favoring the enactment of legislation to revise Federal civil-service laws to permit replacement of Government employees in certain classifications with qualified personnel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Five resolutions adopted by the National Sojourners, at Baltimore, Md., relating to world government distribution of U. S. S. R. information bulletins; the Genocide Convention; the UNESCO pamphlets entitled "Toward World Understanding," and sovereignty over Antarctic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Three resolutions adopted by the National Sojourners, at Baltimore, Md., relating to the constitutional amendment regarding treaties and executive agreements; the flying of the United Nations flag, and the so-called McCarran-Walter immigration bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Joseph Lee, Sr., father of the American playground, and so forth; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the city of Pasadena, Calif., favoring prompt action by the Congress to alleviate flood hazards to portions of the city of Pasadena; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXCISE TAXES ON COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada. It is Assembly Joint Resolution No. 29, memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise taxes on communications services.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

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

Assembly Joint Resolution 29

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise taxes on communications services

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nevada has been giving and is continuing to give study to the effect of the tax burden on utility services; and

Whereas Congress has recognized the special burden created by excise taxes on public utility services by the recent elimination of such tax on electrical energy and reduction of the tax on domestic telegraph communications; and

Whereas communication services cannot be considered in the class of a luxury, yet are taxed higher than most luxuries, thus discriminating against the use of communication services; and

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on communications were initially levied or greatly increased during World War II to help defray war costs and to discourage unnecessary use of communication facilities; and

Whereas all such taxes are discriminatory against the long distance user of communication services, and against sections of the country far removed from centers of population for the reason that the tax is calculated as a percentage of the communication charge; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That in their opinion the present excise taxes on communication services are inimical to the maintenance of a reasonably priced and nondiscriminatory public communication service and that, accordingly, the excise taxes on communication services should be repealed or greatly reduced; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the President of the Senate of the United States of America, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, each of the United States Senators from the State of Nevada, and the Member of Congress from the State of Nevada.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

LANDS OF HOKE COUNTY, N. C., FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of North Carolina, requesting the

United States Government not to take any further lands of Hoke County, N. C., for defense purposes, as set forth in the joint resolution, which is duly certified by Hon. Thad Eure, secretary of state of North Carolina, under date of March 26, 1953. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

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

Joint Resolution 25

Joint resolution requesting the United States Government not to take any further lands of Hoke County for defense purposes

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States and the Defense Department of the United States a plan to take some 50,000 additional acres of land from Hoke County; and

Whereas the United States Government has taken some 92,000 acres of land from Hoke County for the purpose of enlarging Fort Bragg; and

Whereas the United States Government now proposes to take an additional 50,000 acres of land from Hoke County, upon which some 400 families live, for the purpose of having a corridor between Fort Bragg and Camp Mackall; and

Whereas the North Carolina Sanatorium for treatment of tuberculosis, at McCain, N. C., Hoke County, consisting of a hospital of 600 patients ill with tuberculosis, 366 employees and (in most instances) their families, and such service facilities as the power house, laundry, etc., is located within the area seriously affected by the United States Government proposal to take additional acreage from Hoke County but not included in the present proposal; and

Whereas the area sought by the United States Army encroaches upon sanatorium property in such a way that the institution comes to occupy an acute angle, almost a peninsula, within the military reservation, adjacent to the "impact" or target area, where the shells will be detonated at each firing; and

Whereas the basis of treatment of tuberculosis is rest; the proposal will block traffic on route 211, because the road crosses the path of fire, defeating the State's regional arrangement for sanatorium care; and if the Army plan goes through, the sanatorium would rapidly lose its effectiveness as a treatment center; and

Whereas relocation of the sanatorium in more congenital surroundings would at current costs of $15,000 per bed amount to $9 million exclusive of site, housing of employees, etc.

Whereas if said 50,000 acres of land is taken, it will in effect practically destroy Hoke County as a governmental unit, and in addition thereto, an unusual hardship would be visited upon the 400 families whose lands are proposed to be taken; and that said lands proposed to be taken are fine farm lands and most of the owners of said lands have been natives of Hoke County since its creation, or are descendants thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring):

SECTION 1. The General Assembly of North Carolina does hereby respectfully request the United States Government not to take further lands from Hoke County, and in particular not to take said lands of Hoke County for the corridor proposed to be made between Fort Bragg and Camp Mackall.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of War, and to the North Carolina Members of Congress.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption.

JOINT MEMORIALS OF OREGON STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I present three joint memorials adopted by the Oregon State Legislature and sent to me for presentation to the Senate and printing in the RECORD.

The first deals with a situation in Tillamook Bay in the State of Oregon, involving the Bayocean Peninsula, where the sea is very rapidly washing away approximately $2.5 million dollars' worth of homes and capital investments.

There is a great deal of feeling on the part of the Oregon Legislature, which I believe to be entirely justified, that the Federal Government should cooperate, through the Corps of Army Engineers, in building whatever walls and revetments and other protective installations which may be necessary to stop this great loss.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint memorial be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

House Joint Memorial 2

To the Honorable the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America; to the Honorable the Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America; and to the Honorable Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America from Oregon:

We, your memorialists, the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Bayocean Peninsula guarding the entrance to the Tillamook Bay area is on the verge of complete obliteration by the eroding action of the sea; and

Whereas the entire Tillamook Bay area, protected for generations by the Bayocean Peninsula, serving as a buffer or natural dike from the rampaging waves and storms of the sea; and

Whereas the oysterbed industry in Tillamook Bay, representing a $2,500,000 capital investment, is being covered and destroyed by sand and silt swept in by the sea; and

Whereas the Port of Bay City, with a cash investment of $2,100,000 principal and interest of taxpayers' moneys, and whose activities, including the operation of the port ebbing tidal waters, the flow through the old channel has lessened considerably, and as a result the 18-foot deep inlet serving as the Tillamook Bay area's commercial outlet to the sea is threatened with coverage by silt due to the decrease of the scouring action of the lessened tidal flow; and

Whereas even the existence of the city of Tillamook and several little hamlets on the eastern shore of the bay, due to their low elevation above sea level, would constantly live under the threat of combinations of high tide and westerly storms as the result of the obliteration of Bayocean Peninsula; and

Whereas the entire future economy of Tillamook County will suffer through loss of real property taxes, payroll income, and income taxes paid to the State and Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State or Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That this 47th Legislative Assembly, in regular session assembled, urges the Congress of the United States to consider this as an emergency and to take immediate steps following the report of the United States Corps of Engineers, now being processed to provide funds to start construction forthwith; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America; to the Honorable the Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America; the Honorable GUY CORDON, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable SAM COON, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; and the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The second joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of Oregon deals with the so-called Bricker joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution relating to treaty-making powers. I ask unanimous consent that the joint memorial be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

House Joint Memorial 3

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, and to the Honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress of the United States of America from Oregon:

We, your memorialists, the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas it is essential to protect the rights of American citizens against the dangers of treaty law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That this 47th Legislative Assembly in regular session assembled recommends to the Congress of the United States for consideration an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in respect of the treaty-making powers, reading as follows:

"A provision of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by Congress which it could enact under its delegated powers in the absence of such treaty"; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate of the United States, and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the third joint memorial adopted by the Oregon Legislature, deals with the problem of deepening the channel from Portland, Oreg., to the mouth of the Columbia River, so as to give to that great port the necessary depth of channel to meet its ocean transport needs. I ask unani-

mous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Senate Joint Memorial 5

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the United States Army Engineers, North Pacific division, have submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors a report recommending modification of the existing project in order that the channel depth of the Columbia River at its mouth may be increased from the present authorized 40 feet to a depth of 48 feet and adequate width provided in order to eliminate shipping delays and existing hazards; and

Whereas the ship channel in the Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., to the mouth has not been continuously maintained to the project depth and width and that such lack of adequate maintenance has resulted in navigational difficulties to the detriment of commercial and industrial waterborne commerce by limiting the feasible draft of oceangoing vessels using these rivers; and

Whereas such restrictions adversely affect the livelihood of the citizens in commercial, industrial, and agricultural pursuits, not only in the area immediately adjacent to the rivers but also in the much larger area of the Willamette Valley and the great inland empire; and

Whereas the funds expended by the Corps of Engineers for maintenance of the Columbia and Willamette River Channels and the mouth of the Columbia River have been insufficient to continuously maintain the authorized project width and depths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That this, the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, hereby does petition the Senate of the United States of America and the House of Representatives of the United States of America to approve and expeditiously appropriate sufficient funds to enable the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, to implement the report of the engineers above referred to, in order that a channel of 48 feet in depth and adequate width may be created at the Columbia River entrance; be it further

Resolved, That these bodies take such action as may be appropriate in order that the channel of the Columbia and Willamette Rivers below Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., be continuously maintained at the project dimensions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable GUY CORDON, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable SAM COON, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; to the United States congressional Committee on Rivers and Harbors; and to the Board of United States Army Engineers appointed to investigate and approve such projects.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SENATE, AND LEGISLATURE OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a number of resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Legislature of the State of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 13

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of title 16 of the United States Code providing for taxes upon the sale of toilet preparations and upon the sale of wallets, ladies' handbags, and similar handbags and similar articles

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas under the provisions of title 16 of the United States Code, a tax of 10 percent is imposed upon the sales price of perfumes, toilet waters, toilet powders, and similar substances; and

"Whereas under the provisions of title 16 of the United States Code, a tax of 20 percent is imposed upon the sales price of wallets, handbags, pocketbooks, and other similar articles; and

"Whereas the above taxes are levied and collected without regard to the ability of the purchaser of such substances and goods to pay such a tax; and

"Whereas such taxes are a direct burden upon the business economy of this country and unfair to persons of low income: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to repeal the provisions of law imposing such taxes; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

"House Memorial 4

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to exempt pensions or moneys received from labor union funds from taxation by the Federal Government

"Whereas the working man and woman of America is being burdened by high taxation, and that to alleviate some of this burden, the Congress of the United States should enact remedial legislation; and

"Whereas the expenses incurred by workers are not now exempt or deductible as expenses from income taxes; and

"Whereas expenses incurred by parents for the care of minor children, while said parents are employed, are not deductible from income taxes; and

"Whereas coal miners now receiving pensions from the welfare fund of the United Mine Workers of America are taxed on moneys received as pensions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact such remedial legislation as may be necessary to permit the deduction from income taxes of expenses incurred for travel to and from work, expenses incurred by working mothers and fathers for the care and maintenance of minor children, and to exempt from income taxes remuneration received by coal miners in the form of miner's pension; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be furnished to each House of Congress and the appropriate officers thereof."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 19

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 397 introduced in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, constituting the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district

"Whereas the increase in population and economic activity in the State of New Mexico has resulted in excessive administration burdens for the customs collection district to which the State of New Mexico is presently attached; and

"Whereas for efficient customs administration it is desirable and feasible to constitute the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district; and

"Whereas there has been introduced into the 1st session of the 83d Congress Senate bill No. 397 which if enacted would constitute the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district with ports of entry at Columbus and Antelope Wells, and with headquarters at Deming, all in the State of New Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact Senate bill No. 397 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress constituting the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district with ports of entry at Columbus and Antelope Wells and with headquarters at Deming in the State of New Mexico; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 11

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States and to the New Mexico congressional delegation relating to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to effect a change in the method of electing the President and the Vice President of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the present system of election of the President and the Vice President of the United States by the electoral college is an anachronism in the 20th century; and

"Whereas the present system is undemocratic in that it allows the possibility of the election of a President with a minority of the popular vote, and this has been the case in three presidential elections in this country; and

"Whereas reform in the method of electing the President and Vice President is urgently needed; and

"Whereas it is necessary to protect the right of the people of the sovereign States to have their votes adequately reflected in such presidential elections: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation to provide that a proposed constitutional amendment be submitted to the sovereign States to abolish the electoral college; to provide that each State retain the same number of electoral votes as it has Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress; and to provide that the electoral vote in each State for the President and the Vice President be cast in proportion to the number of popular votes cast for each candidate in such election; be it further

"Resolved, That an enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives as well as to the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in the United States Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial by the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to remove the prohibition in section I of the compact between the United States and the State of New Mexico relating to the sale, barter, etc., of intoxicating liquor in New Mexico to Indians

"Whereas section I of the compact between the United States of America and the State of New Mexico provides a prohibition against the sale, barter, or giving of intoxicating liquors to Indians, and the introduction of such liquors into the Indian country; and

"Whereas it is felt that the Indians of this State are now capable of engaging in the sale, barter, or receipt of intoxicating liquors: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized to enact adequate legislation to remove the restriction contained in section I of the compact between the United States of America and the State of New Mexico, which provides a prohibition against the sale, barter, or giving of intoxicating liquors to Indians; be it further

"Resolved, That an enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be sent to each of the representatives from New Mexico in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 12

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America regarding the construction of a series of small dams at the head of the streams, on the Coyote, the Agua Negra, the Cebolla, the Sapello, and the Manuelitas Creeks, in Mora and San Miguel Counties, N. Mex.: (1) A dam on the Coyote River, near Black Lakes, N. Mex.; (2) a dam on the Lujan Canon Creek, above Chacon, N. Mex.; (3) a dam on the Cleveland Lake, near Cleveland, N. Mex.; (4) a dam on the Cebolla Creek, below Rociada, N. Mex.; (5) a dam on the Sapello Creek, near San Ignacio, N. Mex.

"Whereas 1,800 families living in this area of small-income farms lose their crops and labor every year for the lack of water-storage facilities to carry over the drought period, between June 15 and July 15 of each year; and

"Whereas by the construction of such dams an adequate water supply can be provided, and thereby benefit 1,800 families to the point of sufficient incomes to maintain their families, make the area a prosperous farming community, and an asset to the State; and

"Whereas investigation and research show that these dams can be constructed very economically due to the fact that they are small; and

"Whereas by the construction of such dams a normal flow of water can be maintained on the creeks the year round, making fishing and hunting another asset for the benefit of all the people of the State of New Mexico and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take proper action toward the construction of the aforementioned dams, to the end that future loss of crops and farm labor and distress among the families of the small-income farmers be relieved; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forthwith sent to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 11th day of March 1953.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of Mexico."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

"House Memorial 9

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, regarding the construction of a series of small dams at the head of the streams, on the Coyote, the Agua Negra, the Cebolla, the Sapello, and the Manuelitas, creeks, in Mora and San Miguel Counties, N. Mex.: (1) A dam on the Coyote River, near Black Lakes, N. Mex.; (2) a dam on the Lujan Canon Creek, above Chacon, N. Mex.; (3) a dam on the Cleveland Lake, near Cleveland, N. Mex.; (4) a dam on the Cebolla Creek, near Ledoux, N. Mex.; (5) a dam on the Manuelita Creek, below Rociada, N. Mex.; (6) a dam on the Sapello Creek, near San Ignacio, N. Mex.

"Whereas 1,800 families living in this area of small-income farms lose their crops and labor every year for the lack of having facilities of water storage to carry over the drought period, between June 15 and July 15, of each year; and

"Whereas by the construction of such dams an adequate water supply can be provided, and thereby benefit 1,800 families to the point of a sufficient income to maintain their families, make the area a prosperous farming community, and an asset to the State; and

"Whereas investigation and research show that these dams can be constructed very economically due to the fact that they are small; and

"Whereas by the construction of such dams a normal flow of water can be maintained on the creeks the year around, making fishing and hunting another asset for the benefit of all the people of the State of New Mexico and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to take the proper action toward the construction of the aforementioned dams, to the end that future loss of crops and farm labor and distress among the families of the small-income farmer, be relieved; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forthwith sent, respectively, to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress."

"House Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the construction of a water storage reservoir to be known as the Nambe Dam and to be located on the Nambe River within the Pojoaque Soil Conservation District, New Mexico

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the United States Geological Survey, the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the New Mexico State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the United States Department of the Interior, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the United States Forest Service, the United States Bureau of Land Management, the United States Park Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the New Mexico State Lands Office, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the New Mexico Highway Department, the All Pueblo Council and the Pojoaque Soil Conservation District have recommended the construction of a water storage reservoir to be located above the Nambe Falls on the Nambe River, N. Mex.; and

"Whereas the construction of such reservoir has been in the planning stages for at least 30 years; and

"Whereas such a storage reservoir is necessary for the storage of water and for irrigation and flood control; and

"Whereas the cost of such reservoir has been estimated by the above named agencies to be $218,700; and

"Whereas the cost of such reservoir is minor when compared with the immediate need for such reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation providing for the construction of a water storage reservoir to be known as Nambe Dam and to be located above the crest of the Nambe Falls on the Nambe River within the Pojoaque Soil Conservation District, New Mexico; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to each of the agencies named herein."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing two joint resolutions, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 13

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to grant to the State of New Mexico for the benefit of the Museum of New Mexico 500,000 acres of public lands of the United States within the State of New Mexico

"Whereas the Museum of New Mexico is an important educational and scientific institution which was inadvertently omitted from the original group of State institutions given land grants by the act of Congress of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557); and

"Whereas such museum conserves and houses invaluable collections of the greatest cultural importance in the fields of archeology, ethnology, history, and art; is charged

with the duty of excavating and studying ancient ruins for the benefit of the museum, the preservation of archeological sites in New Mexico and the publication of investigations of the same; repairs and maintains various historic sites and State monuments, performs in part a national duty for the people of the United States in helping to preserve numerous archeological landmarks on the public domain; maintains an extensive research library in the foregoing fields and operates numerous branch museums in various communities of the State of New Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is requested to enact a law granting to the Museum of New Mexico 500,000 acres of public land situated in the State of New Mexico, notwithstanding such lands are now or may hereafter be embraced within a grazing district authorized under the act of Congress of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269).

"SEC. 2. That the lands requested to be granted shall be held by the State under the same restrictions and limitations as those granted by the Enabling Act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557).

"SEC. 3. Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forthwith sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 16

"'Joint memorial to the President and Congress of the United States relating to Indians

"Whereas the State of New Mexico has, since its admission to the Union, had a large Indian population, most of whom are wards of the United States living upon reservations supervised and controlled by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas New Mexico became a part of the United States more than 100 years ago; and

"Whereas this legislature does not feel that the Indians living within this State have been given proper opportunity to secure proper education and to achieve any sort of economic independence; and that the United States has not assumed its full responsibility in this regard; and

"Whereas the Indians of this State have demonstrated conclusively that they are loyal subjects of the United States and have served with valor and distinction in the Armed Forces of the United States and that they are persons who, when given the opportunity, readily respond to our educational and self-improvement opportunities; and

"Whereas the welfare, not only of the Indians, but of the State of New Mexico and the United States will be best served by changing the method of education and treatment of the Indian to develop his independence, initiative, and economic stability; and

"Whereas within the State of New Mexico the different Indian tribes have adequate amounts of land which cannot be developed because of the lack of necessary modern equipment and because of the unavailability of the necessary funds with which to purchase said equipment: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Senators, and Representatives of New Mexico in the United States Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs be memorialized as follows, to wit:

"1. To provide educational facilities for all Indians of a quality and character of the type now being enjoyed by the students in the public school system of the State of New Mexico.

"2. That such educational facilities be provided for the Indians at or near their homes in similar manner to that provided by the public schools of the State of New Mexico.

"3. That steps be taken to the end that the Indian people be educated in vocations and occupations suitable to their needs and wherever possible unappropriated waters adjacent to Indian reservations be diverted through proper irrigation to the end that the agricultural and livestock potential of the Indian be increased to further his economic self-sufficiency through agriculture and stock raising.

"4. That there be speeded a complete lifting of the restrictions imposed on the Indians as wards of the United States so that their initiative will be cultivated and that they be assimilated as full citizens with all rights, responsibilities, and privileges thereof at the earliest possible time.

"5. That the Congress, in cooperation with the Interior Department, make a survey designed to make available, under a self-liquidating plan, to the Indians such equipment as they might need to reclaim their lands and promote modern farming, livestock, and other industries.

"6. *Be it further resolved,* That enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in the United States Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"Joint memorial memorializing Congress to refrain from passage of United States Senate bill No. 281, giving the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over the discontinuance of intrastate railroad services

"Whereas there has been introduced for consideration by the 1st session of the 83d Congress, Senate bill No. 281, giving the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over the discontinuance of intrastate railroad services, in certain instances; and

"Whereas this proposed legislation is clearly an infringement upon the sovereign rights of the various States of the Union; and

"Whereas such legislation, if enacted, would clearly violate the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is memorialized to justify the faith placed in its Members by the electorate, by refraining from enacting into law said Senate bill No. 281 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this memorial be submitted to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of New Mexico's delegation in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Interstate Commerce Commission to expedite hearings now pending and render a decision equalizing freight rates in the southwest region, including New Mexico

"Whereas New Mexico has been and is now suffering from high and discriminatory freight rates to the detriment of development of the natural resources of the State; and

"Whereas new industry is vital to the economic development of the State and the well-being of its people; and

"Whereas it is difficult if not impossible to attract new industry under the existing high freight rate structure with which the State is burdened; and

"Whereas hearings are now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning freight rates in the Southwest region: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and it hereby is, memorialized to expedite the hearings now pending and render a decision equalizing freight rates for this region; and be it further

"Resolved, That enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation to appropriate moneys for the construction of Los Esteros Dam on the Pecos River in Guadalupe County, N. Mex., for flood control, power, and reservoir

"Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers has approved the construction of a dam at the Los Esteros Damsite for the purposes of flood and sediment control; and

"Whereas there is a great and urgent public need for the construction of said Los Esteros Dam to prevent the destruction of farmlands by flood, to impound waters needed for existing irrigation projects which is otherwise lost in spring run-offs, and other beneficial uses; and

"Whereas the present unrestrained flow of the Pecos River above existing reservoir structures on said river causes the movement of silt into said reservoirs and thus reduces the usefulness of said reservoirs and will ultimately destroy completely said exiting reservoirs, as storage basins; and

"Whereas the construction of said Los Esteros Dam would eliminate seasonal turbidity during seasonal run-off periods and eliminate excess salinity during protracted dry seasons and eliminate further bank cutting and loss of land caued by flood stages of said Pecos River: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is petitioned to authorize the appropriation and transfer of such amount of moneys from the general fund of the Treasury to the reclamation fund as the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War report to the Congress as the amount of the total cost of the Los Esteros Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River, N. Mex., and that Congress authorize the construction of the Los Esteros Dam and Reservoir by the United States Corps of Engineers for the purposes of controlling floods, regulating the flow of the Pecos River, providing for storage and for delivery of stored waters, and for other beneficial uses; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of New Mexico."

TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
President of the Senate.
NATALIE S. BUCK,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ALVIN STOCKTON,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
LILBURN C. HOMAN,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC., ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions adopted by the stockholders of the Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., at their annual meeting in St. Paul, Minn., on March 5, relating to the commodity loan program, farm policy and parity, and the completion of certain multipurpose dam projects.

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

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"CERTIFICATE OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY STOCKHOLDERS AT 22D ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMEES UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC., MARCH 5, 1953

"*Resolved*, That this meeting records its support of the commodity loan program and agricultural conservation payments for soil conservation; and

"*Resolved further*, That we believe that farmer-elected community committeemen should have responsible participation in the administration of farm programs; and

"*Resolved further*, That we favor further development of Federal crop insurance so that farmers will have the opportunity to protect their investment in producing the Nation's food and fiber."

"FARM POLICY AND PARITY

"We are in agreement with many leaders in the major phases of our national life—political, economic, social, and religious, that the family-type farm must be preserved and protected.

"When the farmer raises food and fiber he is subjected to enormous risks and uncertainties, both in the yield and the price of his crops. In the national interest these risks must be taken. But it is neither fair nor economically possible in this day and age for the farmer alone to bear the burden of these risks.

"Hence, during the past 20 years we have developed the principle of parity income and parity prices for farmers and legislation has been enacted designed to make parity prices for farmers a reality.

"The method of computing parity should provide equitable relationships as between commodities and as between the farm and nonfarm portions of our population.

"The method of computation may change as conditions change, but the goal of 100 percent parity prices for all farm products should not change. It should be a permanent national policy, not something that shifts with the winds of political pressure.

"Farmers are now suffering in a terrific economic squeeze between rising costs and falling farm prices. The present law giving price supports for basic commodities at 90 percent of parity will expire in 1954. It was supported during the recent political campaign by both parties and their candidates for President. It was recognized as a legal and moral commitment.

"Therefore, we are amazed and dismayed to see that the law is now being administered with obvious reluctance and seeming antagonism.

"We call for the fulfillment of preelection promises so as to end the fear and uncertainty of the present and what will happen after 1954.

"We call for a policy of disaster prevention, not disaster relief; for price safeguards for both perishable and nonperishable crops.

"Our stand is for 100-percent parity."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"CERTIFICATE OF RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY STOCKHOLDERS AT 22D ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC., MARCH 5, 1953

"Whereas we as farmers view with fear the reports in newspapers and over the radio on the probable changes to be made in the Rural Electrification Administration, Rural Telephone Administration, and public-power programs affecting millions of farmers and farmer-owned power-distributing and generating co-ops; and

"Whereas we believe these bipartisan programs which have so helped agriculture to provide the greatest abundance of food and fiber production this Nation has ever known should be strengthened and not weakened; and

"Whereas due to lack of sufficient power in many areas of the country at the present time, together with constantly increasing demands for electric energy by farmers and other consumers, it behooves us to seek more low-cost power-generating facilities; and

"Whereas since hydroelectric power generated by multipurpose dam projects providing power, flood control, irrigation, recreational facilities, and wildlife conservation areas have proven to be very successful under a regional-development basis, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be urged to complete with all speed all such multipurpose dam projects by providing the necessary construction and administrative funds; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we again ask the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps to participate with the Canadian Government in the immediate construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River seaway."

INCREASE OF FEDERAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION—RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 257, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Local 257, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, St. Paul, Minn., favoring an increase in the Federal Income Tax exemption from $600 to $1,500.

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

BROTHERHOOD OF
RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS,
St. Paul, Minn., March 13, 1953.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The membership of this Lodge No. 257, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks adopted the following resolution at our last regular meeting held on March the 3d, 1953.

Resolution: "Be it resolved that Local 257 favors raising the Federal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,500."

The membership feel that big business is constantly requesting tax relief and receiving certain tax relief under many loopholes but the worker still has to carry the full load, therefore some consideration should be given the worker. Trusting that you will give your support to any bill giving relief to the average wage earner and attempt to introduce such legislation, at the earliest opportunity, I remain.

Sincerely and fraternally.

WARREN J. KOPPY,
Recording Secretary, Local Lodge 257.

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL INCOME TAXES—LETTER FROM UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, ELY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Steve Marn, recording secretary, Local 1664, United Steelworkers of America, of Ely, Minn., relating to a reduction in Federal income taxes.

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

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL UNION NO. 1664,
Ely, Minn., March 12, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting held on March 8, 1953, by Local 1664, United Steelworkers of America, the possible reduction of Federal income taxes was discussed at length and the following action was unanimously approved. That if Federal income taxes are to be reduced, the amount of exemption allowed each dependent be raised from the present figure of $600 instead of a percentage decrease. We feel that the small-wage earner needs tax relief more than any other group and the increase of exemption for each dependent would be most equitable. Your careful consideration of this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

STEVE MARN,
Recording Secretary.

P. S.—We are 100 percent in back of you on the tidelands oil issue. Keep up the good work.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER FROM MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from George W. Lawson, secretary of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn., relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

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

MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
St. Paul, Minn., March 12, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The executive council of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor at its meeting held on March 7 adopted a motion supporting your position on the St. Lawrence Waterway, and I was instructed to notify you of this action.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. W. LAWSON,
Secretary, Minnesota State Federation of Labor.

PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTIONS OF FARMERS' UNION LOCALS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by three Farmers Union locals in Minnesota—the Farmers Union, Local 228, Roseau County, the Normania Farmers Union of Yellow Medicine County, and the St. James Farmers Union, Local 308, favoring an expanded and improved price-support program.

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

SALOL, MINN.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We, the members of the Farmers Union Hay Creek, Local No. 228 (130 dues-paying farmer families), of Roseau County, Minn., present the following resolution:

"Whereas the security of thousands of farmers is threatened by inflexible farm costs and flexible farm prices; and

"Whereas this not only endangers farm families, the jobs and living standards of workers, the prosperity of small independent business, but our entire national economy; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower told farmers:

" 'I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income * * * a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity * * * but full parity.'

"Therefore we urge you to immediately take such actions as present legislation permits to support the income of livestock producers and to also outline a program to Congress which will assure family farmers that the President's statement on full parity will be realized with regard to all farm products.

"Further, we want our own elected farmer committees to administer all our farm programs, not county agents who have unsavory connections and alliances with antifarm and antiparity organizations."

Respectfully yours,

MRS. TILFORD WICKLANDER,
Secretary.

NORMAN W. WAHLSTROM,
Chairman.

MARCH 16, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We the members of the Normania Farmers Union, Yellow Medicine County, urge you to do all in your power to have legislation passed immediately which will support prices of farm commodities including perishables at 100 percent of parity to prevent a farm-led and farm-fed depression. We also urge you to support and vote for the oil for education bill. These resolutions were unanimously passed by the Normania Farmers Union, No. 24, consisting of 125 farm families.

ORDELL LOUSNESS,
President, Hanley Falls, Minn.
JOHN G. ANDERSON,
Secretary, Cottonwood, Minn.

We, the undersigned members of the St. James Farmers Union Local 308, resolve that you take immediate action to write an expanded and improved price support law into the statutes. There should be several improvements:

1. Support basic commodities beyond the expiration date, December 31, 1954, and include oats, rye, barley, flax, and soybeans as basic commodities.

2. Take action to stabilize the price of beef and pork. We feel that the cattle market has already been allowed to go far too low, and that a lot of farmers are going to be a long time recovering from the loss they are taking on cattle this year.

3. Take action to support perishables, so that the diversified farmer would have protection along with the grain farmer.

PUBLIC DAMS—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MINNESOTA VALLEY COOPERATIVE LIGHT AND POWER ASSOCIATION, CHIPPEWA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light and Power Association, of Chippewa, Minn., relating to public dams, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

MINNESOTA VALLEY COOPERATIVE
LIGHT AND POWER ASSOCIATION,
Montevideo, Minn., March 30, 1953.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HON. SENATOR HUMPHREY: At a regular meeting of the board of directors of the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light and Power Association, Montevideo, Minn., which was held on March 19, 1953, the following resolution was adopted:

Motion made by Albert Windingstad, seconded by Alfred Reishus, that—

"Whereas it has been reported that certain members of the Presidential Cabinet have suggested that the big public dams of the Federal Government be sold by the Government: Now be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light and Power Association express their opposition to the sale of any public dams, as being contrary to the public welfare of the Nation, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators, THYE and HUMPHREY, and Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN."

Very truly yours,

OSCAR W. SWANSON,
Manager.

DISTRIBUTION OF MISSOURI RIVER POWER—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the annual convention of the Minnesota Electric Cooperative, held recently in St. Paul, Minn., relating to the distribution of Missouri River power in Minnesota, and the St. Lawrence seaway, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

To the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution 1

"Whereas 20 cooperative and three power companies in Minnesota have developed a joint plan whereby Missouri River hydroelectric power may be made available in their respective service areas and delivered to the load centers of all preferred customers within the marketing area of the Bureau in the State; said plan being for construction of a 230,000-volt system by the Bureau of Reclamation and for full utilization of existing facilities owned by the cooperatives and the power companies for subtransmission of power to the load centers of the preferred customers; and

"Whereas we believe the plan to be economically sound, and to be consistent with the objectives and the purpose of the members of this association: Be it

"*Resolved*, That Minnesota Electric Cooperative does hereby endorse the plan and the agreement that has been made by the 20 cooperatives and the three power companies for delivery and distribution of Missouri River power in the areas in Minnesota affected by the agreement; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the 9 Congressmen and to the 2 Senators, THYE and HUMPHREY."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution 4

"Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway development will provide a vital and economical transportation facility and electric power for defense and for farm and industrial production; and

"Whereas the area involved has vastly increased its demand for electric power as it seeks to meet the needs of the area and the national economy; and

"Whereas the demand for such transportation and electrical development is pressing and urgent, and should be met: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Electric Cooperative Association does insistently request the Congress of the United States at its present session to enact legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, in cooperation with the Canadian Government, and in accordance with the statement of policy heretofore adopted by this association as to the development of such natural resources; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be immediately forwarded to each Member of the Congress, and to such other public officials as may be interested in or have responsibility for expediting this development."

RESOLUTIONS OF MEMBERS OF BROWN COUNTY REA COOPERATIVE, SLEEPY EYE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the members of the Brown County REA Cooperative, held on March 12, 1953, in Sleepy Eye, Minn.

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

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas it is imperative that rural electric cooperatives have the right to construct and operate generating plants and transmission lines; and

"Whereas it has been proven by history that the very economic foundation of the rural electric cooperatives is dependent upon an adequate power supply at reasonable rates, and that it was only through the construction of generating and transmission facilities by a few cooperatives to serve as a self-controlled yardstick as to reasonableness of rates, that the economic welfare of the electric cooperatives throughout the United States has been protected; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has, in the past, recognized this right: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Brown County REA assembled at their annual meeting, That we urge the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate to support legislation, to protect and defend the right and opportunity of the cooperatives to construct and operate generating plants and transmission lines; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge Congress to appropriate adequate funds for this purpose; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas the rural electric cooperatives of Minnesota have, with commercial power companies, presented a plan for joint use of all available electric facilities to Congress for the distribution of Missouri Valley electric power to cooperatives and municipalities; and

"Whereas such joint plan is impossible without the construction of Government-owned 230-kilovolt transmission lines from Fargo, N. Dak., to Fort Randall through western Minnesota; and

"Whereas the commercial power companies have declared to committees of Congress the impossibility to such companies to finance and construct said 230-kilovolt lines for distribution of Missouri Valley power to cooperatives and municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to provide the funds necessary for construction of 230-kilovolt lines through western Minnesota; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas the farmers and the townspeople of the State of Minnesota feel that the development of the St. Lawrence waterway would be of an economic benefit to the State of Minnesota and to the entire Nation; and

"Whereas there is presently pending in the Congress of the United States bills for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the members of the Brown County Rural Electrification Association at their annual meeting, That we urge the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate to support legislation to provide for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every Member of the Congress of the United States in the State of Minnesota."

PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTION OF FARMERS OF NORMAN, MAHNOMEN, POLK, AND CLAY COUNTIES, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by 700 farmers of the counties of Norman, Mahnomen, Polk, and Clay, Minnesota, in a meeting on March 9, 1953, relating to price supports.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT FARM MEETING, ADA, MINN., MARCH 9, 1953

Whereas, The increasing pressure of rising operating costs and declining farm prices makes it very essential that Congress take action to extend and strengthen the farm price support laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress take action at this seession to—

1. Enact a system of price supports to assure full parity income on all major farm production, including perishables, based upon a realistic parity formula, and

2. To retain the system of democratically elected farmer PMA committeemen, to continue handling of ACP conservation payments through the PMA committees, and to increase appropriations for the ACP program; and be it further

Resolved, That the 700 Norman, Mahnomen, Polk and Clay County farmers assembled at this meeting instruct the secretary of the meeting, Lloyd Mickelson, to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

LLOYD MICKELSON, *Secretary.*

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT—DEFINITION OF EMPLOYEE—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA POULTRY, BUTTER, AND EGG ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Poultry, Butter, and Egg Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act by clarifying the definition of "employee."

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

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, MINNESOTA POULTRY, BUTTER, AND EGG ASSOCIATION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MARCH 10, 1953

Whereas the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor has seen fit to follow the concept of "dependency as a matter of economic reality" in administering the wage-and-hour law; and

Whereas under this concept an employer could be held liable for retroactive overtime covering the employees of an independent contractor if the Wage and Hour Division considered that this contractor depended on this employer for a substantial part of his income; and

Whereas Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, has introduced in the United States Senate S. 471, "A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by clarifying the definition of employee"; and

Whereas the enactment of this legislation is vital to all employers in the poultry, butter, and egg industry who use independent contractors and contract truckers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Minnesota Poultry, Butter, and Egg Association go on record as favoring the Capehart bill, S. 471, and instruct the secretary of the association to send a copy of this resolution to each of the members of the association and request that they write their Congressmen and Senators and urge them to support this bill.

H. G. MALLON,
President.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 30, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1493. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to suspend deportation and admit for permanent residence under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1494. A bill to provide that time spent as a civilian internee during World War II shall be considered as active service in determining priority for induction into the Armed Forces of medical, dental, and allied specialists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1495. A bill to establish a program of grants-in-aid to assist the States to provide maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 1496. A bill to increase the authorized amount of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia to an amount equal to 25 percent of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1497. A bill for the relief of Sebouh Amirian and Christine Amirian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1498. A bill to amend section 81, National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, and 176), to provide for the organization of the National Guard Bureau, and to define the responsibilities, functions and duties of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1499. A bill for the relief of Carl A. Annis, Wayne C. Cranney, and Leslie O. Yarwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1500. A bill for the relief of permittees living on Indian lands, Oahe Dam and Reservoir project, South Dakota, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 1501. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits; and

S. 1502. A bill to extend the records and reports provision of the Interstate Commerce Act to persons furnishing locomotives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. BRIDGES (by request):

S. 1503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers commemorating certain deceased members of

the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rev. Pang Wha Il; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1505. A bill to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to make the Farm Credit Administration an independent establishment of the Federal Government; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1506. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1507. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1508. A bill for the relief of Borivoje Vulich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1509. A bill to facilitate the administration of the national forests; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1510. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended, to certain lands in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1511. A bill for the relief of Tamami Kusuda; and

S. 1512. A bill for the relief of Esther Cornelius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution to establish the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is being introduced simultaneously in the House of Representatives today by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 in a minor respect in order to provide relief from deportation to illegally entered aliens who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States in the Korean conflict, in World War II, or otherwise for a period of 3 years. I ask unanimous consent that a joint statement being issued by myself and Representative CELLER be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1493) to authorize the Attorney General to suspend deportation and admit for permanent residence under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN, is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN AND REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER ON INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

We are today introducing a bill to permit veterans who have served honorably in the Korean conflict in the armed services of the United States but who originally entered the United States illegally to be relieved from deportation and be allowed to remain in the United States at the discretion of the Attorney General.

We are proposing an amendment to that section of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 which provides for suspension of deportation, applying that suspension to a number of veterans who have nobly served the United States but who have remained in the United States in technical defiance of the law. Most of them came over to this country as seamen and jumped ship. They were drafted or enlisted in the armed services and served honorably and in some cases with great distinction, and are now, despite their services and sacrifices in the cause of the United States, being served with orders of deportation. The present law is so restrictive that no discretion is given to the Attorney General to suspend deportation in these cases. The entire section dealing with suspension of deportation needs to be drastically rewritten in order to be in accord with the traditions of the United States. Legislation is now being drafted which would accomplish this among many other sweeping changes in our present immigration law. However, pending the introduction of this bill and congressional consideration of this overall legislation, we feel that prompt relief should be provided in this restricted group of cases which, according to our information, does not include more than 100 individuals. Some of the cases that have come to us are truly appealing, including some veterans who have received high decorations for bravery and gallantry in Korea and elsewhere.

During their stay in the United States, they have abided by all our laws and have shown every indication of being good citizen material. If they have violated any law, suspension of deportation would not apply.

This legislation would only apply to the following classes of veterans:

(a) Those who have served in World War II.

(b) Those who have served in the combat Zone in Korea.

(c) Those who have served for periods aggregating 3 years or more in the armed services of the United States.

They must be certified to have served honorably and to have been honorably separated from the services. It then comes within the discretion of the Attorney General whether to suspend deportation. No such discretionary authority is now vested in him.

MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF ENLISTED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at the request of the American Legion, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a program of grants-in-aid to assist the States to provide maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency. I think the bill is of major importance, and should receive prompt consideration by the Congress.

I take this opportunity to point out that it is but one more proof of the fact that the Legion concerns itself primarily not with the needs of veterans, although it does discharge that obligation too, but that first and foremost, it continues to think of and to suggest programs designed to meet the needs of the men and women still in uniform, still on the fighting front.

I have said I am introducing the bill by request, and I am. But let there be no misunderstanding. Upon occasion that phrase is taken to mean that the person introducing proposed legislation is not committing himself to its support. In this case, I want it clearly understood that I am glad to comply with the request of the Legion because this is a bill which I wholeheartedly support. In effect, it calls for the reenactment of a program which I helped sponsor during World War II, and which at that time, proved eminently worthwhile. The bill proposes a reenactment of that wartime program modified so as to fit today's circumstances and designed to assure our fighting men that the wives and children they have left at home will be given that necessary medical care which they themselves would have striven to provide had they not been called to fight our battles. It is little enough for us to do for the members of our Armed Forces. It is an obligation we owe them. It is a program, the soundness of which we have already proved. It is a bill which should receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of a letter addressed to me by the Legion requesting the introduction of this bill, together with a resolution on the subject adopted at the last national convention of the Legion. I ask that both be set forth in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1495) to establish a program of grants-in-aid to States to provide maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter and resolution presented by Mr. MURRAY are as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1953.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Enclosed please find copy of Resolution No. 156, adopted at our national convention on the subject of emergency maternity and infant care for servicemen's dependents, etc.

I also enclose typewritten draft of a suggested form of bill which, in our opinion, would carry out the purpose of resolution No. 156, and we would appreciate it if you could see your way clear to introduce a bill for us at your early convenience.

Thanking you for your consideration, and with kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

CHILD WELFARE—EMERGENCY MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE FOR SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS

Whereas, during World War II a system of Emergency Maternity and Infant Care (known as EMIC) was established to provide needed service for the families of enlisted men; and

Whereas, reports from the departments show that there is again a need to provide such maternity and infant care service for the families of men now entering or reentering military service; and

Whereas, the 33d national convention meeting in Miami, Fla., recommend the enactment of an EMIC program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the establishment of an Emergency Maternity and Infant Care program similar to the program operated during World War II, with due consideration given to correcting any inequities which the experience developed during World War II may have revealed.

ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the authorized amount of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia to an amount equal to 25 percent of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia.

On March 2, 1953, I addressed the Senate on this matter, and attempted to point out that such a proposal would be fair and equitable in meeting what I consider an obligation on the part of the United States to share to a greater extent in the expense of maintaining the Federal City.

I am hopeful that the proposed legislation will receive favorable consideration at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1496) to increase the authorized amount of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia to an amount equal to 25 percent of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO REVOCATION OF AMENDMENT OF CERTIFICATES AND PERMITS OF WATER CARRIERS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission under certain conditions to revoke or amend certificates and permits of water carriers. The bill is part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1501) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

The bill was introduced by request in my capacity as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It is part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and is similar to the bill, S. 2364, which was reported favorably by this committee after extensive hearings last year.

The need for the bill, which would authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission under certain conditions to revoke or amend certificates and permits of water carriers, arises because part III of the Interstate Commerce Act does not now provide revocation authority and procedure such as are found in part II and part IV with reference to motor carriers and freight forwarders, respectively. The United States Supreme Court, in *United States* v. *Seatrain Lines, Inc.* (329 U. S. 424), has indicated that the Commission is without authority to revoke water carrier certificates or permits in whole or in part, once they have become effective and the time fixed for requesting rehearing or reconsideration has passed.

The bill would place water carriers in a position similar to that of other carriers. It would provide the means for a more flexible and equitable control over the supply of domestic water transportation than is now possible.

The present lack of revocation authority as to water carriers has become important because a considerable number of the prewar operators have found it impracticable or inexpedient to resume operations since the close of World War II. Consequently, existing water-carrier service in some important areas is far below the prewar service. The Interstate Commerce Commission has reported that about one-fourth of the presently outstanding water-carrier operating authorities are not being used and that in some instances this condition has persisted for some time.

It has been further stated by the Commission that the traffic and revenues of carriers on the inland waterways have improved substantially; but that the coastwise and intercoastal carriers, hampered by constantly rising terminal handling costs, continue virtually as marginal operators. Package-freight service no longer exists on the Great Lakes and less-than-bargeload service has all but disappeared from the other inland waterways. A few carriers are said to be experimenting with various devices and projects for the improvement or resumption of these services, but little tangible progress has been made thus far.

Dormant or unused operating rights could be a major cause of this condition, because the existence of such outstanding certificates and permits may be revived at any time, causing an adverse effect upon old and new operators. The Commission points out that the existence of these dormant operating authorities also makes it difficult to determine to what extent duplicating new authorities should be granted considering the danger of an eventual surplus of competitive service which might be injurious to both the carriers and the general public.

For these reasons the Commission, beginning in 1947, and in its subsequent annual reports to the Congress, has recommended that "part III of the act be amended by adding after section 312 a new section (213a) containing provisions for revocations of water carrier certificates or permits." Accordingly, the Commission at the hearings before this committee generally supported the purpose of S. 2364, but suggested certain amendments for consideration. The Commission's general position on this matter was stated as follows:

"Although water carriers should have reasonable protection against loss of their operating rights where abnormal or special conditions have hindered resumption or continuance of operations, we do not believe it to be in the public interest that certificates and permits be held indefinitely regardless of the reasons for their nonuse. We believe that we should have authority to determine upon the facts of each case whether operating rights should be revoked for nonuse."

The principal changes suggested by the Commission were designed to make it clear that the revocation authority would be made contingent upon "willful" failure to engage in or continue service, since it is recognized that the nature of water carriage and the size of equipment used is such as to make it impracticable for some water carriers to provide service at all times to all ports within the scope of their operation authorities. The other revisions proposed were to make the language and terms of the bill conform more closely with the comparable revocation provisions of part II and part IV of the act.

Other witnesses testifying in support of this bill emphasized the need of the Interstate Commerce Commission having discretionary authority which would enable it to take into account "extenuating circumstances" and to exercise such authority in the event of a "willful" failure to operate. The principal opponent of this bill argues against any revocation authority. He contended that nobody is being "hurt" by the existence of dormant water carrier certificates and that, considering rapid changes in the water transportation industry and with increasing rail freight rates, "it could well be that an unprofitable water freight today will become profitable this year or next, with the result that adequate transportation services will be provided by present holders of certificates or permits."

As other witnesses have pointed out, it would appear that the bill should provide reasonable protection of the operating authorities of water carriers who may be compelled, by the force of economic circumstances, to curtail or cease their operations temporarily. The suggestions made in this regard have been taken into account in the bill.

EXTENSION OF RECORDS AND REPORTS PROVISION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT TO PERSONS FURNISHING LOCOMOTIVES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, by request, I also introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the records and reports provision of the Interstate Commerce Act to persons furnishing locomotives. This bill is likewise a part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1502) to extend the records and reports provision of the Interstate Commerce Act to persons furnishing locomotives, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

The bill was introduced, by request, in my capacity as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It is part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and is similar to the bill, S. 2353, on which extensive hearings were held last year by the committee.

As the law now stands, persons furnishing cars or protective service must grant access by the Interstate Commerce Commission or its agents to the records, accounts, and other documents which pertain to the cars or protective service so furnished. The law also authorizes the Commission to prescribe the forms of all records, accounts, and memoranda which it is authorized to inspect and copy. Furthermore, the ICC is authorized to require such reports as it may deem necessary and may require persons furnishing such cars or protective service to submit their records, accounts, and other documents for inspection or copying to any of its authorized agents upon demand.

No new regulatory problem nor any significant extension of regulatory authority is dealt with in this bill. It simply extends the ICC's authority to require information about relations between railroads and the suppliers of freight cars to the same relations with suppliers of locomotives. The legislation has become necessary now because railroads have in recent years been using the same kind of leasing arrangements for their locomotives that they previously used in supplying themselves with cars. If relative degrees of importance can be assigned, it would seem even more necessary to cover locomotive-leasing practices than such practices in regard to the furnishing of freight cars.

For some reason a misconception about this bill developed at last year's hearings. A couple of committee members assumed that the bill gave the Commission powers to control the arrangements between railroad and lessor, making it necessary to get ICC approval before entering into such equipment lease arrangements.

This is not the case. In fact, the carriers themselves would not be affected at all. It is simply a matter of informing the Commission of certain matters in connection with the leasing arrangements. The person supplying the locomotives would be the one required to make any reports, not the railroad. As Commissioner Mahaffie pointed out, there have been no objections at all about the way this requirement has worked out as it concerns the supplying of cars, and there is no reason that there should be any with regard to locomotives.

It simply boils down to the commonsense fact that the Commission should be appraised of details concerning any arrangement whereby the railroads do not own their own equipment.

It should be noted, by the way, that the railroads (the AAR) did not even bother to testify on this legislation last year.

FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1953

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to make the Farm Credit Administration an independent establishment of the Federal Government; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1505) to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to make the Farm Credit Administration an independent establishment of the Federal Government; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The analysis presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1953

The principal purpose of the bill is to provide for increased borrower participation in management of the Farm Credit Administration. While the Administration would remain in the Department of Agriculture, it would be made subject to the supervision of a new Federal Farm Credit Board, rather than the Secretary as at present. The Board would consist of 13 members. One member would be appointed from each of the 12 farm credit districts by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among nominations submitted, respectively, by (1) the national farm loan associations, (2) the production credit associations, and (3) the cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of the bank for cooperatives, of the district. The thirteenth member would be designated by the Secretary. The functions of the Administration would be carried out by a Governor of the Farm Credit Administration appointed, and subject to general supervision, by the Board.

In each district 3 of the 4 district board directors now appointed by the Governor of the Administration would be elected as provided in section 15 by (1) the national farm loan associations, (2) the production credit associations, and (3) the cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of the regional bank for cooperatives respectively, whenever the investment of the United States in the Land Bank, the production credit associations, and the bank for cooperatives, respectively, for the district, falls below a level of about one-third of their respective capital, surplus, reserves, and guaranty fund. Under present conditions the national farm loan associations and the production credit associations in all 12 districts would each be entitled to elect an additional director under this provision.

In addition, the bill would—

1. Abolish the offices of Land Bank Commissioner, Production Credit Commissioner, Cooperative Bank Commissioner, and Intermediate Credit Commissioner.

2. Transfer the Division of Cooperative Marketing to the Agricultural Research Administration.

3. Provide for payment to the United States of a return on its investment, if any, in the various land banks, production credit corporations, and banks for cooperatives as set out in sections 10, 11, 12, and 13. At present the United States owns no stock in any of the land banks. The production-credit corporations are wholly owned by the United States.

4. Permit production-credit associations under certain circumstances to raise additional capital by sale of a new class C stock to investors and production-credit corporations.

Within 1 year after its appointment the Federal Farm Credit Board would recommend such additional changes as might be necessary to carry out the purpose of the bill.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT AND SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT RELATING TO NATURAL MINERAL RESOURCES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to release the stranglehold which the Securities and Exchange Commission now has on the mining and other important industries.

The mining industry is a speculative business, and every mine is a financial risk until large bodies of ore have been blocked out. Discovering and blocking out the valuable ore is a long, expensive, and financially hazardous process.

After the valuable ore has been blocked out, speculative funds are not needed, but until the mineral deposit has been developed, venture capital must be available. Unless securities can be sold to raise venture capital to finance the discovering and development of strategic and critical metals, our national-defense effort will be seriously jeopardized.

The Securities and Exchange Commission was created by Congress to perform a useful function in preventing fraud and deliberate misrepresentation of facts to investors by requiring that the truth be told to the public before an offering of stock could be made.

But the Commission continually goes far beyond the functions Congress intended it to perform when, before allowing stock to be sold, it arbitrarily attempts to determine the ultimate feasibility of the enterprise. The success of a mine cannot be determined until the very work which is to be financed through the sale of securities has been completed.

Until expensive exploration has been done, there is no way to tell the depth or width of a vein, yet the Securities and Exchange Commission often assumes the authority to arbitrarily rule on the feasibility of the mine and to prevent the sale of stock on the strength of their ruling. In this way, private venture capital is prevented from flowing into the mining industry, and without it undetermined amounts of mineral wealth lie undiscovered and undeveloped.

Furthermore, the mining industry suffers additional injuries when hearings are called, or official statements are made by the Commission, before a proper investigation has been made, indicating fraud or lack of feasibility. This procedure has the effect of scaring the potential investor, then even if the enterprise seeking a permit to sell stock is completely cleared, its reputation is besmirched and the only recourse is to give up the project, because, Mr. President, although new venture capital must be given every encouragement in order to finance development of the strategic and

critical minerals of this Nation, the Securities and Exchange Commission has practically paralyzed the private capital market and this situation must be cured at once.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, legislating through the medium of its rule-making power, has seriously hurt the mining industry, and retarded many worthwhile developments in other fields. If this Nation is to keep up the production of strategic and critical minerals necessary for national security, private capital must be readily available and the regulation for sale of securities must be done in the manner authorized by the Congress and not by the tyrannical methods of the Commission. This abuse of the power granted by Congress must be stopped.

Mr. President, in order to promote the cause of national defense by helping the mining industry to get necessary working capital, I introduce the bill, to be referred to the proper committee, to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1506) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph as follows:

"(12) Any security the issuer of which is engaged in the exploration and development of natural mineral resources: *Provided*, That the issuer shall file with the Securities and Exchange Commission, before a public offering is made, a written statement containing substantially the following information: The full name and complete mailing address of (a) the issuer, (b) the directors and officers of the issuer, (c) the person by or on behalf of whom the offering is to be made, and (d) the principal underwriter of the securities to be offered; the title and amount of the security to be offered; the amount of the offering and of the underwriting discounts and commission; the date of the proposed offering; the States in which it is proposed to sell the security; the purpose for which the net proceeds are to be used; and three copies of every written communication, advertisement, or radio broadcast to be delivered thereafter to investors by the issuer or the principal underwriter of any such security to more than twenty-five persons."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 19 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) When in possession of written evidence and facts which, in the opinion of the Commission clearly justify an investigation for the enforcement of this title, and upon its written order, any member of the Commission, or any officer or officers designated by it, is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents which the Commission deems relevant or material to the inquiry. Such hearings and investigations as may be required shall be held in such place or places as the Commission may designate, but no witness shall be required by subpena to appear at a place outside the Federal judicial district in which he may reside without his consent."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 20 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in section 8 of this title, the Commission shall investigate only such violations of the provisions of this title or of any rule or regulation prescribed under authority thereof, as shall be based upon a written complaint of a person outside the staff of the Commission setting forth material facts and circumstances showing that a substantial violation has occurred or is about to occur, and the Commission may thereupon, if in its opinion the public interest will thereby be served, authorize an investigation by written order, and a copy of such order and written complaint shall be made available promptly to the person subject to the investigation."

SEC. 4. Section 21 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by adding thereto a new sentence to read as follows: "Any person who is under investigation and who shall testify in such hearings or in any preliminary investigation shall be permitted to obtain at cost a copy of his testimony and to be represented by counsel."

SEC. 5. Section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new subsection as follows:

"(d) No provision of this title shall apply to, or be deemed to include, any market place or facilities for the purchase and sale of securities of an issuer engaged exclusively in the exploitation, development, or operation of mines, or in the exploitation, development, and production of oil, gas, or other natural mineral resources."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Location Act—the 1872 mining claim legislation—is the last resort of the prospector or small miner.

It is the only chance for the man who is willing to work, to take his grubstake into the mountains and deserts—and to locate his claim, filing only with the county clerk for a small fee—and then owning his ground as long as he does $100's worth of work a year in the development of his property.

Let us remove the handicaps and barriers so that he may develop the mineral deposits of this Nation.

REVISION AND REPRINT OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and directed to revise, by bringing up to date, the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government," as set out in House Document 465, 79th Congress.

SEC. 2. Such revised pamphlet shall be printed as a Senate document, and there be printed 100,000 additional copies of which 24,750 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; 66,150 copies for the use of the House of Representatives; 3,100 for the Senate Document Room and 6,000 for the House Document Room.

CHANGE IN NAME OF ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT ASSOCIATION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2277) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such Association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am advised by the Parliamentarian that it would be appropriate to have the bill considered by the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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. MANSFIELD:

Letter regarding a military deficit, written by Senator JACKSON to the President of the United States.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Statement on political investigations of universities issued by the Princeton University Chapter, American Association of University Professors.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "A Glorious Gamble," written by the Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 29, 1953.

Statement issued by certain mayors of American cities dealing with offshore oil lands.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Bricker Presses Vital Safeguard," published in the Ashtabula (Ohio) Star-Beacon of March 23, 1953.

Editorial entitled "The Question of Treaties," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 26, 1953.

NEED FOR A NEW BRAND OF DIPLOMACY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am proud to count among my good friends Prof. Charles Roger Hicks, of the department of history and and political science of the University of Nevada. Professor Hicks and I maintain a correspondence which is not, I am sorry to say, regular, but which is always, to me, enlightening.

Professor Hicks has written me a letter—he wrote it on St. Patrick's Day—which expresses so well and so forcefully feelings which I have myself held for a long time, that I want to take this opportunity to endorse and underline what he has written. The letter is short, all on one page, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
Reno, Nev., March 17, 1953.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN.

ESTEEMED FRIEND: Generally speaking, the following proposition holds true: At the time we, as a nation, were physically weak, we were diplomatically strong; and since we

have been physically strong, we have been diplomatically weak.

The period of our physical weakness and diplomatic strength ended with the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Since then we have been appeased and pussyfooted into two great World Wars and into the present Korean mess.

It is time to act our age. It is time to revert to shirt-sleeve and big-stick diplomacy. It is time to resume our old custom of calling a spade a spade. It is time again to stand up for principles of right and decency in our relations with foreign powers. It is time to take the initiative away from the Russians. It is time to encourage President Eisenhower in the firm policy with which he started his regime and to take steps to prevent him from falling before the specious arguments of the Acheson crew. It is time to give full and complete support to Chiang Kai-shek, time to blockade the China coast and time to bomb across the Yalu.

Appeasement always leads to war. Positive action has, in times past, prevented wars; and may prevent another all-out and wide-spread conflict. Russia respects force alone. Russia will start a war, a war to the finish, when she thinks the omens to be favorable—and not before. If Russia is bluffing, let us call her bluff; if she is serious in her menacing actions then let us see to it that she throws down the gauntlet, and have an end to persiflage, insults, and to devious maneuvers. If there must be war let us have war and an eventual end to the drain on our resources and manpower. Be sure that the God of Hosts will be with us and against the malevolent gods of the Kremlin.

For God's sake, for our country's sake, and for the sake of our children let us act as if we had some guts.

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES ROGER HICKS.

Mr. MALONE subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that earlier today my colleague [Mr. MCCARRAN] had printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the necessity for a strong foreign policy, written by Mr. Charles Roger Hicks, professor of the department of history and political science of the University of Nevada. I received from Professor Hicks a similar letter in which he applies to the subject of foreign policy considerable common sense, which has been a rare commodity in the city of Washington for some time.

I had intended to present the letter from Professor Hicks to the Senate, but, inasmuch as my colleague has had printed the one received by him, I shall content myself with this brief statement.

COMPARISON OF COMPENSATION OF AMERICAN AND ALIEN SEAMEN

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an unsolicited letter which I have received from a Marine chief engineer. The letter is extremely interesting, because the writer enclosed three hypothetical wage vouchers to illustrate how alien seamen fare better than American citizens, from the standpoint of take-home pay for a given amount of work.

These computations show that for an equal amount of work, an unmarried American citizen seaman would receive $411 in take-home pay, an American citizen seaman, married, would receive $433.50, and an alien seaman would receive $495.87.

Perhaps these figures do not mean very much, and I do not offer them as proof of anything at all, but I think some of my colleagues may be very much interested in them. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the three vouchers attached may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.,
East Lynn, Mass., March 11, 1953.

The Honorable Mr. MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In spite of all the criticisms and that some Members of the 83d Congress will try to introduce amendments to the McCarran-Walter Act, I admire the principles behind such legislation.

I, as a seaman, naturally have heard pro and con discussions as to the justification of this act; but I have also heard more remarks from immigration officers in favor of than against. For example, "Now we have something to work on" said by immigration officers in reference to crew members that are aliens during entry after a vessel has returned from a foreign voyage. It is very interesting to listen to the answers from alien seamen when they are asked, "How did you originally enter the United States?" The usual answer is, "I jumped ship."

In reference to the law that all seamen must be screened, I not only think it was a very wise move and a protective measure against subversive activities; but I also have found that most seamen that had clear records did not object to this screening. What loyal American would?

I have enclosed three imaginary wage vouchers to illustrate how nonresident aliens are benefited under the present income tax laws. Many of these aliens are full-fledged union members that have full protection from their union. Many are very militant union members and take very active parts in unionism aboard our ships. I might add that it is not easy to take, one as a citizen being obligated to their demands and then still have to abide by our income tax laws, and they contribute practically nothing for the privilege of living by United States standards. Of course, there are some aliens that have the proper attitude by giving a mailing address and then are subject to our income tax laws. This, of course, is with the idea in mind of obtaining citizenship papers more easily.

The imaginary vouchers are made up of typical cases illustrating a married man with one child, a single man, and a nonresident alien giving their basic salary and the approximate amount of overtime earned, which is governed by union contracts; giving the exemption of $1.40 per day to nonresident alien seamen that citizens are not entitled to; and giving the taxes that citizens are subjected to. It is quite obvious why nonresident aliens do not want to declare a resident address.

Forgive me for taking your valuable time, but I feel that a man of your integrity and ideals, of protect America, is of the caliber to have this unjust tax condition brought before the Congress when they battle the tax reduction.

Again, I want to congratulate you on your ideals that you must have had in mind to foster the McCarran-Walter Act.

I remain,

Sincerely yours,

I. H. RINKER,
Chief Engineer, S. S. "Gateway City."
Z. M. DUNN,
Master.

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.—WAGE VOUCHER

Date: January 30, 1951.

Vessel: *Gateway City.* Port, New York. Voyage: 53.

Name: John Doe. S. S. No. 9. Rating able-bodied seaman.

Wages from January 1 to January 30; 30 days; rate, $302.32.

Bonus: From January 12 to January 21; 10 days; rate par day, $2.50.

Overtime: 100 hours; rate, $1.87.

Gross amount, $514.32.

INFORMATION, SOCIAL-SECURITY AND WITHHOLDING RECORDS

Total wages, bonus and overtime, $514.32.

Subsistence allowance: Number of days, 30.

Rate per day, $1, equals $30.

Old-age benefits tax, 1½ percent of gross earnings, $8.16.

U.I.— /10 of 1 percent of $2.16.

Withholding tax (number of exemptions, 3), $70.50.

Gross earnings: $544.32.

Total deductions, $80.82.

Balance due, $433.50.

Received payment in full.

JOHN DOE,
Payee.

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.—WAGE VOUCHER

Date: January 30, 1953.

Vessel: *Gateway City.* Port: New York. Voyage: 53.

Name: John Doe. S. S. No. 5. Rating: Able-bodied seaman.

Wages from January 1 to January 30; 30 days; rate: $302.32.

Bonus: From January 12 to January 21; 10 days; rate per day, $2.50.

Overtime: 100 hours; rate, $1.87.

Gross amount: $514.32.

INFORMATION, SOCIAL-SECURITY AND WITHHOLDING RECORDS

Total wages, bonus, and overtime, $514.32.

Subsistence allowance: Number of days, 30.

Rate per day, $1, equals $30.

Gross earnings: $544.32.

Calculation nonresident alien tax: 5 days pay, United States waters, $50.39.

Wages earned in United States: 10 hours overtime, $18.70.

Exemption ($1.40), $42.

Taxable: $27.09.

Thirty percent of taxable: $8.13.

Old-age benefits tax (1½ percent of gross earnings), $8.16.

U.I.— /10 of 1 percent of gross earnings, $2.16.

Nonresident alien tax, line 18, $8.13.

Total deductions: $18.45.

Balance due: $495.87.

Received payment in full.

JOHN DOE,
Payee.

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.—WAGE VOUCHER

Date: January 30, 1953.

Vessel: *Gateway City.* Port: New York. Voyage: 53.

Name: John Doe, S. S. No. 4: Rating: Able-bodied seaman.

Wages from January 1 to January 30; 30 days; rate, $302.32.

Bonus: From January 12 to January 21; 10 days; rate per day: $2.50.

Overtime: 100 hours; rate, $1.87.

Gross amount: $514.32.

INFORMATION SOCIAL-SECURITY AND WITHHOLDING RECORDS

Total wages, bonus and overtime, $514.32.

Subsistence allowance: Number days, 30.

Rate per day: $1 equals $30.

Gross earnings, $544.32.

Old-age-benefits tax (1½ percent gross earnings), $8.16.

U. I.— /10 of 1 percent of gross earnings, $2.16.

Withholding tax (number exemptions, 1), $93.

Total deductions, $103.32.
Balance due, $411.
Received payment in full.

JOHN DOE,
Payee.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before proceeding with the calendar, which I understand is the next order of business, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], be authorized to address the Senate at this time.

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the distinguished majority leader thinks I should do so, I am glad to yield.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Griswold	McCarthy
Beall	Hayden	McClellan
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Humphrey	Payne
Carlson	Hunt	Potter
Case	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
Goldwater	Martin	Wiley
Gore	Maybank	Williams
Green	McCarran	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on Friday, March 20, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] stated to the Senate his reasons for not accepting the offered chairmanship of a proposed subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The purpose of the proposed subcommittee was to finish the unfinished business of a subcommittee of the same committee which during the 82d Congress conducted investigations of irregularities and corruption in Federal tax matters and to make sufficient investigation of leads which might develop out of the unfinished business, so that the whole committee might be in position to determine whether new investigations should be undertaken.

When speaking of the whole committee in matters involving decision it should be noted that a lawful minimum effective quorum is eight members actually present. It should also be kept in mind that there is a total of 15 members on the Senate Finance Committee; that the members of any subcommittee have the opportunity to vote as members of the whole committee; that a minimum voting majority can range from 5 to 8 votes, depending upon the number of votes cast.

The Senator from Delaware was a member of the subcommittee which operated during the 82d Congress and the Senate Committee on Finance wanted him to be a member and chairman of the proposed new subcommittee.

The Senator from Delaware does not quarrel with the purpose of the proposed subcommittee. He does not quarrel with the implementing powers which would be granted the proposed subcommittee.

The issue as defined by the Senator from Delaware which confronted the Senate Committee on Finance is exceedingly simple.

It was whether that committee should empower a single member of the proposed subcommittee, acting on his own judgment and without the approval of the majority of the subcommittee or of the whole committee, ranging from 5 to 8 members, to disclose confidential information developed by the proposed subcommittee or the whole committee if that member, on his own independent judgment, should come to the conclusion that such information showed a violation of law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Colorado care to yield at this time and at other times when he raises certain points about which I should like to inquire?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am particularly anxious to yield to the Senator from Delaware, and I wish he would keep some notes and then make his inquiries at the conclusion of my remarks. However, if he decides that he must make inquiry as I proceed with my remarks, I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall wait until the Senator has concluded his remarks.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The Senate Committee on Finance refused to grant that privilege.

There is the whole issue.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of the Senator from Delaware of March 20 and the debate thereon.

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

(The remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of March 20 and the ensuing debate appear in the Appendix under the heading "Rules of Procedure of Finance Committee.")

Mr. MILLIKIN. But there have been suggestions by persons knowing nothing of the facts to the effect—and I emphasize not by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]—that the refusal of the Senate Finance Committee to grant the privilege desired by the Senator from Delaware is pursuant to some oppressive or ulterior purpose.

I cannot hope to change the opinions of those who would soothe gnawing evil in their own hearts by ascribing it to others, nor can I hope to set straight congenital declaimers of error. But I do think that I am warranted in stating for those who are interested and who are without blinding bias why there should be explicit rules for the operations of the proposed subcommittee, why the proposed grants of power to the proposed subcommittee are ample, and why the Senate Committee on Finance would be derelict in its duty if it did not include the rule which meets with the objection of the Senator from Delaware.

During the 82d Congress, indications of corruption and gross irregularities in the Federal Revenue Service caused the Senate Finance Committee to set up a subcommittee to look into the situation. The subcommittee consisted of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It did not operate under formal rules. From time to time the subcommittee requested the whole committee to grant needed powers and these were generously granted.

The operations of the subcommittee confirmed and exceeded the suspicions of corruption and irregularities in the Federal Revenue Service. The credit is largely due to the intelligent and indefatigable labors and dedicated zeal of the Senator from Delaware, who has earned and received the gratitude of his colleagues and the Nation.

The subcommittee's work was unfinished at the end of the 82d Congress. Material and leads were in hand which deserved further exploration. Therefore, the Senator from Delaware during the present session of Congress outlined the nature of the unfinished business to the whole Senate Committee on Finance, which was of the unanimous opinion that the job should be finished, and was unanimously willing that a new subcommittee should be set up, with the Senator from Delaware as its chairman.

At this point let me emphasize that the Senate Finance Committee, with the exception noted, has not been an investigator of crime and has not operated

through subcommittees. With the exception noted, it has been thought advisable that hearings and the business of the committee should be conducted by the whole committee. Considering the importance of matters within the jurisdiction of the whole committee, such as taxation, social security, reciprocal trade, customs regulation, and veterans' benefits, it has been thought advisable that each member should have direct, firsthand opportunity, as a part of an unsplintered team, to acquaint himself thoroughly with proposed legislation covering such matters.

Subcommittees have been a part of the normal operations of other committees, and doubtless there has been good reason for them.

The fact that the Senate Committee on Finance, with the exception noted, has not used subcommittees is mentioned to underline the further fact that when, during the preceding session of Congress, the subcommittee predecessor to the proposed subcommittee was authorized, there were no formal rules ready for use defining or regulating its powers and duties. Necessary backing and powers were given by the whole committee as needed and as requested by the subcommittee.

When the subcommittee was set up during the 82d Congress, there was no suggestion that it should be considered as more than a temporary arrangement for dealing with a situation which it was hoped would be of limited size. The shocking magnitude of subsequent developments was unguessed at that time.

The informal, problem-by-problem-as-it-arose method whereby the whole committee powered the subcommittee seemed at the time to be appropriate for the initial purpose. I venture the personal opinion that had we known what we were getting into, the relations of the whole committee and the subcommittee would have been covered from the beginning by more formal and precise arrangements.

But when in this session of the Congress, it became apparent that the job as to a sizable number of matters had not been finished, and that the creation of a new subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] seemed advisable to complete the unfinished work and possibly to follow other leads suggested by that work, the time seemed to have come for setting out more explicitly, and in advance, the job of the subcommittee, its powers and duties. It was also in mind that the enlargement of the whole committee from 13 to 15 members might call for more frequent use of subcommittees in other directions.

It does not take a member of this body long to learn that he, as well as the Senate collectively, is constantly accompanied by an inseparable companion. His name is "Precedent," and his countenance and being are often judged to be ugly or benign depending upon whether he beams or frowns upon individual or collective ambitions as they may change from day to day. He is a helpful fellow or can be a monster, depending on how he has been shaped in the past and upon how we shape him as we go along. He is well worthy of our never flagging attention.

The Senate Finance Committee felt that for precedent values, rules were better than no rules. It felt that rules could, and that the proposed rules did, give generous amplitude of power to men like the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and could protect against possible future abuse by members who might come on the committee in the future and who might have a lesser sense of proper responsibility and restraint. It was felt that clearer definition of rights and duties was owing to the members of the proposed subcommittee, as well as to the other members of the whole committee. It should not be forgotten that the committee as a whole and every member of it are not free of responsibility for the actions of a subcommittee.

So let us examine without delay the powers and the restrictions for the proposed new subcommittee. This, I am confident, will demonstrate the falsity of any suggestion that the proposed rules would hobble the proper activities of the proposed subcommittee. It will also show the exact point of difference between the whole committee and the Senator from Delaware.

The proposed rules are as follows:

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the Senate Committee on Finance hereby establishes a subcommittee consisting of the following members—

Three spaces are left, as will appear in the RECORD, because members' names have not been filled in, inasmuch as the members of the subcommittee have not yet been formally appointed—

which subcommittee is hereby authorized to conduct studies and investigations of, and to report on, the following matters and such other matters as may from time to time be authorized by the whole committee.

There the specific subject matters are to be set forth. That has not yet been done, because the determination of the exact wording of the subject matters has not been completed.

The subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings on said matters and to sit and act on them during the present Congress at such times and places within the continental United States, and without the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions as the subcommittee may determine and as approved by the whole committee.

In the performance of its functions, the subcommittee may hold such hearings whether or not the United States Senate is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and may require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or by other lawful means, to administer such oaths and to take such testimony as it—

The subcommittee—

deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the subcommittee or by any member thereof designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Except as to the specific investigations herein authorized, no investigation shall be initiated or carried on without the approval of the whole committee. However, preliminary inquiries of matters involving possible wrongdoing by officials or others respecting the revenues of the United States leading from, or suggested by, studies and investigations of those matters herein specifically authorized, may be initiated by the subcommittee.

Executive hearings shall be held only with the approval of the Chairman of the subcommittee. This authority may be delegated by such Chairman to other members of the subcommittee when necessary.

Public hearings shall be held only with the approval of the whole committee.

I interject to say that was included as a precaution to avoid conflicts of hearings between the subcommittee and the whole committee. The whole committee was willing to leave it out, and to depend on informal adjustment of the problem if it should ever arise.

An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings.

The subcommittee shall report its actions and recommendations to the whole committee and all testimony taken in executive session by the subcommittee and matters developed therein and actions, recommendations and reports thereon shall not be released or disclosed without the approval of the whole committee, except that the full committee shall not prohibit any member of the committee from discharging his responsibility to disclose any case which he considers to have been a violation of the law and not involving information derived from the executive activities of the subcommittee or of the whole committee.

It will be observed that authority was to be given to make studies, investigations, and reports on matters to be specifically described.

For obvious reasons, these specific matters should not now be set out in the RECORD or discussed on the Senate floor, but they were explained by the Senator from Delaware to the whole committee in executive sessions.

And the point I wish to emphasize is that the whole committee was willing that the proposed subcommittee should be empowered to go into every specific item of unfinished business proposed for further investigation by the Senator from Delaware.

So far no hampering, no smothering, no obstruction.

It will be noted that the members of the proposed subcommittee are not named in the draft of the proposed rules I have read to the Senate. I have also explained that.

The whole committee understood that the Senator from Delaware was to be a member, and was to be chairman.

According to custom, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] had submitted to the chairman the name of the member from the minority. The chairman was prepared to appoint a third member.

I assure you, Mr. President, that no member of the proposed subcommittee would have been unfriendly to the Senator from Delaware or to the pursuit of the objectives of the subcommittee.

I have been referring to the functions. Now let us look at the powers to be granted the proposed subcommittee for the performance of its functions.

First, there is authority to hold hearings on the unfinished business to which I have referred, during the present session of Congress and at such times and

places within the continental United States, as the subcommittee might determine, and also authority to hold hearings without the continental United States, its territories and possessions, as the subcommittee might determine and with the approval of the whole committee.

Would anyone say that this is a niggling, hampering grant of authority? The Senator from Delaware does not say so.

It was proposed by the whole committee that the contemplated subcommittee might attend to its business whether or not the Senate was in session, had recessed, or adjourned.

Within its broad grant of jurisdiction, the proposed subcommittee could require the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, by subpena or other lawful means. The proposed subcommittees could administer oaths and take such testimony as it deemed necessary.

Under the signature of its chairman, or any member of the subcommittee designated by him, subpenas might issue and be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

No one understanding the meaning and implication of these various powers would say that they were reluctant cheese parings offered by a whole committee bent upon starving a subcommittee it was about to create. The Senator from Delaware does not say so. In fact, he has expressed satisfaction with these various powers. And why not? They give to the proposed subcommittee advance, blanket powers of enormous magnitude which the predecessor subcommittee had to request from the whole committee as the need for them developed.

Then it was originally specified that, except as to the specific investigations to which I have referred as unfinished business, no further investigation would be initiated or carried on without the approval of the whole committee.

At this point, I may say that the opinion seemed to be general in the committee that as to new matters—matters not within the category of specified unfinished business—and especially matters which might come to the attention of the proposed subcommittee involving dereliction, not to be expected and not suspicioned, under the present administration, the Treasury, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Justice Department, and such other agencies as might share responsibility in any particular case of that kind, should be given fair opportunity to clean house on their own steam and under their own initiative.

But at the same time it was well understood that if such new matters were to develop and were brought to the attention of the new administration, and it did not move with expedition or efficiency, the whole committee would not surrender its own proper interest.

Is this a hampering or unfair attitude? The Senator from Delaware has not said so. In fact, I have read a newspaper story crediting the Senator from Delaware with a statement to the effect that the new administration should be given fair opportunity to keep its own house clean.

I did not have to read the newspapers to find this out.

During our first conversations this year regarding the proposed new subcommittee which we were discussing, the Senator from Delaware told me that this was his attitude.

It was suggested by the Senator from Delaware that the study of specified matters of unfinished business might develop leads into other matters which the subcommittee had not previously considered; that it might be an excessive restriction if the rules did not permit preliminary inquiries of sufficient scope to put the subcommittee in position to know whether leads of that kind should be dropped, or whether authority of the whole committee should be requested to go further.

Authority to make such preliminary inquiries was provided.

There was no hampering, no obstruction in these matters. And the Senator from Delaware did not say there was.

We then come to the proposed provision which raises the whole objection of the Senator from Delaware, and the whole issue.

I shall read it:

> The subcommittee shall report its actions and recommendations to the whole committee and all testimony taken in executive session by the subcommittee and matters developed therein, and actions, recommendations, and reports thereon, shall not be released or disclosed without the approval of the whole committee, except that the full committee shall not prohibit any member of the committee from discharging his responsibility to disclose any case which he considers to have been a violation of law and not involving information derived from the executive activities of the subcommittee or of the whole committee.

The Senator from Delaware was not content with that part of the proposed rule which I have read which requires consent of the whole committee (a majority of the whole committee) prior to making disclosure of executive matters before the subcommittee.

The Senator from Delaware proposed language in the rule which, if unmodified, would have allowed any member of the committee, without more, without any approval other than his own, to disclose anything developed in executive session which he might consider to have been a violation of the law.

The whole committee would not accept the Senator's amendment to that effect. It modified the Senator's amendment by limiting it to information not derived from the executive activities of the subcommittee or of the whole committee.

There is the issue in its completely revealing simplicity. That is the only issue. The Senator from Delaware does not assert any other issue.

It is not important to the present inquiry that the whole committee authorized inclusion in the proposed rules of language defining the right of witnesses to have counsel.

Not having his way, the Senator from Delaware told the committee he would not serve on the proposed subcommittee and would not be its chairman. He has stated his reasons to the whole committee and to the Senate. I deeply regret his decision.

The Senator from Delaware is unwilling to yield in these matters to a majority of the whole committee. He asserts a principle which is so deep and moving with him that it will not defer to any contrary or modifying human judgment.

There is no charge by the Senator from Delaware—he was careful to avoid a charge—that the proposed rules are of shifting or shifty expediency to fit the present membership—or any part of it—of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The meanings of terms such as "executive," "executive session," "executive processes," and "executive proceedings," are understood by Members of Congress and those who are familiar with its operations. But perhaps some explanation should be given for the benefit of others.

In order to legislate properly it is obvious that the committees of Congress which process legislation should have the information justifying whatever may be their actions.

Much information which comes before a committee is of such a nature that it can, and indeed should be, received without confidence in open hearings. Much of it by its nature is private and confidential and, if the legislative process is to be protected, should be received in confidence.

This kind of confidential information is developed by and considered in what are called executive sessions, processes, or proceedings of a committee or subcommittees, and the gathering of it may be aided by appropriate power such as the right to subpena witnesses and documents and the right to administer oaths.

The examinations before committees and subcommittees, acting in their executive capacity, are not public although the public interest may require later disclosure by public hearings, or otherwise.

So that we can better judge whether a single member of the committee or subcommittee in possession of confidential information developed in the manner which has been described, should be allowed on his own judgment to disclose it, let us see what that information might be.

Let us also remember always that there is not the faintest suggestion that a Senator should be restrained in disclosing confidential or other information which he has learned on his own.

Whether or not under those circumstances he will disclose is up to him and it is not now relevant to discuss various opinions as to the ethics which should govern decisions of that kind.

The proposed subcommittee might well receive information regarding the collection of revenue which may also be before administrative officials who are preparing action, administrative or judicial, to collect what they believe is due the Government. They may be preparing criminal actions. The same information may also be before grand juries which, by the way, also act in what we call executive session.

It certainly is not necessary to labor the point that premature disclosure by a talkative Senator justifying under the

rule proposed by the Senator from Delaware—and such a Senator would be the sole judge as to whether he should keep in the clutch between his mouth and his brain—might warn criminals to prepare alibis, to secrete their assets, or to flee from justice.

There might well be matters before the proposed subcommittee warranting inquiries as to the assets of a citizen, as to how he gets his income, as to what is in his bank account, or safe deposit box, as to what is being held or secreted by him or others for him.

Premature disclosure by someone acting under the rule proposed by the Senator from Delaware, acting on his sole, irreviewable judgment that there has been a violation of law, might give opportunity for the removal of property in which the Revenue Department might have a very real and important interest.

The talkative Senator might have been completely mistaken and any kind of disclosure in such cases might violate an individual's right of privacy in his personal affairs which in this country is supposed to remain private unless the overriding public interest requires exposure.

Mr. President, at this moment all over the United States of America hundreds of courts are sitting to determine what is the law and what is a violation of the law. At this very moment there are hundreds of juries all over the United States trying to determine what are the facts which raise the questions of law.

In other words, no single person can claim infallibility as to what is a violation of law.

It is not improbable that the proposed subcommittee might have written statements of oral declarations from informers in cases where, as a practical matter, information could not be compelled, where the informants are free of suspicion of being involved in crime and would talk only on the pledge of confidence.

I do not wish to be lurid about it but irresponsible disclosure of that kind of information—and this is possible under the proposed Williams rule—might subject the informant to all kinds of unjust and injurious harassments, indeed, might jeopardize his life. It is not entirely novel to learn that witnesses have been exterminated.

The committee must pass on certain nominations for office in the Federal Government. There might be FBI reports to be examined.

As all of those know who have looked at such reports, they contain many matters which are not proven, which rest on far-removed hearsay, empty tittle tattle, or vicious gossip.

The release of such information by a Senator, acting carelessly under the proposal of the Senator from Delaware, could be destructive of the well-earned, good reputation of the citizen. And this could be done without a scintilla of legitimate public interest.

It may well be that personal income-tax returns will be examined by such a subcommittee. Such returns may also involve the citizen's personal and private affairs and his right to keep them to himself. They, on their faces, or when all of the facts are known, may not show the slightest evidence of income-tax evasion or of legitimate public interest.

Their mistaken disclosure by some Senator acting under the rule proposed by the Senator from Delaware, which gives ample room for misjudgment as well as sound judgment, for precipitate, unfounded conclusions, as well as those which are well based, for reckless guesses; yes, even false pretense of violation of law as an excuse for sensationalism or a headline, could serve no overriding public purpose, could only embarrass or injure needlessly the citizen by violation of his right of privacy in his personal affairs.

A little further attention to the matter of income-tax returns which might come before the committee or the proposed subcommittee.

The Congress considers those returns so much an essential part of the proper privacy of the citizen that it has passed a law providing that their wrongful revelation by any officer or employee of the United States is a criminal offense.

It is my understanding that Members of Congress are not considered as officers or employees of the United States and that, therefore, this law is not applicable to them.

I am not making a point that improper revelation by a Member of Congress of what is in an income-tax return would be a criminal offense.

I am not pressing any technicality. I am not urging sterile legalisms. I am simply showing an instance, carrying its own healthy hints, of congressional solicitude for the protection of the proper privacy of the citizen.

The Congress has been very careful to limit the rights of committees of Congress to ask for income-tax returns. They may be supplied only upon the request of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives—not a subcommittee thereof—or the Committee on Finance of the Senate—not a subcommittee thereof—or by a select committee of the Senate or House—not a subcommittee thereof—specially authorized to investigate returns by a resolution of the Senate or House, or a joint committee so authorized by concurrent resolution.

Under the law a return can only be furnished these committees for consideration in executive session which further emphasizes the congressional view in these particular matters of the privacy and confidence attending such documents.

Then it is provided that any relevant or useful information thus obtained may be submitted to the Senate or the House or to both the Senate and the House—mark you, please, not by a subcommittee, not by some individual acting on his own—but only by the committees which I have described.

There we dealt with returns made by the citizen to the executive branch of the Government. Here we deal with matters which the citizen and Federal agencies may supply to a committee or a subcommittee and which may be as private and confidential in their real substance—perhaps even more so—as is an individual income-tax return.

But nothing that I know of requires that when we are making rules for our own conduct we adopt proposals that might encourage or permit official irresponsibility in our dealings with the people we are supposed to serve.

The Senate Finance Committee has not fallen into that error.

Now let me say a few words on the nature of subcommittees. Again the facts are well known to Members of the Congress and those acquainted with congressional operations.

A subcommittee is no more than the creature of the whole committee. It is an instrumentality for performing, on behalf of the whole committee, certain tasks delegated to it by the whole committee. By rule or other appropriate action it is always subject to the control of the whole committee.

A subcommittee may try to lift itself out of its subordinate position by tugging at its own bootstraps. But we need not give face to ludicrous posturings of that kind.

Manifestly to permit a subcommittee to usurp the functions of the whole committee would defeat the intention of the Reorganization Act to create standing committees with assigned fields of activity. And manifestly, also, the successful seizure by subcommittees of powers not delegated to them by the whole committees could be carried to a point where necessary distinctions would disappear and vital legislative processes of Congress would be thrown into disastrous confusion.

In his statement to the Senate, the Senator from Delaware referred to what he terms "standard rules of procedure." The point was that the proposed rules of the Senate Finance Committee are less generous than what he terms "the standard rules." The so-called standard rules govern only in those committees which adopt them. They have never been established by the Senate as rules to govern subcommittees.

The Senator from Delaware must have thought that what he termed "standard rules of procedure" for the control of a subcommittee are relevant to his situation. But this is not the case.

Those rules do not contain a single provision authorizing an individual member of a subcommittee to proceed on his own initiative and judgment to disclose matters received in confidence in executive sessions.

Far from it, they in fact expressly repudiate the very right that the Senator from Delaware seems to argue would be conferred upon him if those rules were to be adopted by the Senate Finance Committee.

Paragraph 6 of those rules states that—

> All testimony taken in executive session shall be kept secret and will not be released or used in public without the approval of a majority of the subcommittee.

Note the requirement of a majority of the subcommittee.

Paragraph 10 of those rules is as follows:

> 10. No reports shall be made to the Senate or released to the public without the approval of the majority of the subcommittee, or the majority of the full committee.

Note again the words "majority of the subcommittee or the majority of the full committee."

The Senator from Delaware repels the substance of this rule.

The Senator from Delaware says in effect, "I alone, in my own judgment, as a matter of principle binding upon myself, insist upon retaining to myself, regardless of what the majority of the subcommittee or the whole committee may say, the right to release, use or report confidential information which I alone may conclude conceals or represents a violation of law."

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I had intended to wait until the Senator had concluded his statement, but I thought it should be made clear whether the Senator is giving his interpretation of my remarks.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have stated my interpretation of the effect of what the Senator from Delaware said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wanted to have that made clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very glad that the Senator from Delaware has cleared up the matter. I opened that portion of my remarks by saying, "The Senator from Delaware says in effect."

Thus this part of the arguments of the Senator from Delaware, so heavily relied upon by him, is not only bootless from his own standpoint but is condemnatory of his own arguments.

There you have it, my colleagues: Shall a single member of this body on his own judgment be authorized to disclose confidential information developed by or in executive proceedings of the whole committee, or of a subcommittee, regardless of what a majority of the members of those committees do or do not think about it?

To the Senator from Delaware and the Senate Finance Committee, this is a matter of principle.

We are not making a special rule for or against the Senator from Delaware. We are making a general rule binding alike on the Senator from Delaware and those who would serve with him and those unknown persons in the future charged with similar responsibility.

The Senator from Delaware, I respectfully suggest, reflecting on the sizable grants of power under which he has operated and those proposed, reflecting on the feelings of trust which have existed for him in the committee, should be the last person in the world to say, in effect, "When I see what I believe is a violation of law developed by or considered in executive session, I want to make and abide by my own rules, regardless of what the majority of the subcommittee or the majority of the whole committee might think, regardless of whether this would create a precedent for those who might serve on this committee in the future who might not have a dependable sense of responsibility."

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the Senator from Delaware was good enough to say that he would withhold his questions until I had concluded. I asked him to do so. I dislike yielding to any other Senator, but, if the Senator from New Hampshire insists, I shall do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Speaking for myself, I merely wished to comment that I have spoken with a great many persons throughout the country, and have had correspondence with many more, all of whom have praised this fine man, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who has done such a magnificent job for the country in showing up crooks. For example, take the case of the man named Nunan. Since the Senator from Delaware has shown him up, Nunan has been indicted on 15 different counts.

I suggest that instead of criticizing JOHN WILLIAMS, the Committee on Finance and the entire Senate ought to get together and give him a degree, summa cum laude.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That has already been done in the remarks that have been made.

Mr. TOBEY. There will be more remarks made. They bear repetition.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There will be repetition.

What are the principles which moved the Senate Finance Committee in denying this right to the Senator from Delaware? What does it offer in the alternative?

The committee says that confidential matters received by a subcommittee or the whole committee in its executive operations are not to be disclosed except upon the approval of a majority of the whole committee.

Why? Because in doing it this way, protection through the sobering action of a majority of the whole committee, at least 8 out of 15, is given to the citizen's right to be protected against smearing, unfounded suspicion, and unwarranted invasion of his personal privacy than in reposing the power of decision in a single Senator who may turn out to be a person of fabulous wisdom and judgment or a plain rattlehead.

The right of the citizen to be protected against wrongful invasion of his proper privacy is so securely founded that it has the protection of the fourth and fifth amendments of the Constitution.

True, the technicalities of these amendments may be somewhat more relaxed in congressional operations than in courts of justice. But unless we would tyrannize we will never depart from their spirit which puts a radiant shine on our system of government and on citizenship in the United States of America.

We violate rights which were earned on American battlefields when we adopt rules making it easy either for well-meaning misjudgment or evil motive, or irresponsibility, to destroy the citizen's good name and the privacy of his papers and effects.

The Senate Committee on Finance has respect, affection, and admiration for the Senator from Delaware. It does not believe that he will abuse the sizable powers which are proposed to be given to him. But it has also said, "We shall not exempt him from the wholesome safeguards of the proposed rule, not because we distrust him but because, among other things, the power may not always reside in a Senator of his fineness of character."

I hope the Senator from Delaware changes his mind. Come back home, Senator, the light is in the window.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before asking any questions I should like to make it very clear that the Senator from Colorado was correct when he said that there was no disagreement between the Finance Committee and myself as to the extent of the powers which were given to the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I said so in my main remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado is correct. I should like to ask him a couple of questions on another point.

First, in order to clarify the RECORD, I should like to ask this question: In the past 2 years, or during the period in which the Senator from Delaware has been a Member of the Senate, can the Senator from Colorado think of a single case which I have disclosed on the floor of the Senate that was in violation of any rule of the Finance Committee or of the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that I have never made an analysis of the cases which he has disclosed. I have assumed that he was acting as an honorable man, and that has been sufficient for me. When he has disclosed matters which might have been revealed in confidence, I have assumed that he was disclosing matters with respect to which he received information on his own.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado pointed out—and I disagree slightly with him, if my understanding of his statement is correct—that perhaps the Senator from Delaware was trying to set himself up as a one-man power and bypass all committees. Is it not correct that I said I was perfectly agreeable to submit to the Finance Committee all subjects prior to disclosure in the Senate? However, if the Finance Committee should differ with the recommendations of the Senator from Delaware, or if it should differ with the recommendations of what might conceivably be a unanimous report of the subcommittee, the report having been submitted, and the Finance Committee having voted "no," from that time on, if any member of the committee felt that a violation of law was involved, only then, and only at that point, would I ask that individual members be released. Is not that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not remember having heard the proposal spelled out with such explicitness; but the Senator's end point, which he has consistently maintained, was that, after all the discussion was over, after all the things which the Senator has just detailed had been done, he retained unto himself, if he thought there was a violation of law, the right to disclose information devel-

oped in an executive session of the subcommittee or of the full committee.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has such a rule been invoked with respect to any other investigating committee which has been established by the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That I cannot say. However, the so-called standard rules, on which the Senator relies, destroy his own case. At least a majority of the subcommittee must prevail in order to enable any member to do the things which the Senator wants to do on his own responsibility.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado is in error, because the standard rules of procedure provide that a report may be made to the Senate by a majority vote of either the full committee or a subcommittee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Finance Committee struck out the word "or" and left the matter of making a report with the full commitee alone.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The proposal to vest full power in the subcommittee was not accepted by the Finance Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The point the junior Senator from Colorado makes is that all the fuss which the distinguished Senator from Delaware has made with respect to the rules relates to the provision which requires the vote of a majority of the subcommittee or the full committee; but the Senator from Delaware insists on using his own judgment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. The Senator from Colorado is slightly in error. I asked the Senator from Colorado whether or not the Senator from Delaware was in error when he pointed out the example. Suppose that in the course of an investigation it would be possible for the subcommittee to develop what it considered to be charges of bribery or improper influence peddling against Mr. X who was working in the Treasury Department. The subcommittee might be unanimous in its opinion that the particular official should be exposed and reported to the Department of Justice. The subcommittee might make a unanimous report to the full Finance Committee. Under the rules adopted by the Finance Committee would it not be possible for the Finance Committee to veto any disclosure by the subcommittee, even though it was unanimous in its report?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It would be possible; but that is off the point, so far as the point has been delineated by the Senator from Delaware. He is not taking a case of unanimous decision by the subcommittee, or a decision by a majority of the subcommittee. He bases his case on his own exclusive judgment, regardless of whether anyone agrees with him or not. The Senator from Delaware says, in effect, "If I think there is a violation of law I am at liberty to disclose it, even though the rest of the committee may be against me."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe the Senator from Colorado is quoting what he thinks is the position of the Senator from Delaware, however, he overlooks the broad implication of his rules.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask the Senator from Delaware if that is his position?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator from Delaware ready to say that he will act on the basis of the decision of a majority of the subcommittee or of the full committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am ready to act on the basis that either the full committee or the subcommittee has prior rights. I am ready to act under the same rules of procedure as were adopted by the other committees. The Senator from Colorado voted for several investigating committees since the first day of January and every single one of these committees are acting on the rules which you reject, namely that after the full committee or the subcommittee has had a chance to act and fails, then each member of the committee is free to act independently. Even this freedom of action is requested only in cases where actual violations of law are involved.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Delaware must know what kind of a trap he is falling into.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me finish.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say that we should adopt the standard rules of procedure. The Senator from Colorado protested them, and they were rejected. The standard rules of procedure provide that a report may be made to the Senate either by a majority vote of the full committee or a majority vote of a subcommittee. They go further. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], who is chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, stated on the floor that there was nothing in the rules of his committee which prohibited, in the final result, any member of the committee from disclosing what he considered to be fraud.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is chairman of another investigating committee. He is present in the Chamber. His committee is operating under the same rule. If there are any rules applicable to any Senate committee which restrict the individual members of the committee from disclosing what they consider to be fraud, I should like to have the Senator from Colorado or some other Senator point them out.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The standard rules, on which the Senator relies, do not give any individual Senator that right. They give the right to a majority of a subcommittee or a majority of the full committee.

I now again ask the Senator, Would he abide by a rule putting the power in the majority of the subcommittee or the majority of the full committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will abide by the standard rules which the Senate Committee on Finance rejected—the same rules as interpreted by every Member of the Senate who served on the Committee on Government Operations. There are many members of investigating committees present in the Chamber. If I am in error in my statement regarding their rules, let them rise and correct me. I repeat, there has never been an occasion in connection with any committee on which any member has agreed in advance, or has been asked to agree in advance, that in the event the majority of the full committee should disagree with him, he would not file a minority report disclosing a charge which he thinks involves a violation of law. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] is present. He has served as chairman of an investigating committee and can take exception to that statement if I am in error.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is exactly what the standard rules provide. They provide that there must be a majority vote of the subcommittee or of the full committee. I again ask the Senator, without qualifications as to interpretation, and without qualifications as to what may happen in other committees, will he abide by the majority decision of the subcommittee or the full committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will so far as making an official report to the Senate is concerned. The Senator from Delaware will never abide by any rule which calls upon him to agree in advance that under certain circumstances he will withhold what he considers to be damaging evidence against any individual solely because a majority of the committee decides otherwise. No Member of the Senate on any other subcommittee has ever been asked to do so. If I am in error, let the Senator from Colorado point out the error.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Delaware is in error because he has now defined the issue exactly as I have stated it to be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very sorry that I find myself in complete disagreement with the Senator from Colorado. I ask again if I am in error. I have served on committees previously. I have served on committees with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is also present in the Chamber. I recognize the importance of executive meetings. I do not believe any Member of the Senate will say that I have unduly violated the trust of executive meetings. However, I have yet to hear of any committee of Congress that has ever been established which, by majority vote, could forever bind any Member of the Senate from disclosing what he considered to be a crime. If the Senator from Colorado differs with me, I hope he will speak out. If we carry that rule to an extreme, would it not be theoretically possible, if such a rule were adopted for all subcommittees and investigating committees, for the political party in power to place a majority on the subcommittee and forevermore block any disclosure of corruption under any administration?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is true; and it is equally true that under the Williams rule some irresponsible addlepate acting on his own responsibility could disclose the deepest confidences developed in a committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot quarrel with the statement of the Senator from Colorado if he does not have confidence in my discretion.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that question has not arisen. It did not arise at any time. I specifically and very

carefully excluded that point. If we are going to talk about confidence, however, why does not the Senator have confidence in the majority of the Members of the Committee on Finance? If the discussion is to degenerate into one of personalities, why cannot the Senator from Delware abide with safety in the majority of the members of the Committee on Finance, or all of the members of the committee? I kept personalities very carefully out of the discussion because I thought the Senator from Delaware was trying to do likewise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe I have kept personalities out of the discussion. I understood the Senator from Colorado as indicating that perhaps it might be dangerous to give such power to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, now, Mr. President, there is nothing to that effect at all in any of my remarks. If the Senator from Delaware believes I said anything like that, I ask him to produce it. I have taken scrupulous care to avoid any thing of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am willing to accept the explanation of the Senator from Colorado. However, I point out that the other investigating committees to which the Senator from Colorado has referred possesses the same power to obtain access to income tax returns that is possessed by the committee under discussion. I grant there have been examples in the Senate when committees have gone too far. I agree that we must always take care to protect the rights of every American citizen and to make sure that he is not crucified on the floor of the Senate. However, I do not think that the Senator from Colorado or any other Member of the Senate can point to a single instance when I discussed any case on the floor of the Senate which was before a grand jury or when a man had been indicted. I have scrupulously refused to comment on cases once I knew the Department of Justice has moved in.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a little while ago I brought to the attention of the Senate the fact that at this very moment hundreds of courts throughout the land are trying to find out whether particular acts are violations of law, and hundreds of juries at this very moment are trying to determine factual situations.

Does the Senator from Delaware claim the virtue of perpetual infallibility or believe he will never commit a blunder in making a decision on a matter which deeply perplexes other men? I believe we should keep personalities out of the discussion. While he is talking about precedents, let me say that we have recently seen gross abuses of power by men, purporting to speak for committees, when they did not speak for committees at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree fully with what the Senator from Colorado has said, and I could even accept his view on this subject more freely and willingly if it were a forerunner of what might be the necessary restrictions of some subcommittees. The Senator from Colorado is not only the chairman of the Committee on Finance, but he is also chairman of the Republican conference, which authorizes the establishment of these subcommittees to which he has referred. If he is going to propose similar restrictions for other subcommittees perhaps all of us could agree with him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado is in the habit of letting neither his teeth nor his nose get too long. He is content to consider the issue before the Senate, which is exclusively with the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor this point any longer; but I desire to make very clear what I have in mind. For example—and the Senator from Colorado will correct me if I am in error—I went before the Committee on Finance a little more than 2 years ago, or perhaps nearly 3 years ago, regarding this corruption issue. I addressed a letter to every member of the Committee on Finance. I have a copy of the letter before me dated August 2, 1950. This letter calls attention to the fact that there were certain gross irregularities in the third collection district in New York. I asked the committee to take action. I should like to read the letter to the Senate. The copy of the letter is addressed to the Senator from Colorado, but identical letters were sent to every other member of the Committee on Finance. The letter, as I say, is dated August 2, 1950. It reads:

> DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: During the recent weeks I have heard some rather alarming rumors in reference to the conditions prevailing in the Office of the Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third New York District.
>
> I have called these rumors to the attention of Mr. George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner, Bureau of Internal Revenue, and have requested a copy of their most recent auditor's report of this district in order to determine whether or not there was any foundation to these rumors. I have just received a letter from Mr. Schoeneman to the effect that it is against the policy of the Bureau to comply with my request that I be allowed to examine a copy of the auditor's report of these records.
>
> I want it thoroughly understood that I am making no charges of irregularity in this office since I do not have at this time any proof of these rumors; however, the nature and the source of the rumors are such that I do not feel that they can be overlooked. I am calling this to the attention of the members of the Senate Finance Committee with the request that your committee direct an inquiry to Mr. Schoeneman and examine for yourselves the report and records of this district.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

On the copy of the letter I sent to the then chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I added the following postscript:

> P. S.—I will be only too glad to appear before your committee if you wish and to explain to you the nature of these rumors.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the Senator's point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will get to it in a moment. I understand that the Committee on Finance did call before it—and if I am in error I stand corrected—representatives of the Treasury Department, and received assurance that there was nothing wrong in the city of New York and that perhaps the Senator from Delaware was unduly alarmed.

Five months later in 1951 I became a member of the Committee on Finance, and as one of the first actions on my part I asked that the committee obtain copies of the audited report to which I refer in my letter. I said I was not satisfied with the report which had been submitted to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator at this point. The Committee on Finance did a great deal better than anything the Senator from Delaware has suggested so far. It appointed a subcommittee to look into the matter, and other matters as well, and appointed the Senator from Delaware to be a member of the subcommittee. Therefore I ask again: What is the point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The committee appointed me a member of the subcommittee, Senator BYRD was the chairman of it, and I might say he did an excellent job. His assistance was invaluable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Delaware was the most active member of the subcommittee. I do not think he will deny that he was the most active member of the subcommittee. Perhaps I have made a mistake, but I do not think I have made one, in paying full tribute to his being the most active member of the subcommittee.

This is getting to be a little frustrating. Perhaps the Senator from Delaware was not there at all. However, I want to keep the record straight. The Senator from Delaware never came before the Committee on Finance when I was present, and asked for anything that I did not make the motion to give it to him. The Senator from Delaware knows that statement to be correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator from Colorado could tell the Senate what the Committee on Finance did with the report I brought to the attention of the committee in August 1950.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know the answer to that question. My memory is not that clear today. The committee did just as I suggested a moment ago, namely, it appointed a subcommittee, and appointed the Senator from Delaware chairman of it, and the committee never denied him a single power he asked for.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado is correct. However, I point out that between August 1950, and the date when I became a member of the committee nothing was done.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We were extremely happy to have him become a member of the committee. I will say again that he did a superb job, and I will testify to it again and again. However, that has nothing to do with the issue involved in this case. I will load the Senator down with medals, if that is what he wants me to do, but I will not put a martyr's crown on his head, because he has not been martyred.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not asking for medals. I wish the Senator from Colorado would instead give us the authority needed to do this job in a way that would command the confidence of the American people. All I am asking is that we not be bound to protect a man we think is a crook. I was always taught

that it was a crime to conceal a crime. I do not mean to imply that the present members of the Finance Committee would do this but we are establishing a precedent here.

As I was saying, in 1951 I became a member of the Finance Committee, and I requested a copy of these reports, as the Senator from Colorado will confirm. A subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Delaware was appointed by the committee; to read these reports and not one of us was bound in advance that we would have to withhold any evidence or anything else which developed. No conditions were spelled out and I heard no complaints.

We checked the records, and found them to be much worse than I had pictured them or that the committee or anyone else would imagine them to be. We found that notwithstanding that representatives of the Treasury Department came before the committee during the period between August and January and fully satisfied the committee that there was nothing wrong in the third district in New York, nevertheless the records of the Treasury Department showed they at that time knew about the corrupt condition in that office. Back in 1947—and all this material appears in the record, and can be confirmed—Mr. Roger Stuart, the editor of the New York World Telegram, wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury a letter in which he told him of the conditions existing in the New York office, and requested an investigation. The investigation was authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury; and Mr. James J. Saxon, an assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, Special Counsel to the General Counsel of the Treasury Department, was appointed to be in charge of the investigation.

In December 1949, Mr. Saxon wrote a letter to the Honorable John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, in which he stated that conditions in the New York office were even worse than had been pictured by the editor of the New York World Telegram, and stated that if something were not done immediately, that situation would blow up into a major scandal. That was on December 13, 1949, 8 months before I called the matter to the attention of the Finance Committee.

On February 27, 1950, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Schoeneman, wrote a personal memorandum to Secretary Snyder in which he reviewed the record of the two previous memoranda—the one in 1947 and the one in 1949—and then said he was sorry that he had to report that, instead of getting better, conditions in the New York office were becoming worse; and again he recommended that immediate action be taken. That was in February 1950, 6 months before I called the matter to the attention of the Finance Committee, and about 8 months before representatives of that office came before the Finance Committee and convinced the committee that there was nothing wrong.

It was not until August 17, 1951, that we were able to have the collector of that office removed. During that time I do not remember that the committee took too much interest. I discussed the problem with you and Senator GEORGE several times.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Was it done against the objection of the Senate Finance Committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; not against their objection.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The matter was not discussed with the Senate Finance Committee, was it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; it was.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did the Senator from Delaware discuss with the committee the fact that he was going to make a statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; long before——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat my question: Did the Senator from Delaware discuss with the Senate Finance Committee the fact that he was going to make a statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Has the Senator forgotten it? One conference was in the Senate district room.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A statement of confidential material which had been received by the entire committee or by the subcommittee at executive session or through its executive process?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just a minute, Mr. President——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask the Senator from Delaware whether he made such a statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I have said I made the statement and as a result several men went to jail.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The question I have asked is a simple one, and can be answered either "Yes" or "No."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have answered the question. I made the exposure of the New York, Boston, St. Louis, California offices and several other cases. Does the Senator object to any of them having been exposed?

Furthermore, Mr. President, I did tell the Senate Finance Committee; and I regret very much that in the few years I worked on this matter, I have yet to hear the Senator from Colorado even so much as raise his voice against one of these corrupt officers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Now the Senator from Delaware is becoming personal—an attitude against which he has advised everyone else, a fault into which he said he would not fall.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I am not. But I think the Senator might likewise be a little more careful.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado simply wishes to say that the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] were doing an adequate job, without the necessity of intervention on the part of anyone else.

However, all that is beyond the point. The point is in regard to the power claimed by the Senator from Delaware as a right as an individual to disclose, against the judgment of a majority of a subcommittee or a majority of the full committee, confidential material which has been furnished the subcommittee or the full committee in executive session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am merely pointing out how the new rule could work. I say I did disclose those cases, and I would do it again even if it had to be done over the objection of every member of the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What the Senator from Delaware is arguing—and I do not think he is doing it thoughtfully—is that the judgment of 14 other honest members of that committee is no good, and that his judgment is infallible—a very foolish position for the Senator from Delaware to take.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not making any such argument. I am merely pointing out that on the other side of the Capitol, the House Ways and Means Committee today is doing a good job under exactly the same rules that have been rejected by the Senate Finance Committee. The same was true of the King committee, last year; and the same is true of the subcommittee of which I was a member last year. In other words, we did not bind ourselves in advance that every one of us would keep our mouth shut under certain conditions if we found an actual violation of law. I will never do that and you have no precedent for asking it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Neither did the members of those groups bind themselves in advance not to burn down a house or not to rob a bank. What kind of an argument is the Senator from Delaware making?

Again I challenge the Senator from Delaware—because we can dispose of this matter very quickly if he will come to the point: Will the Senator from Delaware abide by the majority judgment of the whole Finance Committee or of a majority of the subcommittee of that committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will never agree that I will permit the whole committee or the subcommittee to exercise a veto power upon me, so as to prevent me from disclosing a violation of law. Furthermore I am surprised that the Senator asks such a commitment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, I have accurately stated the issue, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And the statement of the Senator from Delaware about when he was right and others were wrong is not pertinent to the issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Again I ask whether the Senator from Colorado or any Member of the Senate who has served on those investigation committees can point out in the history of the Senate an instance of a member of a subcommittee being bound in advance?

Mr. MILLIKIN. With the exception of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, it never popped into many heads that anything of that kind could be done. And when it has been done, it has been done irresponsibly, and has caused great embarrassment to the Congress and to the committees involved. It has been done, but not because of a rule or withholding a rule. A responsible committee member simply does not think of doing such a thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I see no need to delay this question further. The Senator from Colorado has clearly stated the point.

So far as I am concerned, I see no need to go through a long process of investigating a case and finding what may be regarded as gross irregularities on the part of any individual, and then as a committee member being put in a position of being bound in advance to keep his mouth shut, as has just been proposed. In that event a few months or a few years later, another committee might disclose the case, and might say, "Well, the Senator from Delaware knew all about it, but did not denounce it." In such an event there could be no clarification of your position.

Mr. President, I have never agreed to draw the line in that way in regard to any matter upon which I have been working, and I am never going to agree to have any committee draw the line for me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, since the Senator from Delaware is rather profuse in his use of the vertical "I," let me use one. I do not want to be on either a subcommittee or a committee of which an individual member receiving confidential information, may undertake to disclose and reveal the secrets of the committee or subcommittee meetings, without my knowledge. I do not want to have to read in the press for the first time things ascribed to a committee of which I am a member and on which I have equal responsibility.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the junior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. The junior Senator from Delaware has a short nose and dull teeth, but he would like to ask the learned and very much admired Senator from Colorado a question. Under the rules adopted by the Senate Finance Committee, is it possible for a minority report to be filed by a member of a subcommittee?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is possible for a minority report to be filed. I am assuming the Senator is talking about confidential matters, and what might be the position of the whole committee, as to confidential matters.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It would, of course, be possible for a minority to file a report with the chairman, but not with the Senate. But an alternative is always open. If a Senator does not like the action of the whole committee, if he is convinced that a violation of law is being covered up, he may always come to the floor of the Senate and submit a resolution calling for a report from the committee on the matter which he describes. He can always do that. If there is enough steam behind the effort, he will probably get results.

Mr. FREAR. I do not think I fully understood the reply of the Senator from Colorado. Will he yield to permit me to ask a question for the purpose of clarification?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. In the rules adopted by the Senate Finance Committee, covering a subject such as the one which has been debated this afternoon, is it provided that a minority report may not be filed by the subcommittee on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Am I correct that it would be necessary to obtain permission on the part of a majority of the Senate, in order that such minority report might be filed, in case the chairman and majority of the full committee did not desire a subcommittee report or a statement of minority views?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct, assuming it is not information which those who filed it dug up themselves, and also assuming that the nature of the subject is presumptively confidential, and has been obtained through committee processes or subcommittee processes.

Mr. FREAR. I failed to say it was assumed the information would come as the result of an executive session of the subcommittee. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield,, along the line of the point raised by my colleague, I may say, it is true, as the Senator from Colorado just pointed out to my colleague, that as a last resort, if such a controversy arose, the subcommittee, or any member thereof, could come to the Senate and submit a resolution calling for an immediate report. That is true. But is it not also true that, in submitting such resolution, and in defending it on the Senate floor, members of the committee would be morally bound, under the rules being laid down by the Finance Committee, not to tell the Senate, or the American people, the nature of the charge which the Senator is seeking to expose? You could come to the Senate as the Senator of Colorado states and say, "I know something I cannot tell," and then try to convince the Senate it would be interesting enough to override the committee report. You could not do it without disclosing the nature of the case and every Member of the Senate knows it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The charge could be generalized, without revealing anything that happened in executive session; and if the particular Senator had the requisite standing in the Senate, that kind of request might receive very sympathetic attention.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The American people need more than sympathy, they want action in cleaning up this corruption. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado one further question. Can he cite a precedent anywhere in the history of the Senate of a procedure being resorted to whereby, in order to file a minority report, a member of the committee must get permission from the United States Senate as a whole?

Mr. MILLIKIN. To file it in the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; or to speak on the subject in the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not so sure, so far as filing the report is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think you will find one. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Wait a moment. That is what the Senator mentioned first. I will answer the question, bite by bite, if necessary. I am not sure that a subcommittee has now a right to file reports in the Senate, without obtaining the permission of the Senate. What is the second barrel?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly. The Senator is correct on the report. I am speaking about the rights of an individual Member of the Senate to speak. That is the controversy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I answer the Senator again as I have answered him before. The field has literally been littered with stuff put out by irresponsible—let us not say irresponsible persons, let us say by persons of mistaken judgment, revealing things which should not have been revealed. Everybody is aware of such instances. I need not specify them. This discussion is sufficiently broad without undertaking to mention half a dozen recent instances. The Senator is fully aware of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor, when the Senator from Colorado has concluded.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat that, so far as a Member of the Senate rising on the floor to repeat confidential information received in an executive session of a whole committee, or of a subcommittee, it is an unthinkable procedure, except by an irresponsible man; with the exception, I am sorry to note, that a responsible man like the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] wants such a right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right, if the Senator from Colorado has concluded.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The Chair wishes to state that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Colorado was recognized with the understanding that immediately following his statement the Senate would proceed to a call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a few brief remarks. I think it would be appropriate at this time, since this question has come up. It should be settled now while we are all here.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, would the Senator from Delaware be willing to limit his remarks? The only difficulty is, I made certain promises. I supposed this discussion would be concluded long ago. Senators are waiting for a call of the Consent Calendar. Furthermore, we have a bill to take up regarding the reorganization plan. Would the Senator from Delaware limit his remarks?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will be as brief as possible. I do not think I would require many minutes. However, if it is the Senator's wish, and it is agreeable with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I will wait and speak later.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—in the Senate within recent weeks the

practice has developed of limiting the time during which Senators may speak on the floor of the Senate. Even though the speaker, under the circumstances, might be willing to agree to it, it is bound to have an effect on the organization and presentation of his material. It is bound to have limiting effects. In my opinion, there is one thing we ought to keep inviolate on the floor of the Senate, namely, unlimited debate. I want to hear the Senator from Delaware without a feeling on my part that he is being limited by the clock. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

VISIT BY MEMBERS OF THE GERMAN BUNDESTAG

During the delivery of Mr. MILLIKIN's speech,

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am happy to say that accompanying me are four members of the German Bundestag, who are entitled to the privilege of the floor.

Last year it was my privilege to visit in Bonn. While I was there the members of the Bundestag were very hospitable to all members of the American delegation. They made our visit a memorable one in many ways. We were received most hospitably in the Bundestag and at all the receptions. The President of Germany literally took us into his arms.

So it is a great pleasure to present these gentlemen to the Senate. I will ask them to stand, please. They are: Hans Joachim von Merkatz, of the Germany Party; Karl Georg Pfleiderer, of the Free Democratic Party; Gerhard Schroeder, of the Christian Democratic Party; Franz Joseph Strauss, of the Christian Socialist Party.

They are in the United States in order to become better acquainted with us Americans. I suggest that we give them a hand. [Applause, Senators rising.]

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

ORDER TO CONSIDER CALENDAR AT POINT FOLLOWING LAST CALL

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar begin at the end of the last previous call. The prior bills have been called three or four times. I ask unanimous consent that the call begin with Calendar Order No. 83, Senate Concurrent Resolution 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first measure following the previous call of the calendar.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was announced as first in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the concurrent resolution will be pasesd over.

CAROL LYNN BARBARA HECHT

The bill (S. 55) for the relief of Carol Lynn Barbara Hecht was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Carol Lynn Barbara Hecht, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Russell E. Hecht, citizens of the United States.

BERNARD W. OLSON

The bill (S. 71) for the relief of Bernard W. Olson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard W. Olson, of Oakes, N. Dak., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor child who was fatally burned as a result of falling into an open pit of scalding water located on the United States naval air base, Trinidad, British West Indies, on January 22, 1949, and for burial and other expenses incurred as a result thereof: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

NORMAN S. MACPHEE

The bill (S. 142) for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, apparently the author of the bill is not present.

Mr. President, I am advised by the Department that there are 225 other persons in a situation similar to that of one covered by the bill. I find no objection to this bill but the department recommends that it be generalized in its nature, inasmuch as there are so many others similarly situated. Since the author of the bill is not presently on the floor, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am not the author of the bill, but I am a member of the committee which considered the bill. I may say that during the 82d Congress, at the suggestion of the Navy Department, bills were introduced to authorize payments covering the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel. Those bills were not enacted. Had they been enacted, the result would have been to relieve not only Mr. MacPhee but also other individuals similarly situated.

The committee has recognized similar situations in the past, and sees no reason why the claimant herein, who acted in good faith and upon the basis of orders issued by competent authority in the Navy Department, should be required to wait for the enactment of general legislation in order that he may be relieved of his liability to the Government.

The committee therefore recommends favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah makes a fair statement. I find no objection to this bill. My objection was made in order that the problems of others similarly situated might be called to the attention of the committee. If the distinguished Senator from Utah will take upon himself the responsibility of calling to the attention of the committee the need for general action, then I shall withdraw any objection.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall certainly be glad to do that. I think the committee has considered two similar reports.

Mr. GORE. Then I withdraw my objection to the bill.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 142) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Norman S. MacPhee, of Underwood, N. Dak., is hereby relieved of all liability for the repayment to the United States of $284.35, representing the costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in providing transportation of household effects of the said Norman S. MacPhee from Richmond, Va., to Underwood, N. Dak., upon his separation from service in the Navy in 1946, the payment of such costs having been subsequently disallowed by the General Accounting Office on the ground that such payment was not authorized by law.

WALTRAUT MIES VAN DER ROHE

The bill (S. 306) for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Waltraut Mies van der Rohe shall be held and considered to have been lawfuly admitted to the United States for permanent

residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CORNELIUS A. NAVORI

The bill (S. 314) for the relief of Cornelius A. Navori was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cornelius A. Navori shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. ALEXANDRE DEMETRIO MORUZI—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 389) for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been requested by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to object to bills granting citizenship to exchange students. The case covered by the bill just called seems to be unusual, and it was my hope that the Senator from Arkansas would be present to hear the merits of the bill explained, but since he is not on the floor, I am not at liberty to withhold objection. I therefore object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to apologize to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who has been called off the floor. I promised him that I would suggest the absence of a quorum before the calendar was taken up. It quite slipped my mind. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Fulbright	Lehman
Beall	Goldwater	Long
Bennett	Gore	Magnuson
Bricker	Green	Malone
Bridges	Griswold	Mansfield
Bush	Hayden	Martin
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Maybank
Byrd	Hennings	McCarran
Capehart	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Carlson	Hill	McClellan
Case	Hoey	Millikin
Clements	Holland	Morse
Cooper	Humphrey	Mundt
Cordon	Hunt	Murray
Daniel	Ives	Neely
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Dworshak	Kefauver	Purtell
Eastland	Kennedy	Robertson
Ellender	Kilgore	Russell
Ferguson	Knowland	Saltonstall
Frear	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.	Taft	Welker
Sparkman	Thye	Wiley
Stennis	Tobey	Williams
Symington	Watkins	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR CONTINUATION OF CALL OF CALENDAR AFTER 2 O'CLOCK

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the hour of 2 o'clock has been reached, the call of the calendar may be continued to the end of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 486) for the relief of Che Kil Bok was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. At the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RONALD LEE OENNING

The bill (S. 516) for the relief of Ronald Lee Oenning was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ronald Lee Oenning (formerly Michio Yoshida), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. Floyd L. Oenning and Mrs. Margaret L. Oenning, citizens of the United States.

DR. ALBERT HAAS

The bill (S. 616) for the relief of Dr. Albert Haas was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if we might have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I, as the author of the bill, would be very glad indeed to explain it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I would thank the Senator from New York if he would do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this is a bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Albert Haas, a 40-year-old native of Hungary and citizen of France who last entered the United States as a visitor on May 19, 1950. His status was changed to that of an exchange visitor on June 4, 1951. Shortly after his arrival in the United States in 1950, he became an extern in tuberculosis rehabilitation at the New York University-Bellevue Medical Center in New York City, serving in that capacity until July 1, 1951, when he was appointed as resident physician in that hospital. His wife and 9-year-old son are permanent residents of the United States. He has been strongly recommended by men in whom I am sure we all have confidence. Documents were submitted to the committee showing the following citations received by him:

1. Medal of Resistance, signed by C. de Gaulle, September 1, 1945.
2. Citation of the Minister of National Defense with the Croix de Guerre with Silver Star, signed by Colonel Josset, March 27, 1947.
3. Citation of the President of the Provisionary Government of the French Republic with the Croix de Guerre with Silver Star, signed by General Bonneau, December 24, 1946.
4. Certificate of Service, signed by Field Marshal Montgomery, May 6, 1946.
5. Certificate and citation from United States Army Medical Service, signed by Maj. Donald H. Vollner, August 6, 1945.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The explanation made by the distinguished Senator from New York is quite satisfactory and sufficient. I withhold objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as a member of the committee I wish to add that the wife and son of the beneficiary of the bill are permanent residents of the United States at this time.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 616) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Albert Haas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 712) for the relief of William R. Jackson was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CHARLES ANTHONY DESOTELL

The bill (S. 846) for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Charles Anthony Desotell, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of T. Sgt. and Mrs. George G. Desotell, citizens of the United States.

JACQUELINE SUE LAWN (AKEMI INOUE)

The bill (S. 853) for the relief of Jacqueline Sue Lawn (Akemi Inoue) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jacqueline Sue Lawn (Akemi Inoue),

shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Jack Elsworth Lawn, citizens of the United States.

ROBERT HAROLD WALL

The bill (S. 954) for the relief of Robert Harold Wall was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Robert Harold Wall, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lt. and Mrs. J. V. Wall, citizens of the United States.

MR. AND MRS. LUCILLO GRASSI

The bill (S. 1039) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws relating to loss of nationality, Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi shall not be considered to have lost their United States citizenship by reason of voting in a foreign election or because of any period of residence outside the United States prior to the enactment of this act.

DR. PETER C. T. KAO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 69) for the relief of Dr. Peter C. T. Kao, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Peter C. T. Kao shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SISTER LOUISE MARIE JOSEPHINE BELLOIR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 166) for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SISTER JEANNE MARIA HENNETH LANGLO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 167) for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GEORGE MAUNER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 811) for the relief of George Mauner, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Mauner may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

RELIEF OF EXCHANGE STUDENTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is now on the floor. I should like to address to him a question with reference to three bills, as to two of which I happen to be the author, and as to one of which another Senator is the author, and to which objection was made today. The bills provide for the retention in the United States of persons who came to this country as students under the student exchange program. These students, having received an education in this country, now seek to remain here. Does the Senator from Arkansas look with favor upon their retention?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had not considered that aspect of the matter. I do not know whether any offer has been made to them.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not understand that any offer has been made.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I feel certain that the Senator from Nevada understands very well the reason for the objection to their retention. To permit foreign students to come into the United States under the auspices of this Government and then to remain in this country really defeats the very purpose of the program, because the objective is to acquaint them with our country and our way of life, and then to have them return to their own countries and, we would hope, present a favorable impression of this country.

I know that every time this question occurs, criticisms will arise. It is only because of my interest in the long-term permanence and effectiveness of the program that I object. I do not know these individuals personally. However, I should be glad to consider such a program. I should like to have the Board of Foreign Scholarships give an impression of its view as to this question.

Offhand, I would not want to assume the responsibility of consenting, because not only is actual money involved, but a great amount of trouble and effort goes into this program. If it ever becomes established that this program affords a way to get into the United States, then there will be many other persons making special efforts to come under the program. I think it would be very wise policy to discourage to the utmost the idea that if they can win scholarships, they can stay here, because such a plan would really defeat the whole purpose of the program.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator is correct in his view that such action would defeat, to a certain extent, the program. However, I do not believe there would be so many students who would want to stay. That is only my thought.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Unfortunately, I have seen a good many of them, and a number of them want to stay. In many ways, I do not blame them, because by their desire to remain they pay us a great compliment. However, I think it is necessary for us to be very careful and not permit them to stay here. To my mind, it would seriously hinder the program, and would be very bad practice.

There are other implications to be considered besides the money involved. Much of the money is also in foreign currencies, so it would be very difficult to evaluate the cost.

Mr. McCARRAN. I merely desired to have the views of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I might suggest to the Senator from Nevada that the question should be formally presented to the Board of Foreign Scholarships. I should also like to suggest that the Senator's committee consider the question, to see if a definite policy could not be developed by the Board of Foreign Scholarships under the guidance of the Senate.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the Senator recognize that there may be some cases in which equities have developed and should be considered, in view of which,

after students have entered the United States, they might be permitted to remain?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not say that that is not possible. I could only judge that question in specific cases, where such a situation had actually developed. It might well be that something of that nature could happen.

By the way, my attention has just been called to a case which I had not previously heard about. It appears that the person originally came from Rumania.

Mr. WATKINS. It is calendar No. 90, Senate bill 389.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a new case, to which I had not had my attention called previously, but the Senator from Nevada has mentioned it.

Mr. WATKINS. The person affected by calendar No. 90, Senate bill 389, is stateless at the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not thoroughly acquainted with the case. It has just this minute been called to my attention, and I said I would be glad to look into it. I had not read the entire report. I understood the person came into this country from Venezuela. If he came from Venezuela, he did not enter the United States under the program with which I am thoroughly familiar.

There are some small programs involving specialists. There was one involved under the old Inter-American Committee. A doctor who was 50 years old was brought into the United States. It might be that that is a case in which an exception could be made. That person may be serving such a special purpose of benefit to this country that, all things balanced, he should stay here. However, I would not want to say definitely offhand.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I read the report on this bill last night, I came to the conclusion that it had particular merit, in that the person affected came from behind the Iron Curtain and is supposedly stateless now. However, two questions come to mind. The first is, From what country did he come? The other question is, How is it that a man who is 50 years of age, and already protected, can come under the student-exchange program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I have said, I am not familiar with the case. It has just been called to my attention, and the point that strikes me is that the man could not have come into this country from behind the Iron Curtain under the program with which I am familiar, because we have no such agreement with Rumania. Under the student-exchange program, he could not have come from Venezuela.

Mr. GORE. The report shows that he came from France, but he does not now claim to be a citizen of France. The bill raises some questions, as well as meritorious circumstances.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator know under the authority of which law he came into the country?

Mr. GORE. I think it wise that the bill go over, and I had so requested.

Mr. WATKINS. I trust that the committee will get the information which has been requested by the Senator from Arkansas with respect to the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. I hope the committee will attempt to get the information the Senator wishes with respect to this person.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it meets with the approval of the Committee on the Judiciary, I should like to have the information, and apparently that committee considers bills like this. I should like to suggest that they submit an inquiry to the Board of Foreign Scholarships as to what the Board thinks about this type of case.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall be glad to do that.

ESTATE OF MARY M. MENDENHALL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 851) for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "$50,000 in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the death of the said Mary M. Mendenhall from asphyxiation caused by the improper administration of an anesthetic during an operation performed on her" and insert "$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Mary M. Mendenhall while she was being delivered of a child", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall, deceased, wife of Capt. George W. Mendenhall, United States Air Force, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Mary M. Mendenhall while she was being delivered of a child, on September 8, 1949, at the 49th General Hospital, Tokyo, Honshu, Japan: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

PROPOSED EXEMPTIONS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The bill (S. 18) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], from whose committee the bill was reported.

According to the report, the bill would bring under the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act certain agencies which are now excluded from that act. I notice that the opinions given by the executive department are dated 1951. Does the distinguished Senator from Nevada believe it would be wise to secure an opinion from the Bureau of the Budget at the present time with respect to the application of the bill to certain agencies?

Mr. McCARRAN. As the Senator may recall, a similar bill was approved by the Senate in the 82d Congress. It seems to me that, regardless of what the Bureau of the Budget might say, the proposed legislation is meritorious. That is the position of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. COOPER. I think there is good ground for what the distinguished Senator from Nevada has said, but I thought it might be wise to obtain the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget. I therefore ask that the bill be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 30) to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over, by request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 39) to further implement the full-faith-and-credit clause of the Constitution was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is that at the Senator's own request, or at the request of some other Senator?

Mr. GORE. It is at the request of the Senator from Tennessee. The question is rather complicated. The report itself consists of nine pages of fine print, and I simply did not finish my study of the bill last night. If the Senator does not object, I should like to have a little more time to study it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot object.

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FORFEITURE AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY SEIZED UNDER THE ESPIONAGE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 41) to further amend the act of June 15, 1917, as amended.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on page 2, line 9, there is a misspelling of the word "subsection." I move to correct the spelling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "subsetion" and insert "subsection."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of title VI of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 233),

as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 22, sec. 401), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whenever an attempt is made to export or ship from or take out of the United States any arms or munitions of war or other articles in violation of law, or whenever it is known or there shall be probable cause to believe that any arms or munitions of war or other articles are intended to be or are being or have been exported or removed from the United States in violation of law, the Secretary of the Treasury, or any person duly authorized for the purpose by the President, may seize and detain such arms or munitions of war or other articles and may seize and detain any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft containing the same or which has been or is being used in exporting or attempting to export such arms or munitions of war or other articles. All arms or munitions of war and other articles, vessels, vehicles, and aircraft seized pursuant to this subsection shall be forfeited.

"(b) All provisions of law relating to seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture and condemnation for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of the property forfeited or condemned or the proceeds from the sale thereof; the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures; and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures, and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this section, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof. Awards of compensation to informers under this section may be paid only out of funds specifically appropriated therefor.

"(c) Arms and munitions of war forfeited under subsection (b) of this section shall be delivered to the Secretary of Defense for such use or disposition as he may deem in the public interest, or, in the event that the Secretary of Defense refuses to accept such arms and munitions of war, they shall be sold or otherwise disposed of as prescribed under existing law in the case of forfeitures for violation of the customs laws."

SEC. 2. Sections 2, 3, 5, and 7 of the act of June 15, 1917 (ch. 30, title VI, 40 Stat. 224–225; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 22, secs. 402, 403, 405, 407), and section 4 of such act, as amended by the act of March 1, 1929 (ch. 420, 45 Stat. 1423; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 22, sec. 404), are repealed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 252) to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN TAX COURT DECISIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 984) making provision for judicial review of certain Tax Court decisions, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 5, after "January 1," to strike out "1954" and insert "1952"; and on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "1954" and insert "1952", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections 732 (c) and 732 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, the decision of the United States Tax Court, entered after January 1, 1952, respecting the determination of any question arising under subparagraphs 711 (b) (1) (H), (I), (J), or (K), section 721, or section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, shall be subject to review by the United States Court of Appeals in the same manner as other decisions of the Tax Court. In the case of any decision entered after January 1, 1952, and before the date of approval of this act, a petition for review therein may be filed at any time within 90 days after the date of approval of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

PROVISION FOR TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 719) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1954, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation: *Provided*, That such Canadian vessels may transport merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports and points herein enumerated.

APPROVAL OF CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The bill (S. 1082) to approve a conveyance made by the city of Charleston, S. C., to the South Carolina State Ports Authority, of real property heretofore granted to said city of Charleston by the United States of America was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision in the act of Congress, approved May 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1387), and in the deed made pursuant thereto by the United States of America to the city of Charleston, which prohibits the city of Charleston from transferring the title of the propertly conveyed thereunder shall not be deemed applicable to the conveyance of a portion of the said property, made without consideration, by the city of Charleston, to the South Carolina State Ports Authority, an agency of the State of South Carolina.

PROVISION FOR COMMISSION TO REGULATE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION UTILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REFERENCE OF BILL

The bill (S. 922) to provide for a Commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill relates in major part to the District of Columbia, and I think it would be a good idea to have the bill referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia for study, with instructions to report it back not later than a certain date, satisfactory to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would not object to that procedure. However, there is this to be said: The bill deals entirely and exclusively with interstate transportation, and our committee is the proper committee to handle such proposed legislation. It does directly affect transportation in the District of Columbia. So the Committee on the District of Columbia could very properly consider it to see if there are any objections to it.

If the Senator from New Jersey will permit me to do so, I invite attention to a concurrent resolution on the calendar, Order No. 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, establishing a joint committee to make a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia. It seems to me that that resolution deals with interstate transportation.

Mr. GORE. It is on the calendar for action today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado will not object to that resolution if it is amended so as not to deal with interstate transportation.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will examine the resolution he will find that it relates entirely to the matter of study. It is not designed to accomplish the things which the Senator's bill is designed to accomplish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But does it deal with interstate transportation, or simply with transportation within the District of Columbia?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I understand, it deals with transportation within the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The resolution is somewhat broad in its terms. It deals with all transportation within the District of Columbia, most of which extends in its operations beyond the boundaries of the District. There is no way that an adequate study can be made of the Capital Transit Co., for example, unless a study is made of the operations of that company both in Maryland and in Virginia. It seems to me, if the distinguished Senator will allow me to make the suggestion, that the two measures should be considered together.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I remind the Senator from Tennessee that I am not

a sponsor of either the bill or the concurrent resolution; nor am I a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I am merely speaking as a member of the calendar committee on this side of the aisle.

Mr. GORE. It is my privilege to serve as a member of the District Committee. It is my opinion that the two measures should be considered together. Would the Senator from Colorado object to a reference of Calendar 114, Senate bill 922, to the Committee on the District of Columbia, provided there is objection to the consideration of Calendar 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, until the District Committee has studied it and has had opportunity for consultation with the committee of which the Senator from Colorado is chairman?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only point I raise—and I think it is important—is the distinction between intrastate and interstate transportation. Our committee is organized to handle interstate problems. On page 2, section 2, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendar 131, we find the following:

It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of public transportation serving the District of Columbia—

And so forth. It seems to me that that would affect interstate transportation as well as intrastate transportation.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is not the easy solution of these two problems to have both measures go over until the next call of the calendar, so that both committees may look into each one?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to make it clear that our committee has no objection whatever to having Calendar 114, Senate bill 922, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. We are glad to have the District Committee consider it, because it does affect the District of Columbia very directly.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The point made by the junior Senator from New Jersey is that the Committee on the District of Columbia can study the bill, whether it is before the committee or not, during the period between now and the next call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no objection to handling it in any way the Senator wishes to handle it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In view of the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 114, Senate bill 922, be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia for further study, with instructions to report back to the Senate within 2 weeks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the request—I merely wish to state that the Committee on Rules and Administration considered Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 19, which was discussed on the floor in connection with the pending bill. Certainly it was not the intention of the Committee on Rules and Administration to invade the rights of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We merely wanted to obtain consideration for a concurrent resolution which would provide for a study of some of the transit problems of the city of Washington, and it is only natural that the interests should overlap to some extent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I understand. If I may be permitted to say a few more words, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been trying to work out a solution to the problem of interstate transportation in the District of Columbia and neighboring Virginia and Maryland. We tried to work it out at one time on the basis of compacts between the State of Virginia and Maryland, but that effort was not successful, because the States were reluctant to enter into any kind of compact on that subject. Therefore the method which we find set forth in Senate bill 922 is the one we adopted almost through desperation. It seemed as though it would be the only way we could get any action. Action is very badly needed indeed. The transportation which serves the District of Columbia and the area adjoining it in Maryland and Virginia lacks a great deal of what it should be, and it does need supervision. The rates and the connections between the various private transportation systems fall far short of what they should be.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado feel that 2 weeks is too long?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that is all right.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Very well. Then I renew my request.

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

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES ABROAD

The bill (H. R. 3658) to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free transportation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION FROM DUTY OF PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS BROUGHT INTO THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 3659) to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABOLITION OF COMMISSION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD

The bill (S. 1041) to abolish the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the establishment of a Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard connnecting the present Lincoln Memorial in the city of Washington with the battlefield of Gettysburg in the State of Pennsylvania," approved May 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 285), is hereby repealed.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF LETHAL MUNITIONS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 903) to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America, or an instrumentality thereof, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments on page 2, line 6, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "of types normally used for hunting or sporting use" and insert "not in excess of caliber .50, shotgun ammunition, and small arms ammunition less than 20 millimeters of types normally used for hunting or sporting purposes"; in line 12, after the word "materials", to strike out "or devices containing explosive materials, designed" and insert "or combustible or toxic substances, or devices containing such materials or substances, designed"; in line 19, after the word "the", to strike out "movement is arranged" and insert "transportation is of lethal munitions procured (from private or governmental sources)"; in line 22, after the word "thereof", to strike out the colon and "*Provided, however*, That this act shall not apply to the transportation of articles" and insert "or when", and on page 3, line 1, after the word "by", to strike out "the Congress." and insert "the Congress: *Provided, however*, That this act shall not apply to the importation, or to the transportation (exclusive of exportation) in interstate commerce of, prototypes or test quantities of lethal munitions for test or development purposes, and not for resale by bona fide manufacturers and research and development institutions under existing safety laws and regulations."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Lethal Munitions Act."

SEC. 2. As used in this act, "lethal munitions" means all projectiles and propelling charges therefor or a caliber of at least 20 millimeters, land and naval mines, aircraft bombs, naval torpedoes, military rockets (whether free or guided), atomic weapons, hand and rifle grenades, when containing explosive, combustible, or toxic substances, or when designed to contain such substances, and all other articles, implements, or devices which (1) consist of or contain explosive, combustible, or toxic substances, (2) are used in warfare or training therefor, and (3) are designed or adapted to cause destruction of personnel, equipment, or facilities; except small arms ammunition not in excess of caliber .50, shotgun ammunition, and small arms ammunition less than 20 millimeters of types normally used for hunting or sporting purposes, ammunition of any type for the use of State or municipal police forces, pyrotechnic devices for signaling, display, or illumination, and explosive materials, or combustible or toxic substances, or devices containing such materials or sub-

stances, designed and intended for commercial use in agriculture, mining, or industry generally.

SEC. 3. The transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions is prohibited except when the transportation is of lethal munitions procured (from private or governmental sources) by, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof or when procured by the Department of Army, Navy, or Air Force for transfer on a grant or reimbursable basis pursuant to any foreign assistance program authorized by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That this act shall not apply to the importation, or to the transportation (exclusive of exportation) in interstate commerce of, prototypes or test quantities of lethal munitions for test or development purposes, and not for resale by bona fide manufacturers and research and development institutions under existing safety laws and regulations.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall in no way affect other requirements of Federal or State law or regulations issued pursuant thereto.

SEC. 5. Whoever violates, or causes to be violated, the prohibition of section 3 hereof shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I shall certainly not object to this bill, because it is a very worthwhile and fine piece of legislation. I would remind the Senate that in May 1950, as I recall the date, there was a terrible explosion at Perth Amboy, N. J., which took a number of lives and ruined property worth millions of dollars. Had this proposed legislation been on the statute books prior to that explosion I am certain, as I have been assured by experts, that that horrible tragedy would have been avoided.

I remember that during the last session of Congress the distinguished Senator from Montana, Mr. Ecton, introduced a similar bill. I believe the pending bill, with minor changes, is the same bill which was introduced by the then Senator from Montana. At the time I paid tribute to the Senator from Montana for bringing the measure to the floor of the Senate.

Today I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for bringing the pending bill to the Senate. I also wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is the chairman of the committee which has given the problem so much study.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 903) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when procured by, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof for itself or pursuant to an authorized foreign assistance program."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement on Senate bill 903.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

The purpose of this bill is to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when the movement is procured by, or on behalf of, the United States or one of its agencies or instrumentalities. This bill is substantially the same as S. 1429 which passed the Senate unanimously and was reported favorably by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the 82d Congress. The committee knows of no objection to this bill, which has received the support of all the Government departments and agencies concerned, including the Departments of Defense, State, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The bill is intended to do two things, principally: First, to protect citizens against the physical hazards involved in the transportation of the most dangerous type of war munitions, which would be accomplished by requiring that all such articles be manufactured and shipped under service specifications as to quality, packaging, and movement.

Second, this legislation should effectively forestall the development in this country of an illicit munitions industry organized to sell munitions to foreign countries or to any foreign agency or faction that will buy them, because the bill provides that products of munitions companies, whether foreign or domestic, doing business in the United States will be available only to United States of America or any instrumentality thereof or when procured by the Departments of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, for transfer on a grant or reimbursable basis pursuant to any foreign-assistance program authorized by the Congress. (There is no question about the sordid history surrounding the sale of munitions to foreign countries and so-called revolutionaries in the past. Companies which have engaged in this practice have been sources of friction between us and friendly foreign countries; they have been an unmitigated nuisance to our own military agencies; and they have been of no help to the United States as producers of the munitions of war.)

Your committee has taken into consideration all possible objections to a bill of this kind, and has so amended it that no necessary or worthwhile use of munitions or explosives would be prohibited. Such uses, which are protected in this bill, include ammunition for police or hunters, explosives for commercial and mining purposes, and materials for seismographing and oil-exploration purposes; as well as prototype munitions for test and developmental purposes.

STEVE EMERY SOBANSKI

The bill (S. 613) for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am not objecting to the bill, but I wish to call attention to the fact that on March 23 the Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported Senate bill 613. The House of Representatives passed a similar bill, which is H. R. 1192, and it has been referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of House bill 1192, for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski, and that it be immediately considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah, that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 1192, for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the present consideration of H. R. 1192?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1192) for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 613 is indefinitely postponed.

HISIMI YOSHIDA

The bill (H. R. 759) for the relief of Hisimi Yoshida was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDITH MARIE PAULSEN

The bill (H. R. 861) for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARINELLA TALLETI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 556) for the relief of Marinella Talleti which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 5, after the name "Marinella," to strike out "Talleti" and insert "Taletti," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Marinella Taletti, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Thomas A. Douglas, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Marinella Taletti."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution go over. As soon as the call of the calendar has been completed, I shall move to make it the pending order of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will go over.

SCHEDULES OF ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAIL AND REPEAL OF OBSOLETE LAWS RELATING TO POSTAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 3062) to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain

obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished author of the bill care to explain the purpose of it?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend existing postal regulations. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives on March 2, 1953. It proposes to repeal certain postal laws which have become obsolete and to increase the efficiency of the Postal Service.

There are three sections in the bill.

Section 1 eliminates the present provision of law which requires postmasters to keep a detailed record of the arrivals and departures of star routes. It substitutes a provision under which the Postmaster General will require reports only when the arrivals or departures of star routes do not conform to schedules.

In connection with the first section, I may say that in every post office in the United States which has a star route the postmaster must make out a card showing the arrival and departure of the star route. Taken over the Nation, that represents a great number of cards which come rolling into the Post Office Department in Washington. The proposed legislation would not prevent any postmaster from reporting delays in arrivals or departures, or any negligence on the part of carriers.

I may say also that the bill was introduced at the request of the Post Office Department.

Section 2 of the bill eliminates an outdated definition of "clerk in charge." A bill which was enacted a year ago made some changes in legislation affecting postmasters. Therefore, the definition should be eliminated.

Section 3 of the bill repeals unnecessary language in the present law requiring the Postmaster General to make a report to Congress when such report is rendered unnecessary by the specific terms of later statutes.

Mr. GORE. Does the bill purport to take away any civil service rights from any postmasters who have been duly appointed according to law?

Mr. CARLSON. It does not affect the present status of postmasters under the civil service law.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3062) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS GRANTED TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The bill (H. R. 3073) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An explanation is requested.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to repeal a proviso in the Civil Service Retirement Act which prevents persons receiving survivorship benefits from Members of Congress unless such Members live 30 days beyond the effective date of their retirement.

This bill was introduced in the House of Representatives because of the recent death of a former Member of the House who, upon his retirement, had made an election to provide a survivorship annuity for his widow after his death. However, this Member of Congress died within 30 days after the effective date of his retirement; and, consequently, his widow is not entitled to an annuity.

The bill, which was passed by the House of Representatives on February 19, following unanimous approval by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, eliminates the restrictive provision outlined above; and under section 2 of the bill the amendment to the Retirement Act is made effective January 1, 1953.

We had an extensive hearing on the bill, and it was generally agreed that the situation referred to was an oversight when the original measure was passed.

As the provision does not affect civil-service employees, I do not subscribe to it as affecting Members of Congress. Certainly it will be unfortunate if it is not corrected at this time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Under the old law is it not true that the wife would have been entitled to the benefits referred to if her husband had lived for 31 days after retirement?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. But if the husband died on the 29th day or the 30th day after retirement, the wife would be precluded from receiving those benefits; is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Then, Mr. President, it seems to me the law should be corrected.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, and that is our attempt.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3073) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF RUBBER ACT OF 1948

The bill (S. 1410) to amend section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948 was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An explanation is requested.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee is not on the floor at this time, I believe.

Let me say that the bill will extend for only 30 days the time in which the President may make to the Congress a report on a program for the disposal of the rubber plants which now are held by the RFC.

I do not know the exact number of those plants, but there are approximately 20 or 25 of them which still are held by the RFC.

The Chairman of the RFC reported to the President about a month ago, under a bill which was enacted at the last session of Congress, as to a program of disposal. The President's report was to have been made to the Congress on May 15. It was felt that it was impossible to obtain a report by that time, because of the new personnel and because of the problems involved in the matter. Therefore, an extension was requested.

This measure provides for an extension of only 30 days, within which time the President of the United States can report to the Congress his recommendations on the report of the RFC.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Ohio stated that under present laws the President must report by May 15. I believe the Senator will find the requirement to be April 15.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Tennessee is correct; the correct date is April 15. I was speaking only from recollection.

This measure will extend that date for 30 days, to May 15.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield further.

Mr. GORE. It is my understanding that the President requested that he have until July 15 in which to make the report.

As a Member of the House, I had some connection with legislation relating to this rubber program. From that experience I know the matter is very a complicated one. and a very valuable one.

According to the statement the Senator from Ohio has made, several plants are involved.

Why not give the President until July 15, the date of the administration request, rather than require him to submit the report by May 15?

Mr. BRICKER. For the simple reason that this proposed legislation has been before the Congress for the past 5 or 6 years. Ever since the end of the war an attempt has been made on the part of Congress to obtain a report on a proper procedure for the sale of these plants to private industry. I believe everyone desires that they be placed in the hands of private industry as soon as possible.

We finally got rid of the program providing for the pooling of patents; but now there is reluctance to proceed with the research programs in the case of individual companies, because they do not now receive the benefits which come from such research.

Several problems have to be solved. One of them relates to the heating of heavy-duty tires; another relates to the development of the cold-rubber process; and there are many other problems

about which the companies would be willing to do more if they had the benefit of the synthetic rubber plants.

The President did request a continuance; but I think that was done without knowledge of the past history and without appreciation of the fact that if the period in which the report is extended until July 15, another year will pass before Congress could possibly act on this matter, because during the last month of this session there will not be time for proposed legislation to be introduced, hearings to be held on it, reports to be made on it, and then for the bill to be passed by both Houses of Congress.

Being desirous of having the report made as soon as possible and of having proposed legislation introduced, the committee felt, as does the Senator from Ohio, that the provision of this bill should call for only a 30-day extension.

I have talked about the matter to the Secretary of the Treasury; and he says he is confident that every effort will be made to make the report within that time, and that a request for a 30-day extension should be sufficient. If not, a further request will be made of Congress, of course.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It seems to me that much of the statement the Senator from Ohio has made would strongly support the President's request for additional time in which to make a thorough report. It must be borne in mind that the administration is new in power.

If the bill is considered today, it will be my purpose to oppose the committee amendment and place the date at July 15, instead of May 15. I say that in order that the Senator from Ohio may be on notice, in the event he wishes to object to consideration of the bill at this time. Of course, he has a right to do so. But if the bill is considered, I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I shall object to such an amendment to the bill, if it is offered, for the simple reason that such an amendment would prevent the enactment this year of a law providing any satisfactory program for the disposal of the synthetic rubber plants to private industry.

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

Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 1410?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, let me say that I have no objection to the bill in its present form. Let the President submit to Congress his plan for the disposal of these plants, if he has such a plan.

However, I wish the RECORD to show that I believe there are some—and I think the number is large—who question the desirability of disposing of these wartime plants to private industry on the basis of any proposal that any of us has heard to date.

I would have no objection to having the plants go to private industry with adequate safeguards attached to the transfer. But as a former member of the Johnson subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which went into the synthetic-rubber-plant problem and issued a unanimous report concerning it, I simply wish to raise today a signal of warning that we had better be on guard regarding the disposal of these plants to private industry, so as to see to it that when the plan comes before us, the public interest will be protected, and so that the plan finally enacted will not turn out to be another one of the handouts to private industries which seek to obtain, for little or nothing, valuable property belonging to all the people of the Nation.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to give assurance that there is no chance that anything of that sort will happen. Adequate safeguards have been placed around the report of the RFC, and no doubt will be contained in the report of the President; and, in any event, Congress has the last say on the matter.

The purpose is only to get this matter before Congress, so that if the proper safeguards are provided, Congress can provide for their inclusion in the public law which ultimately will be enacted.

This measure provides only as to the date when the report will be made to Congress; and thereafter, legislation will have to be enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the last part of my friend's statement, I am in complete agreement. This measure goes only to the making of the report to Congress, so that the report will be before Congress.

I simply say that Congress should keep its eyes open when the report is before us, for if the plan to be submitted bears any resemblance at all to the kind of plan we encountered before the Johnson subcommittee, let me say that then it will be found that the rubber companies will be seeking just as much as they can possibly get for nothing.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment in line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "July 15, 1953" and insert "May 15, 1953", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C. Appendix, sec. 1928), is amended by striking out "April 15, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 15, 1953."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I object to the amendment. From all the discussion which has occurred on the floor and from what knowledge I have of the subject, I feel strongly that in a field so complicated, in a field in which the public interest is so vitally concerned, if the President of the United States requests a reasonable extension of time in which to make to the Congress a report on which Congress can act, I believe we should grant such a reasonable extension.

An additional 30 days may not be sufficient. Undoubtedly the operations of these plants are vital. Undoubtedly many of the large rubber concerns of the country would like to hurry the enactment of legislation on this subject. I want to be sure that the President of the United States has sufficient time to enable him to protect the public interest. I want to be sure that, before the Congress acts, it shall have an ample, thorough report from the executive branch. Therefore, it would appear that the amendment of the committee is unwise, and I ask the Senate to vote down the amendment. We would then have an extension to July 15, which is the request of the administration that must make the report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this particular amendment has met with the approval of the administration. The report has been in preparation for a long time, and I think 30 days more will afford sufficient time within which to finish it. Certainly, as my colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio, has said, unless we get it by May 15, nothing can be concluded this year. As I understand, the 30 days is sufficient for the administration, though 90 days was originally requested. Under the circumstances, I see no reason why the amendment of the committee should not be agreed to, in order that the consideration of this matter may be expedited.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I have been so advised by the Department, namely, that within 30 days they can complete their report.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there is nothing in the report of the committee and nothing in the record that I can find to indicate that the President has modified his request. True, the junior Senator from Ohio has said he has talked with some official in the RFC, who agrees; but the RFC has not transmitted this request, as I understand.

Mr. BRICKER. I said I talked to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. GORE. Just what did the Secretary of the Treasury say?

Mr. BRICKER. The Secretary of the Treasury advised that they would be able to submit the report within 30 days, with the 30-day extension. That is exactly what I said a while ago.

Mr. GORE. When the Senator was speaking earlier, I understood him to say that the Secretary of the Treasury said they would do the best they could to submit the report by that time. Did the Senator say that?

Mr. BRICKER. They will have it within the 30 days, I was assured. I further said that, if they did not have it ready within the 30 days, another 30-day extension could be obtained, but I do not believe that will be necessary.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator

who is in a position to do so answer the question I am about to ask. Assuming this bill is passed, providing for an extension to July 15, 1953, is there any reason why the President cannot, if he wishes, submit a report on the situation by May 15? Is it the purpose of this bill to require him to report by May 15?

Mr. BRICKER. The purpose of the amendment is to require a report by the 15th of May. It proposes a 30-day extension from April 15.

Mr. AIKEN. If the President were given an extension to July 15, there would be nothing to prevent his making the report by the 15th of May, would there?

Mr. BRICKER. Except that it might not be done.

Mr. AIKEN. The purpose of the bill, then, is to require the President to make a report by May 15. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. AIKEN. Is the President to be required to report by a day certain?

Mr. BRICKER. That is a responsibility of the Congress, I understand.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely asked the question.

Mr. GORE. Under the law, the President is required to report by April 15. He requested an extension of 90 days. The committee has said, "No; we are going to give you 30 days. You must report by May 15."

Mr. AIKEN. I was merely wondering whether the President favored amending the bill to require him to do something 2 months earlier than he would otherwise be required to do it.

Mr. GORE. I believe I have an ally on the subject.

Mr. AIKEN. I am merely seeking information.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, the fact is that if the date is fixed at July 15, the report will be made on July 15; it will not be here any sooner. That is the way the executive department is operating today. It has plenty of things to do. If we ask them to do this by July 15, presumably that will be the reporting date. And I see no reason why it should not be done sooner. In fact, if we have to extend it beyond this session, I would be in favor of not extending it at all. Instead, let us get the report on April 15, which is the present date.

Mr. AIKEN. I should think the attitude of the new administration would be different in that respect.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I seem to have acquired the floor in some way. If I have the floor, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. As a matter of fact, the President is not going to be required to make the report. The Senator has a copy of the report on the bill in his hand. It is a department or agency which makes the report to the President and to the Congress. So the President would also be interested in having the report, I should think, at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, the law, as enacted last year, requires that the agency make a report to the Congress, and then the President is required to make a report to the Congress by the 15th day of April. By the amendment we would extend the time 30 days, until May 15.

This matter, which has been before the Congress for the past 6 years, was formerly in charge of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and then, 4 years ago, in some way it went to the Armed Services Committee. It is properly a matter for the Committee on Banking and Currency, because it deals with RFC and RFC property, and there are no longer any stockpiling requirements, so far as either synthetic or natural rubber is concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, if I may interrupt, the Senator from Ohio feels that making simply an extension of 30 days would be helpful to the President as well as to the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. There is no question but that it would be a help to the President. It would help him get the report before the Congress of the United States, and then the Congress could pass legislation which would be in the public interest.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. I thank all my colleagues who have contributed this information.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Griswold	McCarthy
Beall	Hayden	McClellan
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Humphrey	Payne
Carlson	Hunt	Potter
Case	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
Goldwater	Martin	Wiley
Gore	Maybank	Williams
Green	McCarran	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on line 6, to strike out "July 15, 1953", and insert "May 15, 1953."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1410) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C. Appendix, sec. 1928), is amended by striking out "April 15, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 15, 1953."

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS — JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is still considering the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that the next bill on the calendar be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A 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 VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GORE. Is Calendar No. 128, Senate Joint Resolution 13, now under consideration?

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

ELIZABETH A. REILLY

The resolution (S. Res. 94) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth A. Reilly was considered and agreed to, 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 Achitect 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

The resolution (S. Res. 95) to pay a gratuity to Walter Quarles was considered and agreed to, 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.

PROPOSED STUDY OF TRANSPORTATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) establishing a joint committee to make a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 22, after "January", to strike out "2" and insert "31"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "to", to strike out "January 3" and insert "February 1"; in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "40"; in line 14, after the word "em-

ploy", to strike out "and fix the compensation of", and in line 17, after the words "utilize the", to insert "reimbursable", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(b) A quorum of the joint committee shall consist of four members, except that the joint committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of public transportation serving the District of Columbia, including the fiscal, management, and operating policies of common carriers which transport passengers in the District of Columbia, the regulation of such carriers by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, and other matters related thereto.

(b) The joint committee shall, from time to time, report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report not later than January 31, 1954.

(c) The joint committee shall cease to exist, and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate, upon the submission of its final report.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 83d Congress (prior to February 1, 1954), to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. The joint committee shall have power to employ such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, is Calendar 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, now under discussion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. GORE. Calendar 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, was considered in connection with Calendar 114, Senate bill 922. At that time it was my understanding that we had agreed that Senate bill 922 would be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that Senate Concurrent Resolution 19 would be passed over. That is my understanding of the agreement which was reached.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from Tennessee is partly correct. There was some discussion along that line, but later I moved that Senate bill 922 be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, with instructions that the committee report back on a day certain. As I understand, that motion was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Then I was slightly in error in my understanding. But in keeping with what I understood to be an agreement with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], I ask that Senate Concurrent Resolution 19 go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] gave assurance that in dealing with the problem, the committee would keep in mind the difference between the intrastate and the interstate matters with which these measures deal. I was entirely satisfied with the Senator's assurance that the committee would keep those matters in mind in its consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator now satisfied that this concurrent resolution should be agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 123, House Joint Resolution 223.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

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.

ORDER FOR INCLUSION OF CERTAIN BILLS IN NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have the attention of the majority leader and also of the members of the committee in charge of calendar bills on this side of the aisle, with reference to Calendars Nos. 106, 107, 108, and 109, covering, respectively, Senate bill 18, Senate bill 30, Senate bill 39, and Senate bill 41. I think all of them went over today.

Mr. TAFT. Calendar No. 109, Senate bill 41, was passed; calenders Nos. 106, 107, and 108 went over.

Mr. McCARRAN. I respectfully request unanimous consent that they may be included in the next call of the calendar, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. TAFT. That is satisfactory.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

INDIAN CHILD WELFARE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, for many years, those who are familiar with the problems of the American Indians have been anxious to see the social, economic, and political barriers between them and the rest of the citizens of the United States broken down. The opportunity and encouragement should be given to the thousands of Indians on the reservations to play an active, productive role in the social, economic, and political affairs of the country.

Pursuant to the country's obligation to provide educational facilities to the Navaho Indians, the Bushnell hospital in Brigham City, Utah, was converted into the Intermountain Indian School. This move was considered advisable not only because of the lack of water and other resources necessary for the establishment of schools on the Navaho Reservation, but also because it gave added opportunity for allowing young Navahos to learn the customs and practices of our people in a setting free from reservation influences. Education of this sort seemed to be the best way to acquaint the Indians with the white man's way of life.

A unique plan has been developed by the Intermountain Indian School which I believe deserves wider attention. This plan is illustrated by an article in the Provo Daily Herald explaining an exchange plan in which 25 Navaho boys and girls from the Intermountain Indian School will be guests in the homes of high-school students of Provo, Utah. The Indian children are brought into the students' homes as house guests. They live with the family and become part of a typical American household while they tour the points of interest around Provo, Utah.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Provo Daily Herald of March 4, 1953, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TWENTY-FIVE NAVAHO STUDENTS BEGIN 3-DAY PROVO VISIT IN UNIQUE FELLOWSHIP EXCHANGE PLAN

Provo gave the city back to the Indians today, as 25 Navaho boys and girls, all high-school students from Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City, began a 3-day tour of points of interest. They will live as guests of Provo and BY High students in the latters' homes.

The visit will be returned next month, when Provo high-school boys and girls spend a few days as guests of the Indian school.

In addition to the keys of the city, the visiting Indians were each presented with a sponsor from Brigham Young High School and Provo High School.

Shortly after arrival Monday, the visiting Navahos were invited into the homes of their sponsors and spent the evening getting acquainted with Provo families.

This morning the Navaho boys and girls were scheduled to tour the city, including the Utah Valley Hospital, Provo Airport, the municipal power plant, residential areas, Utah State Hospital, and East Provo Stake House and they will be guests at the home of D. Spencer Grow, one of the members of the Provo Chamber of Commerce civic affairs committee.

INSPECT SHOPS, PLANT

This afternoon the Navaho braves were to inspect the Union Pacific railroad shops, and the Indian maidens, the Barbizon plant.

The youngsters will also visit banks, business firms and the fish hatchery. This evening, the Navahoes, still accompanied by their Provo student sponsors, will be guests of Mark Berkimer at the Academy Theatre.

Wednesday morning, the students from Brigham City will tour Brigham Young University, with Dr. Harold Glen Clark as their guide. After luncheon at the China City cafe, the visitors will be guests of L. F. Black, general superintendent, on a tour of Geneva Steel plant.

Thursday, they will return by bus to Brigham City.

The civic affairs committee of the Provo Chamber of Commerce, which has sponsored the exchange of students is headed by J. Wylie Sessions, chairman, and comprises Loyd Whitlock, Ed Shriver, Rowan Stutz, Howard Knight, Mark Berkhimer and Dr. Clark.

STUDENTS LISTED

The Navaho students include:

Ernest Manygoats, 17; Peter Fran Nex, 17; Herbert Paul Denny, 17; Clyde Brown, Jr., 17; Chee Smith, 18; Bennie Kascoli, 18; Jimmy Alexius, 18; Ben Y. Segay, 20; Junior Sandoval, 20; Tulley Gray, Louise Hubbard, 20; James G. Lee, 19; Leo Tainajinnie, 19; and Ben H. Yezzie, 20.

Clarence Hill, Intermountain Indian School teacher; Mrs. Tamsey Cleary, home economics teacher, and Duane LeBeque, vocation school teacher, accompanied the youngsters.

The visiting of towns, homes, and business firms by the Navaho students is designed to acquaint them with life outside the reservation.

Because of the crowding on the reservation, it is expected that many, if not most of the boys and girls, who complete their education in Brigham City, will make their homes outside the reservation.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly a few of the questions raised earlier this afternoon in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

In the discussion it was pointed out that this was perhaps the first subcommittee that had been appointed by the Senate Committee on Finance for investigation purposes, and probably that statement is correct. However, I wish to point out that it does not excuse the Committee on Finance from its responsibility to investigate the Treasury Department, and that it ought to keep an accurate check on what is going on in that Department, because, after all, that is the committee of the Senate which considers the nominations of most of the Government officials involved in the discussion.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be glad to yield.

As the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, there is no difference of opinion between us as to the powers which were extended to the subcommittee or the powers which the Committee on Finance offered to extend to the subcommittee. There was a difference of opinion—and I should like to refer to it as an honest difference of opinion—as to certain of the rules which were laid down, namely, the rule as to whether or not the Committee on Finance as a whole was to have veto power over the actions not only of members of the committee but also of members of the subcommittee itself.

Under the rules which were adopted by the Finance Committee, it would be theoretically possible for the subcommittee to go before the Finance Committee with a unanimous report involving what, perhaps, the subcommittee considered to be violations of law, such as acceptance of bribes or anything of that nature; and if the full committee in its wisdom decided that this information should not be disclosed, or if it decided that the subcommittee was in error, every member of the subcommittee would be automatically prevented from presenting a report to the United States Senate, and also, as was made very clear in the debate on this point, each member of the subcommittee and each member of the Finance Committee would be morally bound never to discuss the nature of the case, either on or off the floor of the United States Senate or before the American people.

It was for that reason that I objected. I did not question the good intentions of the present membership of the Finance Committee. However, I foresaw what might happen at some future time under such a precedent. It might be possible for the majority party in power to put a veto on the exposure of any corruption which might exist at some future time in the administration which happened to be in power. I think that would be a dangerous precedent to accept.

It was also pointed out that one reason for the rule was the nature of the information to which this particular committee would have access, namely, income-tax returns. I made it very clear, I think, in the Finance Committee, that I would not ask for authority to discuss income-tax returns. I was not asking for authority to come to the floor of the Senate and discuss the income-tax returns of any private citizen. I do not think I have ever violated that rule in the past, and I have no intention of doing so in the future.

I made it very clear that I was perfectly willing to respect the secrecy of the income-tax returns. I pointed out that the secrecy of income-tax returns is guaranteed to American citizens under section 55.

This afternoon and during recent weeks we have heard a great deal about preserving the sacredness of income-tax returns under section 55 of the Internal Revenue Code. Nevertheless, in the exposures during the past few months I have made disclosures where certain tax collectors were in conspiracy with insurance agents, furnishing information as to the private tax returns of troubled taxpayers, so that agents could sell them insurance, after which they split the commissions. I have yet to hear of the United States Department of Justice or the Treasury Department making any effort to invoke section 55 against those collectors or top officials of the Department. Yet you are trying to invoke the rule rather strongly with respect to a Member of the Senate, not only to restrict this type of disclosure but also extend it to protect them against disclosures of bribery or any other law violation.

I have discussed on the floor of the Senate information regarding compromise settlements with various taxpayers. However, I point out that any Member of the Senate, whether a member of the Finance Committee or not, or any member of the press, can go to the Treasury Department and ask for information as to how John Doe's tax was compromised, and that information is readily available under a ruling of the Treasury Department. It has been available for the past several months. It did not require a committee of the Congress to obtain the information which I discussed on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago, or that which I discussed in July or August, just before the adjournment of Congress last year. It could have been done by any Member of the Senate who was interested enough to find out how such cases had been settled.

I repeat that I have not revealed on the floor of the Senate a single case involving the tax returns of any individual. I will go further. I have not attempted to check the tax returns of any individuals. I did not come to the United States Senate to check the tax returns. I have checked and tried to follow through the manner in which they have been handled after they have been reported. At no point have I made an effort to check the accuracy of the reporting. In the first place, I am not qualified. I have to obtain the help of others to figure my own tax returns. I am not debating that point. However, I have followed through and checked to see if, at any point, there might be a conspiracy involving the manner in which certain taxpayers' cases were being handled. I believe that enough instances have been disclosed on the floor of the Senate and in the committees of the House to indicate to the American people that perhaps all was not quite as well in this particular department of the

Government as some of you have been led to think.

Another reason I do not think I could work on the committee under this rule is that it would lead us back to the debate as to whether the chicken or the egg came first. I say this with all due respect to those who feel that the rule should be invoked. I recognize that there are many arguments for it, even though I disagree with those who advocate it.

Would I be furnishing information to the subcommittee, or would the subcommittee be furnishing information to me? We would be in a perpetual debate in the future as to whether or not a Member had a right to reveal a certain subject. As an example, I call attention to one particular case which was discussed on the floor of the Senate last year. In connection with that case I was criticized privately by several members of the committee who felt that perhaps I was in error in bringing out the information on the floor of the Senate.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The Senator from Delaware, a man of widely acclaimed responsibility, is apparently being penalized for the acts of past, present, and future irresponsible Senators. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Delaware if this is not a rather ironic application of caution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Maine that I cannot understand the need for such an iron-clad rule, binding me and every other member of the committee in advance, while at the same time those who advocate the rule indicate that they think the situation was handled properly by our committee during the previous Congress.

Continuing, and pointing out a specific example of a possible difference of opinion which might develop, I call attention to one particular disclosure which I made last year, concerning conduct which was condemned throughout the country—I believe unanimously—by the American people.

Special rulings had been handed down allowing certain taxpayers who were large contributors to the Democratic Party to write off such contributions in their income-tax returns, under the guise of bad loans. I have in my hand—and I will show it to any Member of the Senate who wishes to look at it—one of the original rulings which was handed down. It is on Treasury Department stationery. I will not say where I obtained it, however. It was one of the rulings which established the fact that such rulings had been in existence.

With that knowledge as a background, I asked the Finance Committee to cooperate with me in obtaining copies of all such rulings and seeing how far the Treasury Department had gone in allowing the administration in power—or the administration out of power, for that matter—in financing their campaign indirectly out of the Federal Treasury. As a result, we found that there had been four such rulings in the history of the country. I released copies of all those.

To get back to the question which I propounded a few moments ago, did I give the information to the committee, or did the committee give it to me? There was some of both. I think the American people had a perfect right to know what was being done. I was not aware at the time of any objection on the part of the Finance Committee to the American people knowing what was going on. I do not think they will be found objecting today. Does the American people think that the Senate Finance Committee by a majority vote should have had the right to conceal this scandalous procedure?

Another example was a case involving certain tax settlements under section 102, relating to a tax settlement with Mr. Hannegan, former Democratic national chairman. On December 21, 1951, 6 months before the subject was called to the attention of the Senate, I directed a letter to John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and reported the case to him. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1951.

Mr. JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
United States Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DUNLAP: I have just received a report as follows:

"Just before he resigned, Mr. Hannegan got an option to buy the St. Louis Cardinals for $3 million. The Cardinals had $2 million in cash. This had been accumulated to build a stadium and since it was for that purpose, the accumulation was exempt from section 102—whereas had it been paid out it would have been a dividend and subject to the tax rates of the income of the individual receiving it.

"Mr. Hannegan went to one of the St. Louis banks and told them he was sure he could get the $2 million out without paying any tax. They agreed if he could do this to loan him $3 million to buy the Cardinals. He then went to the Treasury Department where he secured a 'close-out' order exempting the 'take-out' of the $2 million cash from tax. With this order he got the loan, bought the Cardinals, and paid off $2 million of the loan. In less than a year he sold the Cardinals for $2 million, paid off the bank, paid long-term capital gains tax of $250,000 and ended up with $750,000 clear and he had put up nothing except the 'close-out' order."

Will you please check the records and advise me whether or not this report is accurate; and if so, furnish me with a copy of each Treasury Department ruling along with the dates, and any other details pertaining thereto.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The letter clearly indicates that the matter was reported not only to the Finance Committee, but to the Treasury Department, months before it was discussed on the floor of the Senate. Only after confirmation by the Treasury Department was anything said about it on the floor of the Senate. Did I give this case to the committee or did the committee give it to me?

Mr. President, I should like to refer to another case. I wish to make it clear that we are not debating the right to discuss the individual tax returns of John Doe. I will rise on the floor of the Senate at any time to protect the secrecy of the tax return of the individual citizen. I believe we must be very careful about that. However, here is a case which I believe should be further explored by Congress. The letter was dated March 11, 1952, and it was directed to Mr. Dunlap. It reads: "Dear Mr. Dunlap—"

I will delete the names in this particular case because the case has not been fully concluded, and I think it would be unfair to put the names in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator used a name. What was the name he used?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not use any name.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Who was the taxpayer to whom the Senator from Delaware referred?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not use the name of any taxpayer. I said the letter was addressed to Mr. Dunlap.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understood the Senator from Delaware to refer to the name of Steve Hannegan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I have incorporated in the RECORD a statement regarding a certain tax settlement by the Treasury of the United States in relation to a deal which had been made with Mr. Hannegan and another individual in St. Louis.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The letter to which the Senator refers was received by the Senator after the death of Mr. Hannegan; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; that is correct. However I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that the surviving member was subsequently indicted and convicted, and that he is now serving his sentence. Therefore I do not think we are prejudicing any case when we put it in the RECORD under those circumstances. Otherwise the information would have been withheld.

I will say further that the man had not been indicted at the time the disclosure was made. It was not made at a time when it would prejudice the case.

The letter reads:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1952.

Mr. JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DUNLAP: I have received a report that ——, a former employee of the Treasury Department in the Technical Service who resigned on June 30, 1948, was the recipient of an Oldsmobile club sedan from an attorney in ——.

According to my information, this car, engine No. ——, body No. ——, was purchased in —— on January 29, 1948, and transferred to Mr. ——; however, the transfer of the title was withheld until July 11, 1948—7 days after Mr. ——'s retirement.

Will you please check the accuracy of this information, and if correct, I would like to have a list of each tax case in the —— area upon which Mr. —— was in any way contacted, along with a list of each tax case which was handled by the lawyer in question.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. President, I should say that Commissioner Dunlap had made an agreement that he would check these cases and report them to the Committee on Finance upon its request. I have Mr. Dunlap's reply, which is dated March 24, 1952. I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. In this letter, too, the names are deleted.

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

UNITED STATES
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER
OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, March 24, 1952.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter dated March 11, 1952, concerning ——, a former employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, who you state was the recipient of an Oldsmobile club sedan from an attorney in ——. You request that a check be made of the accuracy of information concerning the transfer of the automobile in question, and if correct, that you be furnished a list of each tax case in the —— area upon which Mr. —— was in any way contacted, along with a list of each tax case which was handled by the lawyer in question (who is not named).

You are advised that the matters to which you refer will receive appropriate attention, but the investigative data requested by you will be furnished only to an authorized congressional committee upon its request.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. DUNLAP, *Commissioner.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in this letter Mr. Dunlap agreed that he would assemble the information and have it available to the Committee on Finance.

On April 1, 1952, I directed a letter to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Committee on Finance, which I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1952.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I am enclosing a copy of a letter dated March 11, 1952, addressed to Mr. John B. Dunlap, requesting certain information regarding alleged charge against Mr. ——, a former employee of the Treasury Department.

I have been advised by the Commissioner that a reply can only be obtained with your consent, and I would appreciate your communicating with Mr. Dunlap requesting the information.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] if he would request from Mr. Dunlap an answer on this case. I ask what has section 55 which protects the secrecy of tax returns got to do with this type of a case? However, up to now that is the last I have heard of it, and it will be a year tomorrow. I hope the new committee being appointed will get these answers and then tell the American people.

Mr. President, there are other instances and cases which should be followed through.

I have one more case with which the Senator from Colorado is familiar, and he backed me on it when I went before the Committee on Finance. It was with reference to the possession by a certain collector of internal revenue of approximately $40,000 in currency: According to our information this currency was converted a few days before the deadline for the filing of the net-worth financial statements under the Reorganization Act.

I directed a letter to the collector and said that, of course, there was no law on the statute books providing that he may not have such currency in his possession; however, I felt that by virtue of the office which he held he had a responsibility to tell at least to the committee what the situation was, and to convince the members of the committee that he had accumulated the money in a legal manner.

I was unable to get any reply from him. Neither could I get any information so far as the Treasury Department was concerned. I directed a letter not only to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, but also called the case to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury. I felt the Secretary had a responsibility to check the case.

I also asked the Committee on Finance to call the individual involved before the committee. That was done. I think I am correct in saying that the committee was unanimous in rejecting what we considered an inadequate explanation on the part of the individual involved. However, we did ask him to assemble his records, which he said he could do, and that by so doing could convince us that he had a bona fide excuse.

As I say, he promised to report further. Again we have been waiting over a year without hearing any more about it. I think the case should be followed through and I have been trying to get the answer. Of course, the Committee on Finance was busy with writing tax legislation. On the other hand, I think it was just as important to get that information as it was to write a bill to increase the taxes. If the average taxpayer was caught with $40,000 in his lockbox he would explain very quickly or else.

I tried to make it clear last Friday that there were two sides to this question. I recognize the fact that it is possible for a congressional committee to go too far afield and to usurp the rights of American citizens. I believe that has been done. I would be the first to join the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator in restricting, if necessary, the rights of congressional committees and to protect the rights of the American people. I think we must be careful to do it. However, Mr. President, let us stop beating about the bush, and let us get down to the point of exactly what we are criticizing. If we are criticizing the Senator from Delaware, let us by all means go ahead and veto the power. If we are not criticizing him, but if we are indirectly criticizing what has gone on in the past or what may happen in the future with respect to another committee, let us either restrict other committees or wait until we have had trouble with this committee and correct the problem when it arises.

I say again, with all due respect to the Senator from Colorado, and without questioning his sincerity or the sincerity of any other member of the committee, that I could not in justification to myself serve on any committee if I had to agree in advance that I would agree to withhold any report which I as an individual member of the committee considered a violation of the law. I do not think the American people would have confidence in any investigation conducted with that agreement made in advance.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator from Delaware has said, in effect, that because there might be some abuse of power elsewhere, the Senate Finance Committee should not abdicate its own authority. The Senator from Delaware is entirely correct. The Senate Committee on Finance has not abdicated its authority, and does not intend to do so. Because there have been irregularities and irresponsibilities and criminal conduct in matters affecting the revenues of the United States, the Senate Finance Committee set up the subcommittee on which the distinguished Senator from Delaware so ably served. We want him to lead the next one, and he was a very distinguished and efficient member of the last one.

I repeat that the distinguished Senator from Delaware never came before the committee and requested a power he did not receive. I repeat, if I may sound a personal note, that I believe I made the motion, every time, to give him the power he requested. I think it should be said, in justice to the Members on the other side of the aisle, that they voted unanimously with all the Republican members of the committee to give the Senator from Delaware that power.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Colorado will find that I have criticized the past operations of the committee. I was satisfied with the way it operated in the past.

However, I am wondering who is dissatisfied and is trying to lay down different rules for the future operation of the committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that, because he has been satisfied with the treatment he has received in the past, he should realize that the committee is now the same, with the exception of the new members, who also have indicated their approval of the objectives of the committee as it is now constituted. So I suggest that the Senator from Delaware has nothing to fear from the whole committee.

The Senator from Delaware has said he does not wish to look at tax returns. I do not cite the legal prohibition against publicizing tax returns as a prohibition against the Senator from Delaware. I cite the legal prohibition against the disclosure of tax returns in order to show

that when Congress has been considering the proper privacy of the citizen and how it should be protected, Congress has made it a law making it a criminal offense to disclose the contents of tax returns, except under very careful procedures which are spelled out in the law, and they do not coincide with the procedures the distinguished Senator from Delaware would have rule the operations of the Finance Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator from Colorado to infer that I have violated that law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, no, no, no. I was saying that the Senator from Delaware has said, "I want the power, under my own exclusive judgment, to reveal confidential matters when in my judgment I think a violation of law is involved."

In contradistinction to that, I am pointing out that when Congress was really paying attention to the rights of the citizen, Congress made it a criminal offense for employees and officers of the Government to disclose what is in a tax return—that is not making a criminal out of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], for I took pains to say that that provision does not apply to Members of Congress. I was citing it to show an example of Congressional solicitude for the right of privacy of a citizen.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, certainly there is no disagreement between the Senator from Colorado and myself, on preserving the secrecy of tax returns. Notwithstanding the fact that Members of Congress may, under the law, reveal on the floor of the House or the Senate John Doe's tax returns, nevertheless I made it very clear that even though we may have that right under the law, I believe we have a moral right not to violate the principle ourselves. Certainly I have tried not to disclose anything of a confidential nature in a citizen's tax returns.

I have said before the committee, in connection with this discussion, that I was not debating the question of that particular right.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that has nothing to do with the issue now before the Senate. I have cited an example, not of a Treasury rule, but of a congressional law in connection with which Congress showed solicitude for the right of privacy of the citizen. That was my sole point in citing it. The Senator from Delaware has admitted that the argument is valid, so far as it goes.

Then the Senator from Delaware tells us of his personal virtues, which I concede—in other words, that he himself never has revealed what is in an income-tax return, and that he never will. I am very glad to say that to be true, and I believe it will continue to be true. But it has nothing to do with the point now at issue.

The point now at issue is whether the Congress, when it acts to govern its own actions, should be solicitous in protecting the proper privacies of the citizen. I say Congress should, and I say the rule referred to by the Senator from Delaware is directly involved in that proposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there were other types of violations of law to which I had reference. For instance, there was a case where certain collectors of internal revenue were not paying any income taxes whatever. There have been cases in which bribes were accepted.

At this time I should like to read into the RECORD a statement of a former assistant United States attorney who testified before our committee as to conditions in a western Treasury office. I refer to the statement of Mr. Charles O'Gara. On August 31, 1951, he testified to the following:

I spent 5 years in the service. I finished law school in 1947 and took my present $4,800-a-year job as Assistant United States Attorney in 1949.

In my assignment with the United States attorney in San Francisco, I have done my utmost to fulfill my oath of office in upholding and enforcing all the laws of the United States.

In performing these duties I have seen the outlines of a shocking system of corruption in the handling of San Francisco internal revenues.

The magnitude and significance of this internal revenue corruption turns my stomach.

This corruption is far greater than you know. It is not the commonplace tax fix of the gangsters and the hoodlums. The appalling internal revenue corruption to which I refer apparently involves many persons occupying high places.

This corruption is so gigantic that in San Francisco in the space of a little more than 90 days it has resulted in (1) the firing of a newspaper reporter who attempted to expose this evil when Federal officials failed to act.

(2) It resulted in the extraordinary blocking of a Federal grand jury which initiated an investigation of the tax involvements of the metropolitan newspaper staff with the collector's office.

(3) The arbitrary firing of still another Federal grand jury who attempted to follow through a tax prosecution which has been deliberately sidetracked.

Because I could not stomach what had apparently been long existing, and I wanted a complete investigation, I was taken off the job I had commenced. The slightest efforts that I made to expose these evils have actually resulted in persistent pressure being brought to bear upon me.

Besides being prohibited from appearing officially before any grand jury, an extensive FBI investigation was commenced, not about my loyalty, but about my official conduct which ended with my complete clearance in a unanimous resolution of the grand jury, but not until after my superior had virtually proposed my indictment.

I am certain that a full FBI report on me may be obtained by you.

I have the official records, and those are subject to the approval of the Attorney General's office before they may be released. Those records contain a recital of the 15 instances of alleged corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Now, because the records have been turned over to the United States attorney's office in San Francisco, and because of the direction of the Attorney General, I do not feel free to reveal the contents of the 15 allegations set forth in the list.

That shocking indictment was made by an assistant United States attorney, Mr. Charles O'Gara, a Democrat.

Mr. President, I understand that 12 of the 15 proposed indictments, as recommended by that assistant United States attorney, and to which he referred, have subsequently been made by the grand jury in California.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield at this time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What has that to do with the issue now before us? The Senator has read a recital of certain evils; he has recited many evils. The subcommittee was set up to deal with them, and now it is proposed that the new subcommittee be set up to deal with them. That was the very purpose of the old subcommittee and is the very purpose of the proposed new subcommittee.

What does the Senator from Delaware propose to serve by reciting all these horror cases?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is this: In this situation, the assistant United States attorney was told that under the law he could not reveal the names of the persons involved in those cases; he had been stopped by his superiors and by the Office of the Attorney General, here in Washington.

He told our committee of those 15 cases, as nearly as he could do so. He said we could find out for ourselves about them.

Here we have a situation in which the political party in power could prevent a United States attorney from acting in those cases; but a Member of Congress could not be prevented from discussing them, once he found out about them. In the past, Members of Congress have not been prevented from doing so, and thus we have these indictments to show.

If we confer upon any congressional committee the power to do what the office of the Attorney General or the United States attorney in San Francisco has done, we shall have a very bad situation. Certainly a majority of the Finance Committee should not have had the power to join the Justice Department in covering up this case.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest that the kind of situation referred to by the Senator from Delaware could be a very bad one. But I suggest that the situation would be far worse if any Member of the Senate on his own judgment, on his own discretion, in carrying out his own will or view, as against the view of his own subcommittee and the view of the entire committee, could, as I have said, disclose confidential information, which in many instances the Senator from Delaware knows is just as confidential and as inherently private as a man's income-tax returns.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I agree. I have agreed many times with all the dangers which have been pointed out by the Senator from Colorado, even though we have disagreed about the ultimate rules of the committee.

However, each time he makes the argument, I cannot help but think how we have been operating. Three other Senate committees have been voted funds, and the Senator from Colorado voted for funds for each of them, even though those committees did not and do not operate under the rules the Senator from Colorado now proposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But when we set up a committee, we do not pass on its proposed rules in the future. The committee passes on its own rules; the Senate does not do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true; but the Senate passes on the question of whether a committee will be provided with funds with which to operate. In this instance, I was not even asking for an appropriation.

However, we have already authorized appropriations of funds for these other committees. I may be in error, but I believe those appropriations have been made almost unanimously. Therefore, having provided funds for the operations of the committees, we must approve of the rules under which the committees operate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that is a complete fallacy. The Appropriations Committee or the Committee on Rules and Administration comes here and asks us to appropriate a certain amount of money for a certain purpose. Whoever heard it suggested that either the Appropriations Committee or the Committee on Rules and Administration should sit down to study the rules under which every standing committee of the Senate operates? It never was suggested. It has occurred only to the agile, the very agile and intelligent brain of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To go back for one more specific example, to cite a case, where it was the United States Senate, and not any committee of the Senate, which set up the Kefauver crime committee, and I do not recall that we laid down any different rules for that committee. That action was taken by the United States Senate as a whole, and not by a committee; and the Finance Committee, as well as every other committee of the Senate, accepted responsibility in establishing the rules.

I point out to the Senator from Colorado again, I have great respect for his position, and I hope he respects mine. I am sorry that we differ. But again I see no need of continuing this debate indefinitely. I simply cannot see it the way he sees it, and, as I told him before, I cannot serve on any committee in which I am bound in advance, nor could I be a party to setting up a precedent under which it would be possible to bind in advance any member of the committee, or even the entire subcommittee itself, not to disclose every violation of the law which it discovers, and I say that, with all respect to the Senator from Colorado. I say that particularly in this instance, when it has never before been done by any committee.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I challenge the Senator to show one instance—one instance—where, under the rules of any committee of this Congress, one single man, on his own judgment, was authorized to disclose confidential information.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is not a question of authorizing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is the issue here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not a question of that sort. The Senator from Colorado knows as well as I do that the end result is that the Finance Committee rejected the standard rules of procedure for committees and for the first time placed a possible veto over any future disclosures. Personally, I would rather not know about a particular violation of law, if I were to be placed in an embarrassing position. It would be embarrassing to be sitting here in the United States Senate appropriating money to pay the salary of a Government official, perhaps, who we think was not fit, and be bound by any such rule as this, from disclosing what we considered to be the case against this individual.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In just a moment I will yield. I might say as I have said many times, I fully respect the responsibility of every member of the committee, and of every member of the subcommittee, to report first to the full committee. The full committee has a perfect right to differ, but if a member of that committee differs, and if he feels that Mr. X has violated the law and should be exposed, then the full committee at the same time could come on the floor of the Senate to say "we have reviewed the same evidence and we think he is wholly in error." The rights of all would be protected.

I do not question but that the Senator from Colorado is conscientiously trying to protect what he thinks is the authority of the committee. I respect that. At the same time, I hope he respects my position equally.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think I have paid as many compliments to the distinguished Senator today, and on other occasions, as my limited vocabulary will supply. I want to repeat, what the Senator is really proposing—perhaps the implications have not occurred to him—is a rule of man, rules accommodated to individuals rather than rules that govern all. I want to suggest to the Senator, not that he has anything in his mind or anything in his soul that goes to that implication, but this business of accommodating laws and accommodating rules and accommodating practices to an individual, an able and conscientious and patriotic Senator like the Senator from Delaware sets up a precedent which destroys later on. It is the key to a door that has opened every room for tyranny. And I repeat, this is not a rule for the Senator from Delaware, it is not a rule for any man. It is a sound rule which allows the judgment of a majority as to violation of law, to be taken, and, if necessary, to supersede the judgment of one person—first, the judgment of a subcommittee, next, the judgment of at least 5 out of 8 members of a working quorum of the whole committee, or a majority of the whole committee, if there are more than 8 members present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is the rule, and all the members of the subcommittee have the right to vote. The Senator from Delaware is unwilling to subordinate his judgment as to a violation of law, where confidential matters are involved, to any number of other individuals; and that has been demonstrated in this debate; and that, I respectfully suggest, is very, very wrong—not that the Senator intends to do a wrong thing. I, most respectfully, do not believe he has analyzed his implications correctly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Illinois in a moment. I want to make one point clear. When we speak of the confidential nature of the material, that which the committee describes as confidential, is any case, no matter what type it might be, which is eveloped before the subcommittee; I repeat while the Senator from Colorado has every right to be alarmed at how far afield this may go, nevertheless, to put it on the other side, we can not escape the fact that what they are doing is, laying down a rule whereby in the days to come the political party in power can restrict the exposure of any case that might be developed in a subcommittee.

I promised to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want the Senator to yield. I thought we might be able to take the reorganization plan.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me come to the conclusion of this. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What we are doing is to lay down a rule which in the future will restrain some future Member of the Senate, some irresponsible blabber mouth, some headline seeker, from going out to ruin the reputations of private citizens on what he says is his claim that a violation of law is involved. That is the issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am going to close with just this thought. Again, I want to pay my respects to the Senator from Colorado for his sincerity in this particular case. I am looking forward to the day when, not necessarily as chairman of the Finance Committee, but as chairman of the Republican Conference, he makes the same aggressive effort to lay dawn these same rules—for all the other committees of the United States Senate. Thus far that has not been done.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a letter addressed by me to the Chairman of the Committee on Finance outlining the scope of the investigation requested.

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

MARCH 18, 1953.

The Honorable EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: In accordance with your request I am outlining as nearly as possible the scope of the investigations which I think should be explored by a spe-

cial subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee.

In so doing I want it understood that I am not entering charges against any particular district office or individual in the Treasury Department; however, during the past few months certain allegations have been made which if correct should be exposed.

Among these allegations which should be further investigated are:

1. Bribes: Charges that certain employees (or recent employees) had accepted contributions or bribes from taxpayers whose cases they were handling.

2. Compromise settlements: Many instances have been discovered where compromise settlements have been made for small fractions on the basis of the inability of the taxpayer to pay. Such settlements have been made without obtaining from the taxpayer the required financial net-worth statement. Large racketeers are among those who have settled their tax obligations for small fractions without filing this net-worth statement.

3. Overassessments: Charges that certain Government agents have deliberately overstated the taxpayers' deficiencies solely for the purpose of using such overstated figures for bargaining in compromise settlements.

4. Influence: Charges that undue pressure has been exercised to influence decisions on certain tax cases.

5. Collectors: There is one case which has been reported to the full Finance Committee wherein a collector of internal revenue in one of the midwestern offices just a few days prior to the deadline for the filing of his financial statement under the new Reorganization Act converted approximately $40,000 of unexplained cash into Government bonds. While we fully recognized that there is no law against a man's having cash in his possession, nevertheless for a collector of internal revenue to show up with $40,000 of unexplained currency raises a question which should be explored further.

6. Abatements: The allegation has been made that in certain collectors' offices, particularly in the New York area, unusually large amounts of taxes have been abated during recent months without the proper effort being made toward collection. A sample check should be made of at least one area, and if the fears are justified the check should be continued until satisfaction can be established that such practices were not prevalent throughout the Department.

7. Racketeers: The Kefauver crime committee made the specific charge that prominent members of the underworld were being given preferential treatment by the Treasury Department. Last year in conjunction with Commissioner Dunlap a sample check was made of 10 of the Nation's top racketeers, and it was found that in 7 of the 10 cases proper attention had not been given toward auditing or collecting taxes from this group. As a result of that sample check a further study should be made to determine who was responsible for this undue leniency.

8. Improper relay: Allegations have been made that large tax cases have been pigeonholed until the statute of limitations for criminal prosecution has expired, while the civil case unduly delayed until collection possibilities negligible.

9. Audits: At irregular intervals the various district offices are audited by the Accounts and Collection Division (comparable to bank examiners); however, these reports are submitted to the Department here in Washington. In the past there have been many instances where damaging reports have been completely ignored. The subcommittee should request from the Department copies of these routine audit reports for those areas against which complaints are received, with particular attention being given to the Pennsylvania, California, and Illinois areas.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

AMERICAN PRUSSIANISM—STATEMENTS BY BRIG. GEN. ROBERT W. JOHNSON

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, Brig. Gen. Robert W. Johnson, Army of the United States, retired, former Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, and chairman of the board of Johnson & Johnson in my home State of New Jersey, can speak with telling authority on matters of military organization.

I hope the Senate and the people of the United States will listen when he unburdens important views, based upon rich experience.

I hold in my hand his introductory release, and a statement entitled "American Prussianism," which is an expression of concern over an only too real and living question which confronts all of us who are vitally concerned with the direction and attitudes of our Defense Establishment.

General Johnson's voice is one of several which have been raised on this theme in recent weeks. I commend it to the careful consideration of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, two statements by General Johnson, and a letter written by the general to Hon. Nelson Rockefeller, dated March 10, 1953. I hope, as I have indicated, that every Member of the Senate will study these documents carefully.

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

INTRODUCTORY RELEASE

During the past 25 years I have been intermittently but consistently associated with military matters. My contact with the Pentagon has convinced me that clear and unequivocal civilian domination of our Military Establishment is essential to the security of the United States.

A group of experienced officers who must remain anonymous have visited me in Florida. The long-distance telephone has been burning with calls from Reserve and Regular officer friends of long association in the various military services. It is with deep concern, therefore, I learn that a bold, deliberate, and well-planned movement is under way to expand and entrench the power of the military with attendant loss of civilian authority within our Government. This is a matter of gravest importance, for it involves the preservation of our way of life and our survival as a nation.

A committee has been appointed to submit a program within 60 days. While several members of this committee are my personal friends I doubt that it is properly constituted. The members of the committee are: Chairman, Nelson Rockefeller; Arthur S. Fleming; Milton Eisenhower; Robert Lovett (former Secretary of Defense); Dr. Vannevar Bush; Gen. Omar Bradley; David Sarnoff.

This committee is not broadly representative of the services involved and is patently overbalanced with members already committed to the single staff centralized military power. Such a concept loses its wars and is destructive to the foundations of our republic. It is, therefore, necessary for me as an independent free citizen to oppose my friends on this committee and the other members whom I hold in respect.

The combat front for freedom is both at home and overseas. At times the home front fight is more vital and more difficult to understand than the issues in the theater of war. Patriotism and devotion to liberty are ingredients that we citizens must constantly guard. We owe this not only to ourselves and to the traditions of our great country but especially to the men who are suffering the pain of combat.

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,
Brigadier General,
Army of the United States, Retired.

MARCH 23, 1953.

AMERICAN PRUSSIANISM

Competent civilian control of the Military Establishment is essential to the security of the United States. Accepting this as a tradition established by George Washington, and defended throughout our history, we are confronted with certain administrative and executive issues. This grave problem is amplified at the present time by the size and complexity of our military organization. The need for clear and unequivocal civilian domination of our Defense Department is further highlighted through the efforts of certain military groups driving to establish a single-command authority. This refers to the continuing effort of the Army General Staff to gain control of our military forces and all aspects of our national security. Having failed, heretofore, to achieve its goal through legislative action, the Army General Staff now plans to accomplish its end under the guise of a reorganization of the Department of Defense. It intends to use the Rockefeller committee as its principal tool in implementing such a reorganization.

This idea is not of recent origin. The stage has been carefully set for this latest move. Initially, the Army General Staff was established as a "planning" agency. Not content with this status, the Army General Staff progressively gained an ever-tightening grasp of authority by repeated reorganizations of the War Department (Department of the Army). Each change resulted in more and more centralized power until, at the outbreak of World War II, the General Staff had gained complete control over the Army. With that achieved, the Army General Staff began as early as 1943 to seek control of our entire national security.

Civilian secretaries pass in parade while high-ranking military officers serve for a professional lifetime. This fact, combined with a natural but unsound reluctance on the part of civilians to hold and express their convictions in military matters, tends to minimize the influence of civilian leadership.

Many, if not most, Secretaries soon become captives of the military command. To assure our freedom we must choose men of great competence and experience in management specifically charged by the President and the Congress to establish and maintain civilian control.

CENTRALIZATION VERSUS DECENTRALIZATION

When Congress refused to accept the overall high-commanded concept of the Collins plan in 1946, the General Staff ostensibly accepted the so-called unification bill as a compromise. Not for a single moment, however, has the Army General Staff relinquished its objective. By direct and indirect means it has pushed unification of the Armed Forces far beyond the constructive unification envisaged by Congress when it passed the National Security Act of 1947.

Resonable centralization of control is, in the military as in business, a necessary and useful organizational device. Carried to an extreme, centralization leads to wrong policy

decisions, bad management, and eventual failure. Intelligent decentralization, accompanied by firm fixing of responsibility, by an overall policy and direction of authority, is the formula for proper organization of any major industrial or military endeavor.

But such a system does not lend itself to General Staff control. Consequently, we now find the National Security Act, which embodied the concept of intelligent decentralization, condemned and ridiculed. Significantly, such criticism has invariably originated with the Army General Staff or its spokesmen. The reason for this is obvious. In writing that law Congress deliberately, and with great wisdom, enacted strong obstacles to the imposition of the alien and dangerous Prussian concepts. Changing the law through so-called reorganization is the means by which the General Staff intends to remove those barriers.

The unification law was sound when it was passed. It is sound today. The faulty defense organization and administrtive deficiencies in the Pentagon are not the fault of the law.

I am deeply concerned by present efforts to establish a Prussian-type high command. My apprehensions stem from the historical fact that a totalitarian military system leads to certain military defeat. It is not only dangerous militarily, but it would inevitably destroy our constitutional civilian authority.

As a businessman I resent the General Staff drive toward Prussianism because in the recent war the performance of the Army General Staff demonstrated a stubborn determination to extend General Staff control over both labor and industry. Nothing since World War II indicates that this group has renounced that objective. American industry and labor must not permit themselves to be led down the same primrose path over which German industry and labor followed the Supreme German General Staff.

The sinews of American industrial power can be shackled as effectively by Prussianism as by Marxism. The danger is real and expanding. As we devote an ever greater percentage of our resources to the military establishment, we constantly increase the risk of a military economy dominated by a single-staff control. This risk must be avoided at all costs.

BATTLE OF VIGILANCE

Extreme vigilance is necessary. The advocates of a Prussian supreme staff will never label it as such. It can take many forms such as:

(a) Giving a so-called chairman of the joint chiefs power to resolve issues on which the military chiefs do not hold a view. This actually would make the chairman a single chief of staff after the model of Von Moltke.

(b) Isolating civilian control by establishing a new planning or advisory group or council called super chiefs or some other deceptive name; or by giving the Secretary of Defense a military staff, which Congress deliberately prohibited in order to prevent a supreme staff from developing under unification.

(c) Separating the Joint Chiefs of Staff members from their role as chiefs of military services. This would separate authority from responsibility which is now so firmly fixed under the present system. Any businessman knows the danger of giving authority without responsibility. It is the road to failure.

The present Rockefeller Committee is no source of reassurance to those who oppose Prussian concepts. Three members of the committee—Dr. Vannevar Bush, former Secretary of Defense Robert Lovett, and General Omar Bradley—have publicly endorsed essential features of a supreme general staff. The haste with which the committee is proceeding indicates that the General Staff is playing its cards boldly for it considers the hearings but a formality; and a report based on the Bush-Lovett-Bradley views is a certainty.

The General Staff power play must not be successful. The common interests of industry and labor—even the survival of our Nation itself—demand the resolute rejection of totalitarian militarism in the United States.

The Congress, with its mountain of duties, has a great responsibility in this area. Only constant vigilance and continuous specialized attention will restrain our military leadership from the actual control of our economy and society.

The threat is real. The danger is great.

MARCH 23, 1953.

MARCH 10, 1953.

The Honorable NELSON ROCKEFELLER,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR NELSON: News reached me way down at Caneel Bay of your selection as chairman of the latest Pentagon commission.

As one who has worked intermittently with the military over the past 25 years, I would urge that the question of unification be carefully reviewed and considered. Those who have spent a lifetime in modern management accept the fact that there is merit in centralization and equal or perhaps greater merit in decentralization. There is no fixed, inflexible rule for this.

One of the great difficulties with our military is its rigidity which has grown up over the past 100 years. Between service regulations, which are in fact law to the services, and civil-service regulations, which are law to the Civil Service, we have lashed ourselves down to incompetence.

May I warn you and your Commission to work toward simplicity in structure, giving the utmost consideration to elasticity. By all means, avoid the Prussian concept. The record here is clear. Such centralized military management does well at the start but loses its wars.

Please be careful.

The Army General Staff has for years conducted a crusade for centralized power. On your Commission you have Mr. Lovett, General Bradley, and Dr. Bush. These men come to you committed to the German system which captured civilian authority, lost two wars and ruined Germany. There may be others on your Commission of the same persuasion.

Modern management has created our world leadership through the greatest possible decentralization. We must avoid at all cost the tragedy of a dominant military influence. During the last war, and since, I have had personal experience in and out of the Pentagon with this dangerous type of militarism.

Many Secretaries, otherwise able and sincere, have become captives of their military associates.

This letter is not confidential. You can do anything you wish with it as it represents my convictions.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. JOHNSON.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) providing the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the resolution before the Senate, House Joint Resolution 223, has for its purpose the approval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, and, in effect, waives the normal 60-day waiting period prescribed by the Reorganization Act of 1949 by having the plan become effective within 10 days after its approval by the President. The plan has already been before the Congress for 18 days, and, if approved by the President immediately after adoption, the 10 days which would be required to lapse before the plan could become effective would cut the normal 60-day period to approximately half of that time.

Adoption of the resolution would permit the plan to become effective early in April. Otherwise, presuming the House of Representatives takes its usual 10-day Easter recess, during which period time would not run, the plan would not become effective until May 22.

The basis for this proposal is the fact that there has been little or no evidence of opposition to the reorganization plan itself. The committee unanimously agreed with the President that it should greatly improve the administration and emphasize the importance of vital health, education, and social-security functions now being carried on in the Federal Security Agency by giving them departmental status. The majority of the committee voted in favor of the proposal to have the plan become effective without the 60-day waiting period, or as early as practicable, and recommends that the Senate adopt House Joint Resolution 223.

Joint hearings were held by the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations on March 16, at which time full information was furnished relative to the various features of the plan by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by the Federal Security Administrator. In addition, representatives of the American Medical Association and of the American Pharmaceutical Association appeared in support of the plan as submitted. The plan was also endorsed by former President Hoover, the American Public Welfare Association, the American Osteopathic Association, and the American Parents Committee.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations held further hearings on March 23, in order to permit those who had expressed opposition to the plan, or the proposed procedure for early implementation, an opportunity to present their views. Witnesses who appeared at the Senate hearings directed their testimony more at administrative policies of the Federal Security Agency which originated under the past two administrations, which the plan will help to correct, rather than in opposition to the reorganization plan. Most of those who testified agreed that these matters had no relation to the elevation of the Federal Security Agency to departmental status, although there was still some apprehension on the part of two or three witnesses who felt that this action might in some way tend to enhance programs which have heretofore failed to meet the approval of Congress, such as compulsory-health insurance and broader national welfare programs. It is the firm conviction of this committee that there are adequate safeguards in the plan to insure that the intent of the Congress, that medical and educational functions and those of the Children's Bureau and other programs will be carried on in line with legislative authorizations, and that statutes now governing the operations

of all components of the Federal Security Agency will be continued on the same basis under the new Department.

In considering reorganization plans or legislative proposals that have been submitted to the Congress in the past, proposing the elevation of the Federal Security Agency to departmental status, hearings developed considerable opposition, based on the premise that such action migh subjugate health and education functions under the administration of the larger social security or welfare functions of any new department. Plan No. 1 of 1953 insures that these functions will retain their present independence and that they will continue to be administered under existing statutory authority. The plan authorizes the Secretary to establish central administrative services, but also provides that no professional or substantive functions vested by law in any officer shall be removed from the jurisdiction of such officer.

To further emphasize this point, it might be well to quote direct from the section of the committee report which deals with the safeguarding provisions of the plan as applied to medical and educational functions, for the information of the Senate. I quote from page 11 of the report:

In order that proper emphasis might be placed on the importance of health functions to be administered by the new Secretary under the provisions of the plan, a section has been included to create a special assistant to the Secretary, to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience. The President, in his message, stated that the purpose of this section was to insure that emphasis will be placed on the development of health and medical programs of the Department, and to permit the Secretary to develop programs for submission to the Congress relative to necessary legislation designed to improve Federal activities in the health and medical fields. It is the understanding of the committee that this section is intended to provide for the appointment of a special assistant to the Secretary who is a doctor of medicine and who is thoroughly familiar with the problems of medical practitioners as a result of firsthand experience. The committee is of the view that the functions which the special assistant to the Secretary will perform are advisory, and in no event would be broader than functions of the Department and the Secretary; that the advice and assistance which the special assistant may furnish the Secretary will be limited to the scope of the functions vested in the Department; that authority is not provided for the undertaking of comprehensive studies of all aspects of medical care for the American people or to make recommendations to the Secretary accordingly; and that a comprehensive study of the subject of medical care would undoubtedly require further legislation in any event.

The plan would also continue the present position of Commissioner of Education, with direct access to the Secretary. The President, in his message to the Congress, further advocated that the Department should create an advisory committee on education, made up of persons chosen by the Secretary from outside the Federal Government, which would have the function of advising the Secretary with respect to educational programs of the Department; that the creation of such an advisory body to the Secretary would help to insure the maintenance of responsibility for the public educational system in State and local governments, while preserving the national interest in education through appropriate Federal action.

The plan, in brief, creates a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the head of such agency attaining the same rank as other department heads. It also creates an Under Secretary, two Assistant Secretaries, and an Assistant to the Secretary—with a rank of Assistant Secretary—in charge of health and medical affairs. It continues the Commissioner of Social Security, but removes him from civil-service status and makes the position subject to Presidential appointment. The plan retains the present functional status of the Commissioner of Education, the Surgeon General, the Children's Bureau, and other components of the Federal Security Agency. All functions of the Federal Security Administrator are transferred to the Secretary, and all agencies of the Federal Security Agency with their personnel, records, and appropriations are transferred to the new department.

The major feature of the plan is to improve the administrative and efficiency of Federal activities in the important fields of health, education, and social security by elevating the present Federal Security Agency to a departmental status, and by giving the Secretary added authority toward the establishment of central administrative services which are now duplicated in many respects by various agencies operating under the present structure of the FSA.

The plan creates only one new position—Special Assistant to the Secretary in charge of health activities. It changes the status of the Commissioner of Social Security from classified civil service to a Presidential appointment, and brings about increases in salaries of the Administrator, Assistant Administrator, and the present two assistant heads of the Federal Security Agency, who would be elevated to Assistant Secretaries. It retains the present salary status of the Commissioners of Education and Social Security and of the Surgeon General, as well as other officials such as the General Counsel, Chief of the Children's Bureau, and the Commissioner of Food and Drug Administration.

The President in his message to the Congress pointed out that he considered the functions in the field of health, education, and social security were of such vital importance that they should be properly recognized at a departmental level. After considering the plan and hearing witnesses who have testified regarding its provisions and import, I heartily recommend that the Congress permit the plan to become effective. Furthermore, since there seems to be general agreement that there is no serious opposition to the plan and that it will provide a means for better implementation of administrative policy, as evidenced by the fact that the Federal Security Administrator now attends Cabinet meetings of the President, the committee further recommends the adoption of House Joint Resolution 223 as an additional step toward expediting the recommendations of the President so that the program may be implemented at the earliest date possible.

Several Senators have asked questions regarding the status of the Children's Bureau in the proposed new department. Also, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and other Senators have made inquiries concerning the administrator's consultants on social security.

I have received from Mrs. Hobby, the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, through the clerk of the committee, a letter concerning these matters, together with a list of the present consultants on social security in the Federal Security Agency, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and list be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, March 24, 1953.

Mr. WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on Government Operations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: In response to your two oral requests of yesterday to Mr. Miles, I hope the following facts will provide the answers which you need:

1. In respect to the concern expressed by various persons and groups about the fact that the Children's Bureau was not mentioned in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, the reason is that none of the constituent agencies of the Federal Security Agency was specifically mentioned in the plan. Such other important agencies as the Public Health Service, Office of Education, Food and Drug Administration, and Office of Vocational Rehabilitation were not mentioned by name in the plan. All of the component parts of the Federal Security Agency, including the Children's Bureau, will be transferred to the new department under the terms of section 5 of the reorganization plan. Nothing in the plan would in any way alter the status of the Children's Bureau. The plan would not change the relationship of the Children's Bureau to the proposed new department as compared to its present relationship to the Federal Security Agency.

2. We have recently begun to consult informally with various persons familiar with the field of old-age and survivors insurance for the purpose of developing recommendations to the President in respect to the extension of old-age and survivors insurance system so as to include groups of persons not now covered by the system. Some preliminary discussions have been held with persons in the insurance field. We are now in the process of adding individuals from organized labor and agriculture as consultants on this matter.

If I can be of further help, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Administrator.

CONSULTANTS ON SOCIAL SECURITY, FSA

Allen D. Marshall, General Electric Corp.

Reinhard Hohaus, vice president, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

M. Albert Linton, Providence Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Leonard Calhoun, former social security assistant and General Counsel, FSA (staff of Ways and Means Committee).

Spencer Evalyn Burns, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University.

Robert T. Burrows, New Hampshire pension consultant.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, it is my intention to support Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953—not that I am in full accord with it but because, as the board

of trustees stated in their report to the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, it is a step in the right direction.

The house of delegates did reject a motion to give "unqualified support to the plan." Dr. Bauer, president of the American Medical Association, pointed out that the AMA's support of plan No. 1 is a calculated risk, but he said,

"Gentlemen, this is going to be adopted regardless of what we do."

Generally speaking, in my thinking on plan No. 1, I find myself in complete accord with the position of the AMA, namely, to accept the plan with my fingers crossed. I shall attempt to analyze what may ultimately be the end result of this directive from the President. Specifically, my vote will be cast in favor of this plan for the following reasons:

For more than 30 years various suggestions and recommendations have been made to the Congress by Presidents of both political parties urging the grouping or integration of major Federal activities which are designed to promote social and economic security, provide better health guidance and health facilities, and improve our school system and educational standards throughout the Nation. These recommendations, down through the years, since the time of President Harding, have varied greatly in detail, but by and large are designed to accomplish the same purposes.

Of all the suggestions to the Congress down through the years, including the Hoover Committee report, on which the Hoover Committee itself could not agree, as well as Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 and Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950, I find the plan now under consideration by this body, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, to my way of thinking, quite superior to all.

My second reason for supporting this plan is that the proposed department certainly should rank Cabinet status. There is no activity, no facet of our lives, individually or collectively, as important as the health of the Nation, the education of our people, and our security or welfare.

These most important aspects in the lives of every individual citizen of this country have long begged proper recognition by Government. I am pleased to see that their place of relative importance with other governmental functions and activities, some of which I deem not so important, is about to be achieved. The plan will improve the function and effectiveness of the organization and will, I believe, attract more highly qualified persons, with resultant better administration.

The plan should produce some economy in administration since it establishes central administrative services in the fields of procurement, budgeting, legal, library, personnel, accounting, and all functional activities in the Department. The plan provides for a new under secretary to assume this important responsibility. He should be, and I am sure will be, experienced and highly qualified to carry on these functions.

The facet of this plan which appeals most to me is the effort to bring the public-health services of our Nation into proper proportion, perspective, and relationship within the Department.

The physicians and dentists, as well as the educators, of this country have long resented the present plan, which places health and education in a secondary or subservient position to social security. The appointment of a Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health, including all aspects of medicine, dentistry, and hospitalization, meets a necessary requirement in connection with the proper evaluation and administration of the various health services. Likewise, the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Education will be helpful to the Department, and is a step in the right direction.

Giving to each division of the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare autonomy and freedom from overlapping of authority and direction as between departments will add immeasurably to the efficiency of the Department.

I especially invite the attention of Senators to section 5 of plan No. 1, which transfers intact the Public Health Service and the Office of Education into the new Department. For a great many years the health of the people of the Nation has steadily improved. When this Nation was founded our life expectancy was 35 years. Today it is practically double, or 70 years.

Never a year and hardly a month or a day goes by that there is not announced an advanced treatment of disease or a discovery in the field of medicine.

The Public Health Service, by virtue of organizing the States and the States' political subdivisions into agencies dedicated to the improvement of the health of the people, has been a tremendous factor in lowering the death rate, especially in the fields of communicable diseases, infant mortality, and sanitation.

Section 5, if I read it correctly, guarantees that there shall be no interference with this Department. There must be no injection of partisan politics in its selection of professional personnel.

Mr. President, I have very briefly enumerated the reasons why I favor the plan before us. There is one further aspect of this plan which I think will be helpful. At the present time, the problem of making adequate medical services available to all the American people is a serious one, and I am very hopeful that the Division of Health in this new Department will accept as one of its responsibilities a careful study of the recent report by the President's commission on the health needs of the Nation, and that they may bring strong influence to bear on those now in authority in our Government to take cognizance of the need for Federal aid to medical education.

At the present time it is most difficult to meet both the civilian and military requirements for medical personnel. Existing professional schools are filled to capacity, and in some cases are taking more students than they can adequately handle and properly educate, from the standpoint of teaching personnel and physical facilities. In recent years, as many as 20,000 young men desiring to study medicine and dentistry have been unable to do so because no school could admit them.

This is an area to which, to my way of thinking, the new member of the Cabinet and her Department created under this reorganization plan should give their first attention and intensive study. They should then constantly and consistently urge the interest and attention of the President and the Congress with respect to this problem.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. HUNT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to commend the Senator from Wyoming for a very enlightening and able speech.

The Senator will recall that about 2 weeks ago he and I met with the present Administrator, who we hope will be the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to discuss a problem in which the Senator and I are both interested. I know that the Senator's position has been the same as mine with respect to the field of education. I have always felt that we should have an independent commission on a Federal level. In other words, we should carry our school board system for education to the Federal level.

The proposed commission would not be a regulatory commission, but an advisory commission. It would carry up to the national level the principle, of which we as Americans have been proud, in the field of education on the local level.

In past sessions of Congress I have introduced bills which would have provided for an independent commission on education, a commission composed of 11 members, whose term of office would be spread over a period of 11 years. It would be nonpartisan, as I believe such an office should be.

I wish again to commend the Senator from Wyoming for his interest, particularly in this phase of the proposed legislation. I think that our visit with the President and the Secretary-to-be resulted in the formation of the Commission on Education enunciated by the President in his message to Congress.

I wish to recommend to the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that she use great care in selecting assistants to administer this program who will truly reflect our educational philosophy. Certainly this must be one area where the tinge of politics is excluded.

The National Council of School Administrators has been greatly concerned, and I believe that the members of the council are a litle fearful that by creating a Department there will be a tendency on the part of the Secretary to have the Federal Government further encroach upon the States and other local units of Government in the field of education.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would like to suggest to our new Secretary that she use careful judgment in selecting people for what I believe to be a very important committee. These people will advise her on educational problems, and will influence to a considerable degree the work of the new Department which she will head.

I am very pleased to say that I am looking forward with a great deal of confidence to the work of the new Secretary. I believe she is a very able and intelligent woman. I am sure she will perform the duties of her new position with credit to all the people of our country.

The Senator from Wyoming has been very kind to yield me the time in which to make my comments.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution, and I should like to say to him, with reference to giving the advisory board, or what one might call the Federal Board of Education, certain responsibility and authority, that it will go a very long way toward preventing Reorganization Plan No. 1 from setting up a bureaucracy of all bureaucracies.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me further?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. During his tenure in Government service the Senator from Wyoming has become acquainted with the fact that many advisory boards which have been created have never been used. I sincerely hope that this will be an advisory board which will be used to advise the Secretary on problems relating to educational subjects, and I am sure it will do a great deal to prevent what none of us wish to see happen, namely, an encroachment of the Federal Government upon the educational institutions of the States and local units of Government.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator from Michigan. In connection with this issue there is much to be said both pro and con.

In discussing the aspects of the legislation with which I am not in accord, let me say that I do not understand the great need for haste in pushing this plan through Congress. Neither, Mr. President, does this type or method of legislation appeal to me. In fact, it is not legislating in any sense of the word. It is simply giving our approval or denial to a Presidential directive.

The Reorganization Act of 1946, which we generously reenacted the other day by a voice vote, strips the Congress of its powers, rights, and prerogatives which the Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, thought rightfully belonged to Congress.

During the past few years we have heard much with reference to the Congress surrendering its prerogatives to the executive branch of Government. The acceptance by the Congress of the reorganization plan is the outstanding example of this surrender of power and authority on our part.

Such plans must be disapproved within 60 days or they automatically become the law of the land. No opportunity is given the Congress to amend a reorganization plan. It can only remain in the committee 10 days, which certainly is not ample time to study an exhaustive piece of legislation. Action by the Congress on this type of legislation is not subject to reconsideration.

To my way of thinking, in handling such important legislation in this manner, the Congress becomes merely a rubber stamp.

Mr. President, I opposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 in 1949. I opposed it strenuously for the reason that I thought, and apparently so did some 59 other Members of the Senate, that that plan was the first step toward socialized medicine.

The two succeeding plans, No. 27 in 1950 and this No. 1 in 1953, to my way of thinking, can have tremendous influence in bringing about socialized medicine in the United States, depending solely upon the type of administration and influence of the newly designated special assistant to the Secretary on health matters.

Under the administration of the lady designated to the Cabinet position, I have no fear of socialized medicine, but let me say to the Senate that Mrs. Hobby will not always be the Cabinet member serving as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Times and events quickly change the thinking and position of the people of this Nation. Should we again enter a period of intense depression, as in the early thirties, or perhaps even find ourselves involved in a third world war, in either event there might come such a strong demand on the part of the American people for socialized medicine that should the administration give in to the demands, and should there be in these positions in the new Department those looking for greater opportunity for influence, which socialized medicine would give them, this Nation might easily find its great health services socialized.

Basically I think this reorganization plan is extremely weak in not providing for Federal boards comparable to the efficient, effective local boards. I refer to State boards of health, State boards of education, and State boards of public welfare.

This new Department needs, and needs badly (such advisory boards, meeting on certain designated dates, advising the various branches of the Department and bringing to them the thinking of the people from the grassroots of all parts of the United States with reference to these most important functions that affect the very lives of every individual in our land.

A Federal board of health would be far more effective, far more helpful, less prejudiced, and be able to give to the Secretary the advice and counsel which she, or he, as the case may be, not being a medical professional person, will sorely need. Such a board would be far more effective and unbiased than could an individual appointee who may be designated because of political activities or political influence.

Mr. President, if there is any one place in the Government of the United States where politics should play absolutely no part, it is in the administration of national health, education, and security.

This plan does provide for a Federal Board of Education and there is no sound reason why it should not provide for a Federal Board of Health and a Federal Board of Public Welfare.

I cannot understand why such an important feature would be left out of this plan.

Advisory boards that have been practically 100 percent successful in, I think, 100 percent of the States of the Union would certainly add much to the proper functioning of the Federal agency.

Surely those who have advised the President in the preparation of this plan should have given consideration to the proposition of what is right, not who is right.

I have certain doubts and fears, Mr. President, that there will be an immediate clash, under this plan, between the Special Assistant Adviser to the President on medical matters, and the Surgeon General.

I made previous reference to the Office of the Surgeon General, but let me reiterate that the professions and the rank and file of our people have great confidence in the Surgeon General's Office, and they will look with apprehension upon any political appointee who may be placed in a superior position in this agency.

I am referring, not to the present Surgeon General, but to the Office of Surgeon General.

Knowing as I have for over 20 years the splendid advice and leadership given to the State departments of health by the Office of Surgeon General, I hope this plan will not disrupt the effective, efficient functioning of that agency.

So Mr. President, even though I have some worries and grave apprehension about the acceptance by the Congress of this reorganization plan, I do feel that this plan, under proper administration, affords an opportunity to improve the vital health, education, and welfare functions now being administered by the Federal Security Agency.

This giving of additional departmental rank, this focusing of the attention of the whole Nation on the fact that these functions now are represented in the Cabinet, will all be helpful; and therefore, I am supporting the plan.

Mr. President, for years—I know not how long—other nations have had ministers of health and ministers of education; and, to my way of thinking, agencies of that kind are far more important than some of the Government agencies which at this time are represented in the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and have been represented there for a long period of years.

I realize, Mr. President, that public health services, like all other health resources, reflect the changing character of health needs. New problems require new techniques and methods of organization. It is unrealistic to tackle today's health problems with the type of services that do not improve or do not keep step with our changing times. I think this plan is a forward step.

I am hopeful this reorganization plan will keep in the forefront the objectives of this most important new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. HUNT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was delighted to hear my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, state his views on the pending plan. Some of us will vote for reorganization plans because of the money which may be saved in the operation of the agencies under the plans.

Can the Senator from Wyoming tell us whether any money can be saved the

taxpayers of the United States in connection with the management of this agency under the plan we are now considering?

Mr. HUNT. I think I can correctly say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that on that question we should take the information given us by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Dodge. As I recall, he said that although there will be approximately $32,000 additional, he believes that by means of the appointment of the proposed Assistant Secretary or Under Secretary who will be in charge of the various functions having to do with administration, more money than the amounts of the additional salaries will be saved. His testimony was that the plan would not cost any more.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will money be saved under the plan?

Mr. HUNT. By more efficient administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Wyoming mean money will be saved by means of employing a smaller number of persons?

Mr. HUNT. No. I think money will be saved, let me say, by having a better general manager or a better office manager, if that term better expresses the point. That is the answer Mr. Dodge gave in the committee to the question the Senator from Louisiana has asked.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to call attention to the fact that under the plan now proposed, as I understand it—and let me say that I favor the plan, and I shall vote for it, just as I voted in favor of the plans submitted in 1949 and 1950—the Administrator under the present law, who now receives a salary of $17,500, will be given the title of Secretary, and will receive a salary of $22,500.

The Assistant Administrator under the present law receives a salary of $15,000. Under the pending plan that title will be changed to Under Secretary, and the salary will be increased from $15,000 to $17,500.

Under the present arrangement the Assistant Administrator for the Program receives a salary of $10,000. Under the plan now proposed, when it goes into effect, the title of that official will be changed to Assistant Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, and he will receive a salary of $15,000.

The position of Assistant Secretary for Defense Activities is now vacant, but carries a salary of $10,000. Under the plan now proposed, that position will be known as Assistant Secretary, and the salary will be $15,000.

The present position of Social Security Commissioner will be continued at a salary of $14,800.

Also, under the plan now before us, an additional job will be created, and will be known as Special Assistant Secretary for Medicine. The salary paid will be $15,000.

As the Senator from Wyoming has just pointed out, the additional cost to the taxpayers, as the result of the positions I have just mentioned, is shown by comparing the $67,300 now paid to the $99,800 which will be paid under the plan we are now considering, or an additional amount of $32,500, which will be paid in the way of salary increases to the job holders I have mentioned.

The Senator from Wyoming is familiar with that matter, is he not?

Mr. HUNT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me add that the plan now before us is identical to the plans submitted to Congress in 1949 and in 1950, except for the fact that the pending plan would result in the creation of a new job, to be designated "Special Assistant Secretary for Medicine." That is in line with the actions of the Republican leadership in creating more jobs, as I have pointed out on the floor of the Senate on several occasions in the past.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, when President Truman sent us two reorganization plans designed to increase the efficiency and elevate the status of the Federal Security Agency, I voted for those plans. I thought them well conceived, sound, and in the public interest. The Congress disagreed.

Now President Eisenhower has sent us a reorganization plan very similar to the Truman plans. I intend to vote in favor of President Eisenhower's Reorganization Plan No. 1. I believe it is our function to legislate in terms of principles and to realize that when we act on reorganization plans we are creating institutions that will endure for decades, perhaps for centuries. It should not matter at all to us what particular individuals may occupy the seats of power at a particular moment. It is of the principles, not the individuals involved, that we should be thinking. Because I once voted in favor of certain principles regarding the reorganization of this agency, today I shall vote again in favor of the same principles.

I must point out, however, that in one respect the new reorganization plan differs from those we considered in past years. That is with respect to its creation of a new position within the proposed Department, the occupant of which is to be called Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs). Although I cannot see that it is particularly necessary, nevertheless I have no objection to the creation of such a position if the President and Mrs. Hobby believe it desirable; and I certainly do not mean to object to it. However, a reading of the hearings held by the joint committee raised in my mind two questions in connection with that particular position, and I believe they should be clarified before we vote on this measure.

The first question I had in mind was whether it was the intent of the administration that the occupant of this position serve in a purely advisory capacity, and not have any administrative authority whatsoever over constituent units of the Department. Mrs. Hobby had made it quite clear that that was what she had in mind. Nonetheless, the language of section 6 of the proposed plan is such as perhaps to raise doubts in the future. Therefore, I addressed to Mrs. Hobby a letter raising this question, and she was kind enough to answer immediately. I find her answer to that question completely acceptable. I now ask that my letter to Mrs. Hobby and her reply be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at this time I should like to read, for the benefit of the Senate, and so that our legislative record on this measure will be completely clear, one paragraph of Mrs. Hobby's answer:

> In response to your first question, I think it should be made a clear matter of record that it is the intent of the reorganization plan and the Special Assistant to the Secretary, for Health and Medical Affairs, shall be an adviser to the Secretary and shall have no administrative functions. It is not the intent that section 6 of the plan shall be used to modify or supersede the clear purpose inherent in section 3 of the plan that the Special Assistant to the Secretary shall be an adviser and shall not have any administrative responsibilities.

In my letter to Mrs. Hobby, Mr. President, I also raised a second question which I thought had not been made clear in either the House or Senate reports on this plan. That second question has to do with the stipulated qualifications of the person who might be designated as Special Assistant. Section 3 of the reorganization plan says that the person appointed to this position shall be appointed "from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience." To me, that language seems to be perfectly clear. To me, it means that the President may, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint to this position a doctor of medicine who is a recognized leader in his field and who has wide nongovernmental experience. This, I believe, is made clear in both reports. However, I believe the language in section 3 also means that should the President so desire he could, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint to that position a layman, if the layman were a recognized leader in such fields as medical economics, hospital administration, medical administration, or similar fields. It seems to me that I perhaps did not ask my question with relation to this point clearly in my first letter to Mrs. Hobby, since her reply does not clearly indicate that she, too, understands the language of section 3 in the same sense as do I. Therefore, I have addressed another letter to Mrs. Hobby, and a similar letter to Mr. Dodge, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In both letters I have asked this very specific question:

> Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?

To me, it seemed as though the only answer to the question could be "Yes." I am happy to say that I have received an answer from Mr. Dodge, and that he agrees. Again, in order that the legislative history of this measure shall be absolutely clear, I shall now read Mr. Dodge's letter of March 30. It reads as follows:

> MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of March 27, in which you ask me to provide you, as soon as possible, an answer to the following question:
>
> "Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the

President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?"

It is my understanding that in submitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, and with particular reference to section 3 of that plan, the President anticipated that he would appoint a doctor of medicine to the post of Special Assistant to the Secretary.

Nevertheless, in my opinion, section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 is so worded that a President could appoint a person who is not a doctor of medicine to the post of Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs) although it is not the intention of this administration to do so.

Sincerely yours,

JOS. M. DODGE.

Mr. President, with these specific clarifications of the language of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 understood by the Senate as being a part of its meaning, I intend to vote for the plan and I hope it will promptly pass.

I have previously submitted for the RECORD the correspondence first referred to in my statement. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my subsequent correspondence on the same subject.

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

(See exhibit B.)

EXHIBIT A

MARCH 25, 1953.

The Honorable OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. HOBBY: Two questions have arisen in my mind in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 which I believe should be clarified before the Senate acts on that plan and which clarification should, I believe, be made part of the legislative record on this measure. Before posing those questions I should like to assure you that I am in favor of the proposed reorganization and intend to support its passage. I believe that you will share my interest in clarifying the two questions set forth below; both have to do with the proposed "Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs)."

My first question is in connection with section 6 of the reorganization plan, which states, "The Secretary may from time to time make such provisions as the Secretary deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of the functions of the Secretary by any other officer or by any agency or employee of the Department." (I understand from reading page 69 of the report on the joint hearings on the reorganization plan that you have stated that the Special Assistant to the Secretary would not have the authority of override the Surgeon General—that he would have "no line authority whatsoever.") In the light of your statement I believe that, despite the language of section 6, which I have quoted above, it should be understood that in approving Reorganization Plan No. 1 the Congress shall understand that under no circumstances will the Special Assistant to the Secretary exercise any of the administrative functions vested in the Secretary by law. In other words, despite the language of section 6, it shall be the understanding of the Congress that the Special Assistant to the Secretary is to serve solely in an advisory capacity to the Secretary or as the personal representative of the Secretary in connection with public appearances and similar matters.

In this same connection I am also concerned about some of the language which appears on the so-called job-description sheet found on pages 106 and 107 of the hearings and which I understand was circulated among members of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association prior to that association's formal approval of the reorganization plan. The language in question reads as follows:

"As directed by the Secretary the Special Assistant to the Secretary will see that related health and medical problems arising in any of the various constituents having health or medical-care programs are properly coordinated. * * * In short, the Special Assistant to the Secretary * * * will, as needed, coordinate related health and medical programs within the Department."

The phrase "will see that programs are properly coordinated" to me implies the exercise of administrative functions. If we are to clearly understand that the occupant of this position shall recommend to the Secretary whatever steps may, in his opinion, be needed to bring about proper coordination of the activities mentioned, I should certainly have no objections. If, however, we are to understand that this Special Assistant will be given the authority to direct the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the head of the Children's Bureau, or the Food and Drug Administration to take whatever actions he believes are desirable, even though the heads of those divisions may disagree, then I believe that this intention should be set forth to the Congress very clearly and that we should stop referring to the occupant of the proposed position as one who will serve merely in an advisory capacity.

My second question refers to the phrase in section 3 which says that the "special assistant shall be selected from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field." In this connection I have read with interest the statement made by Mr. Fischelis, testifying on behalf of the American Pharmaceutical Association, which appears on page 111 of the report on the joint hearings. Mr. Fischelis stated, "We presume that the qualifications demanded of this special assistant will be such as to require him to be a doctor of medicine or an administrator in the field of health and medical affairs who has had very close contact with and experience in health and medical programs."

Mr. Fischelis' interpretation of the qualifications coincides with my own. I assume it is also yours, but I believe, particularly in view of the fact that the House report refers to the occupant of this position as a "physician" that this matter, too, should be clarified by you for the record. I would assume, of course, that the President in recommending a candidate for this position should be free to name a physician if he and/or the Secretary of the Department feels that a particular physician would be the best qualified adviser to meet the Secretary's need at any particular time. It is conceivable, however, that actual experience with the problems confronting the Department at certain times would indicate that the Secretary could be better served by a man trained and experienced in problems of medical administration or medical economics. Should this prove true at any time in the future—and, of course, we assume that this is permanent legislation we are discussing—we most certainly would not want to preclude the President's naming such a lay adviser by leaving in the legislative history in connection with the passage of this reorganization plan the intimation that the special assistant must be a physician.

Inasmuch as the Senate may be asked to act upon this reorganization plan at any moment, I would appreciate your comments on these questions just as soon as possible. I am sure that you have, of course, given the substance of my questions serious consideration before the plan was sent up.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

THE FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1953.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your letter of March 25, raising two questions concerning the reorganization plan, has just reached me.

In response to your first question, I think it should be made a clear matter of record that it is the intent of the reorganization plan that the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs shall be an adviser to the Secretary and shall have no administrative functions. It is not the intent that section 6 of the plan shall be used to modify or supersede the clear purpose inherent in section 3 of the plan that the Special Assistant to the Secretary shall be an adviser and shall not have any administrative responsibilities.

The word "coordinate" which is used in the job-description sheet found on pages 106 and 107 of the hearings was not intended to mean that the Special Assistant to the Secretary would have any administrative authority. It is intended to mean that the Special Assistant to the Secretary will discuss health and medical programs with the various constituent agencies of the Department in order to assist them and the Secretary in making sure that there is no unnecessary overlapping or duplication between the health and medical programs of the constituent agencies and bureaus. If disagreement should arise between the Special Assistant to the Secretary and the head of any one of the constituent agencies or bureaus of the Department, the Special Assistant to the Secretary would have no authority to direct the constituent to take specific action. He would have authority only to recommend action to the Secretary.

In respect to the second question, although the plan does not specifically and explicitly say that the Special Assistant to the Secretary shall be a doctor of medicine, it has been my presumption and intention that a doctor of medicine shall be appointed to this position. I would like to call to your attention the discussion on page 59 of the joint hearings on the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, which, I believe, will clarify the administration's position on this matter. When Congressman JUDD asked Budget Director Dodge, "Do you think under that language anybody could ever be appointed to this special assistant position who is not a physician?" Mr. Dodge replied: "It might not be a practicing physician, but he might have had wide medical experience."

If I can provide you with any further information, I shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY.

EXHIBIT B

MARCH 27, 1953.

Hon. OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Administrator,
Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. HOBBY: May I express my appreciation of the promptness with which you replied to my questions in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. I find your answer to my first question quite clear, and I am sure the Senate will be very happy to have so explicit a statement set forth as part of the legislative history of the plan. It has certainly clarified the question in my mind and in a most acceptable manner.

Will you forgive me, however, if I attempt to restate my second question more clearly. I quite understand that it is your intention that a doctor of medicine shall be appointed as Special Assistant to the Secretary if the plan is adopted. I have no quarrel whatsoever with that, and as I read the plan, it unquestionably would authorize the President

to appoint a physician to the position. The question I raise, and the answer to which I believe should be a part of the legislative history of this Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, is simply this:

Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?

As I read the plan, my answer to the question would be "Yes." I should like to know whether your answer to that question would also be "Yes."

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY

MARCH 27, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH M. DODGE,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DODGE: I am enclosing copies of self-explanatory correspondence between myself and Mrs. Hobby, in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I think you will agree with me that the acceptance of a reorganization plan creating a new department in our Government is so serious a matter that it should not be undertaken unless the Congress and the Administration are in complete agreement as to the meaning and intent of the language set forth in the proposed plan. Therefore, and in view of the fact that Mrs. Hobby, in her reply to my first letter, quotes part of your testimony at the Joint Hearings as possibly clarifying the Administration's position on one of the questions which I think should be answered before the Senate acts on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, I should like, in all sincerity, to address the following question to you:

Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?

As I read the plan, my answer to the question would be "Yes." I should like to know whether your answer to that question would also be "Yes."

Inasmuch as the Senate may be asked to act on this reorganization plan this afternoon, I should be most appreciative if I could have your answer just as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1953.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of March 27 in which you ask me to provide you, as soon as possible, an answer to the following question: "Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?"

It is my understanding that in submitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, and with particular reference to section 3 of that plan, the President anticipated that he would appoint a doctor of medicine to the post of Special Assistant to the Secretary.

Nevertheless, in my opinion, section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 is so worded that a President could appoint a person who is not a doctor of medicine to the post of Special Assistant to the Secretary (health and medical affairs) although it is not the intention of this administration to do so.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. DODGE, *Director.*

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. KEFAUVER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I merely want to make a very brief statement. I voted against reporting favorably from the committee, House Joint Resolution 223, because I am opposed to the resolution, and not necessarily because I oppose the reorganization plan. I may say, Mr. President, I think the pending reorganization plan is a decided improvement in many respects over previous plans which have been submitted by the past administration. Both of those I opposed. I think I might support this plan, if it took its proper course under the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1949. I am against establishing the precedent that is now sought to be established by the procedures being followed, in order to put this plan into effect immediately.

We have a reorganization statute. I do not agree with all the provisions of that statute, some of which I have opposed, some of which are the result of compromise as the best that could be obtained at the time the statute was enacted in order to have any reorganization law at all. In this instance the procedure being followed is to pass a special joint resolution to put this plan into effect within a period of 10 days from the time of the enactment of the joint resolution, whereas the Reorganization Act of 1949 provides that a plan shall not become effective until 60 days after it is submitted, assuming that the Congress does not take affirmative action to reject the plan.

I have inquired, "What is the occasion for this joint resolution? Why not let the plan take its normal course as other plans have done, under the reorganization act?" The only answer I have received from any source is to the effect that it is desired to make this reorganization effective immediately, and that there are certain employees within the Federal Security Administration whose removal is desired. They are now under civil service. Through the joint resolution it would be possible to get rid of those employees a little sooner. I am not opposed to getting rid of employees whose services those in authority want to dispense with. Perhaps they are to be commended for taking that course. But if such a situation creates an emergency which justifies special treatment or a special resolution in order to evade the regular reorganization procedures, then the same condition, I dare say, applies in every department of Government today. Instead of attempting to pass a resolution simply to expedite the effective date of a reorganization plan, the better procedure and the sounder procedure would be to amend the existing law, which places the employees of all the departments in a position where those who have the final administrative authority cannot remove them, even if their services are unsatisfactory.

I think this is the wrong approach to that problem. If that problem exists in this agency of government, it certainly exists in many others, and the proper approach to it would be to amend the basic civil-service laws, instead of establishing the precedent of passing a special joint resolution, which would abrogate, in effect, the general provisions of law that now obtain with reference to reorganization plans. If this were to be the last instance of it, if there were to be no repetitions of such procedure, I would not raise my voice against it, although I disapprove of it. But I can well foresee that, instead of giving the Congress time to deliberate upon these plans and study them as they are submitted, and to make certain before they go into effect that the Congress has given them the study and the intelligent consideration they deserve, if we establish this precedent now, we can justify similar action, whenever a plan is submitted to the Congress, and a joint resolution can be passed to place it into effect immediately. Therefore, by this process we are destroying the efficacy of the act which authorizes the submission of reorganization plans.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1, submitted by President Eisenhower, and which we are considering today, although I think there is a great deal of merit in the argument presented by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], to the effect that the purpose of the basic legislation is to give both Houses of Congress 60 days within which to study and consider reorganization plans, and to hear from their constituents relative to the merits and demerits of proposals which may be sent to the Congress. I believe, however, that as to this particular reorganization plan, since it has been before the Congress on previous occasions and has been considered for quite a number of years, the public is fairly well familiar with the arguments in connection with it.

This matter was before the Senate on August 16, 1949, when almost an identical reorganization plan was submitted by President Truman, and at that time the Senate committee reported a resolution of disapproval which was presented to the Senate on that day.

I was very much impressed by the arguments of some of my colleagues to the effect that the proposed plan was in line with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission, that it would save a substantial amount of money, and that it would bring about a reorganization of several agencies under a Cabinet head, so that they would operate with greater efficiency. Therefore, on that occasion, on August 16, 1949, after listening closely to the arguments, I voted for the reorganization plan that was submitted. Thirty-two Members of the Senate voted for the reorganization plan and 60 voted against it, so that it was lost in that Congress.

Among those who voted for the plan which was submitted by former President Truman, some of whom spoke for it, whose arguments and positions impressed me substantially, were the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the present majority leader, former Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, who is now the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations, the then Senator from Arizona, Mr. McFar-

land, and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], as well as other Senators.

Because of the votes many of us cast in support of the reorganization plan in 1949, we were severely criticized by some members of the medical profession. I know that in my own State some physicians criticized my vote for the plan, which, it was contended, would promote the efficiency of governmental departments, would save a substantial amount of money to the Federal Government, and would bring about better service to the people whom these departments serve.

I remember that on that occasion, when the Senate was considering the proposal, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] stated that he had sent former President Hoover a telegram to inquire whether the reorganization plan at that time submitted was in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations, which the Members of Congress were so urgently pressed to adopt. On page 11527 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 9, is the reply from former President Hoover to the Senator from Louisiana. It is a rather long telegram, but in it the former President stated that the reorganization plan was generally in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

When almost the same plan was sent to the Congress this year, I desired to advise with the members of the medical association, and pharmacists and others in Tennessee who were interested, and particularly the officers of the Tennessee Medical Association, so I addressed a letter to the officers of the medical association and to V. O. Foster, the executive secretary. In my letter I stated that previously I had voted for the same program, but had been criticized by some of the physicians and directors of the Tennessee Medical Association; that I thought it was a good plan when submitted in 1949 and that personally I thought it was still a good reorganization plan, but that I did not wish to be fostering any measure which I thought might promote socialized medicine, or be inimical to the best interests of the medical profession, and that therefore I would very much appreciate their advice about the matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I wrote to the officers of the medical association and to Mr. Foster be included in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Dr. V. O. FOSTER,
Nashville, Tenn.

DEAR DR. FOSTER: President Eisenhower has sent to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1953. This plan would give Cabinet status to the Federal Security Agency and designate it as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would bring directly under the control of this Cabinet position all the agencies now loosely included in the Federal Security Agency including the Social Security System, Public Health Service, Food and Drug Administration, and Office of Education. The department, President Eisenhower stated, would be headed by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby.

The plan automatically goes into effect in 60 working days unless it is rejected by a constitutional majority of either House of Congress. Hearings have now been started on this reorganization plan.

I want your advice on this matter. I have always had a high regard for the medical profession and for the tremendous advancement under our free-enterprise system. I do not want to support this plan if you believe it would tend to lead toward the socialization of our medical profession.

In the last Congress, President Truman, pursuant to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, sent to the Congress an almost identical proposal for the reorganization of the agencies under the FSA, and asked that the head of the new department be made a member of the Cabinet. When the proposal was being considered on the floor of the Senate, Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana received a telegram from former President Hoover, Chairman of the Reorganization Committee, stating that the proposal was in line with the Hoover recommendations. I sent a telegram to Mr. Hoover today and have his answer stating that the present proposal is also in accordance with his committee's recommendations. I am enclosing a copy of this. It was pointed out that by bringing the agencies together for operational purposes that a large amount of money would be saved.

I had previously expressed strong general support of the various Hoover recommendations and I voted to approve that reorganization. Many physicians criticized me for this vote, especially on the ground that Oscar Ewing might have been named the Cabinet member in the event the reorganization was approved. I stated that I doubted if President Truman would name him to this position and that I did not think a majority of the Members of the Senate would approve his appointment. I also stated that Congress could better direct the activities of the FSA and its head if he had to come before the Senate for confirmation.

There is no question but that some reorganization of these agencies is desirable. A great deal of money would be saved eventually and service would be more efficient. But before taking a position on the matter, in view of the criticisms that came to me when the same proposal was before the Congress last time, I would appreciate it if you would let me know your opinion and advice, and that of other physicians with whom you have an opportunity of discussing this proposal.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, that letter was sent on March 14. On March 19 I received a letter from Mr. V. O. Foster, the executive secretary of the Tennessee State Medical Association, in which he advised that the association, like the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, was favoring this reorganization plan. I should like to include in the RECORD at this point the letter from Mr. Foster to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

TENNESSEE STATE
MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Nashville, Tenn., March 19, 1953.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: I appreciate your letter of March 14 in which you state that you would like to know the feeling of the medical profession in Tennessee with respect to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I feel certain you have received my telegram of March 13, 3:15 p. m., indicating the official position of this association. In the event you have not received the telegram, I am quoting the same below:

Dr. Overholt asked me to send you a list of local medical society presidents. Sending same by airmail today. Suggest that you weigh the telegram heavily for official position of the Tennessee State Medical Association. No objection however to your securing local physician's opinions.

The board of trustees of this association is the policy-making body between the physicians of the house of delegates. Pursuant to the action of the board, related in the above telegram, it must be stated that the Tennessee State Medical Association is in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 1. This association would greatly appreciate your support and interest in the plan.

On behalf of this association, I want to thank you for your effort to ascertain the official position of this association in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

V. O. FOSTER,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I also ask that a telegram received from Dr. Calvert Cheney, who, as an officer of the board of trustees of the Tennessee Medical Association, attended the Washington meeting of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, be included in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 15, 1593.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
The Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I appreciate your letter very much indeed. I asked Dr. Wilson to send you at once the recommendations as passed by the house of delegates yesterday. The physicians of Tennessee are all in favor of this. Delighted to know you will work for it.

Cordially,

CALVERT CHENEY.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in order to make certain that the present reorganization plan was in line with the recommendations of former President Hoover, as was the reorganization plan of 1949, I sent former President Hoover a telegram on March 13, 1953, reading as follows:

In considering President Eisenhower's Reorganization Plan No. 1, relative to Cabinet position for FSA, would appreciate your advising me whether this plan is in line with your proposal and if this is substantially the same proposal which you advised Senator ELLENDER was in line with the Hoover reorganization program when same matter was before 82d Congress.

With high esteem and good wishes.

President Hoover replied on March 13, as follows:

The President's plan is all right and at the request of your committee I am sending a full statement today.

With kind regards,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. President, I appreciate that some of the opposition to the reorganization plan in 1949 was based upon the idea that President Truman might nominate Mr. Oscar Ewing to head the new department, but I have always felt that in this country we must have a government of

law, and not of men, and that in the passage of laws, we must take into consideration that over a long period of time it is the provisions of law to which we must look. We must assume that we will have a Chief Executive who will nominate proper officers, and that we will have a United States Senate which will either approve or reject the nominations of the Executive according to whether the Senate feels the nominees are qualified to perform the duties to which they have been assigned.

I do not know whether or not former President Truman would have nominated Mr. Ewing to be a Cabinet head. I felt that if he had nominated him, Mr. Ewing probably could not have been confirmed by the Senate. The fact that there were 60 votes against the reorganization plan on August 16, 1949, probably is proof that my idea in that respect was correct.

In any event, I hope that over the years those appointed to occupy this important Cabinet post will be competent and will be able to fulfill the high hopes which are held for him or her in this Cabinet position. I feel certain that we all have great confidence in Mrs. Hobby, and that she will do her job well, because she has had great experience.

I think this can be, and will be, a Cabinet position which will be of assistance to the people of the Nation, and that, by the proposed reorganization, efficiency, economy, and better service will result.

I felt that I was right in my position in 1949. I am glad that Members of the Senate who voted against almost the same reorganization plan at that time have now changed their position and feel that this reorganization plan will be in the public interest.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say only a few words in behalf of Reorganization Plan No. 1, because it will achieve the ultimate result that I have been trying to obtain for a good many years. As I recall, the first bill on the subject (S. 2503) was introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and myself in the 79th Congress on August 1, 1946. No action was taken by the 79th Congress, but in the 80th Congress the Senator from Arkansas and I reintroduced our bill on January 10, 1947. Extensive hearings were held, and the bill was finally reported at that time by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The plan here proposed carries out substantially the same idea. It would create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Fundamentally, there is no great similarity between health, education, and welfare at the local level. In any system that I know of, those functions are entirely separate. Schools are completely independent, and health departments and welfare departments are also independent.

Some persons in these fields have advocated a separate Federal department for each field. That has seemed to me to be impractical and unwise. What the plan would do would be to place in the proposed department the activities of the Federal Government in which the Federal Government really plays a secondary role. Under our constitutional system, the primary obligation with respect to health, education, and welfare rests with local communities and the States.

In a way, the proposed department would be a kind of State-aid department, in which would be grouped together the agencies with respect to which the role of the Federal Government is one of research and advice and, where necessary, of financial assistance. That is really the only consideration that binds together health, education, and welfare; otherwise, there might well be a separate department for each of the three.

It seems to me that those who are opposed to such a Department as is proposed—for instance, persons in the medical field—make a great mistake. If there were a separate, independent Federal Department of Health, it might indicate that the Federal Government was interfering and was attempting to play a primary role in that field. I think that we have succeeded in convincing doctors, who have usually opposed this program, that they will be better off under the arrangement now proposed.

Of course, those engaged in the field of health, in the field of education, and in the field of welfare, have always been somewhat afraid to be grouped together, for fear that one of the groups would dominate the entire department. Doctors did not want to be dominated by the welfare group; educators did not want to be under the rule of doctors; and those concerned with welfare did not desire to be supervised by either of the other two. The result has been a great deal of miscellaneous opposition, in my opinion, much of it mistaken.

The proposed plan has been taken up with the persons in the fields concerned, in an endeavor to satisfy them that there should be in the Cabinet one head in charge of the Department, instead of independent agencies continuing to function; that there should be someone in authority to whom they could present their cases. The three main sections in the proposed new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have direct access to the Secretary, and the Secretary would be an impartial administrator, as among the three, and would represent their interests in working out the general policies of the Government.

Most of the disputes in the past have related to the relative strength of the different agencies within such a new Department. We have tried to make clear that each one of them will be almost autonomous, and will be directly under the Secretary, and that their special interests will be protected by the position they will receive in the new Department.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has made a statement opposing the procedure of a 10-day resolution. I think there are two reasons why, perhaps for the first time, such a procedure has been adopted. The principal reason is the necessity for speed. Until this matter is determined, the new Administrator of the Federal Security Administration, who will probably become the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, will be unable to proceed with an effective organization of her Department or of her Administration. A delay of another 30 or 40 days would be substantial in connection with the preparation of the budget and deciding upon the appointments that must be made in the new Department.

I do not think I would attempt a 10-day resolution, or recommend its adoption, if there were substantial opposition to the plan. In that case, I think probably it would be wise to follow the procedure provided by the Reorganization Act. But where there is no substantial opposition, there is no other way in which to put the plan into immediate effect, except by way of a 10-day resolution.

It seems to me that we must regard the situation as an emergency, not frequently to be followed, except if the conditions I have set forth should be repeated in the future.

I am very much pleased that we have finally reached our objective. We have sought for a long time to give to the three agencies affected representation in the Cabinet, the policy-making section of the Government, immediately under the President. These activities of the Federal Government are tremendously important to the welfare of the Nation, although the Federal Government does not undertake to assume primary direction in the three fields.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my intention to vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1 as submitted by President Eisenhower, and as reported by the committee. I merely wish to make note of what has already been discussed in some detail, namely, that the plan meets a long felt need for participation by the Federal Government in the services of health, education and welfare. I concur in the view expressed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the essential function of the proposed Department would be the carrying out of present programs, which are, in the main, State-aid programs, and represent mechanism for cooperation between the Federal Government, State governments, and local institutions and governments in the field of health, education, and welfare.

I point out, however, that in the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as provided in this plan, special consideration has been given to the medical needs and the health and medical services of the Federal Government. This special reference is related, of course, to the appointment of a Special Assistant to the Secretary in the field of medical and health services. It is my opinion that if there is any justification for this particular position, a justification likewise exists in the field of social security and in the field of education. I think it would be only fair to make known the fact that the special assistant was provided for primarily to remove the resistance of the American Medical Association and some other groups to the establishment of a much-needed Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I have noticed in the report of the committee on this proposal some language which I should like to explore for a moment.

I quote from page 11 of the committee report:

> In order that proper emphasis might be placed on the importance of health functions to be administered by the new Secretary under the provisions of the plan, a sec-

tion has been included to create a Special Assistant to the Secretary, to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience.

I appreciate the importance of having professionally trained people in any professional posts. It would be nothing short of a dereliction of public duty to appoint a person to a key position, such as that of Special Assistant to the Secretary, in the matter of health and medical services, unless that individual had the broadest professional experience. While I realize the importance of nongovernmental experience, I point out that the matter of operating the Government is not necessarily a job for alleged amateurs. It might be well for this individual to have a little governmental experience too, or at least to have some attitude of responsibility toward governmental service.

I make the note that while the plan calls for an individual in the medical field with nongovernmental experience, it is not to be considered a criterion of qualification that he has had no govmental experience. I assume that if we could find an individual with experience in both fields it would be highly desirable. That ought not to be too difficult, because many of the finest doctors in our land have served on governmental commissions, which I would surely call governmental experience. Many of them have been associated with State departments of health, and with city health departments, either in an advisory or administrative capacity.

I merely point out, as a member of the Government and one who has a certain enjoyment in the field of political life, that I do not think it is necessarily a badge of honor to be able to parade around and say that one has never had anything to do with the Government. I strongly protest, in the name of democracy and representative government. It would not hurt a bit if this individual knew of what the Department consisted, and if he had some intimate knowledge of the governmental responsibilities and duties in a Department as big a one as this one.

Let me continue with the description of this position:

> The President, in his message, stated that the purpose of this section was to insure that emphasis will be placed on the development of health and medical programs of the Department, and to permit the Secretary to develop programs for submission to the Congress relative to necessary legislation designed to improve Federal activities in the health and medical fields.

As I see it, the President had in mind a special assistant who would be of aid in the development of the health and medical programs of the Department, and to permit the Secretary to develop programs for submission to the Congress relative to necessary legislation designed to improve Federal activities in the health and medical fields. I consider that to be a proper description of the special assistant's functions. But later in the report we find the following language:

> It is the understanding of the committee that this section is intended to provide for the appointment of a special assistant to the Secretary who is a doctor of medicine and who is thoroughly familiar with the problems of medical practitioners as a result of firsthand experience. The committee is of the view that the functions which the special assistant to the Secretary will perform are advisory, and in no event would be broader than functions of the Department and the Secretary; that the advice and assistance which the special assistant may furnish the Secretary will be limited to the scope of the functions vested in the Department; that authority is not provided for the undertaking of comprehensive studies of all aspects of medical care for the American people or to make recommendations to the Secretary accordingly.

I submit that there is somewhat of a contradiction. If on the one hand we suggest that the responsibility of this special assistant is to advise the Secretary on the development of health and medical programs of the Department, and to permit the Secretary to develop programs for submission to the Congress relative to necessary legislation designed to improve Federal activities in this field—if that is the responsiiblity of the special assistant, the least he should be expected to do is to make a few studies.

I wish to make my position clear. I do not want a special assistant who will blindly recommend things to the Secretary, and I do not want a report to indicate that the special assistant ought not to do a little studying before he makes recommendations. I know that that is not what is going to happen, but I think the language of the report should be properly understood. So far as I see it, as a member of the committee—and I attended the joint committee hearings—as one who in the 81st Congress and in the 82d Congress was interested in similar plans, I do not interpret the special assistant's job to be one of merely making recommendations to the Secretary of the Department without having the opportunity to make broad studies in the field of medical care.

I know what this language is here for. It is here merely to indicate to anyone who might be apprehensive that this special assistant is not going to make recommendations about health insurance, or any recommendations which would be in any way in controversy with the established American medical profession.

However, I submit that if the special assistant is to be an adviser to the Secretary, he is to advise on all matters pertaining to health, and I see nothing within the reorganization plan—and I have looked it over very carefully—or within the job description, which was withheld from the committee until some of us pried it loose, which would indicate that the special assistant is under any obligation to restrain himself in the field of accruing knowledge. He has no administrative functions except to advise; but surely he has the obligation to conduct surveys, studies, hearings, or whatever else may be necessary to seek all necessary information for improving health and medical facilities.

I notice that the special assistant is to receive $15,000 a year. I make note of the fact that I do not call that economy, but I am not going to protest, because I am sure he will be worth $15,000 or more. I only submit that it stand out like a sore thumb that we have a special assistant in health, but that we have a little advisory committee on education, and a small advisory committee on social security.

I think the reason is obvious. The teachers were not mobilized, and the poor old-age pensioners who were trying to get along on small pensions did not mobilize. They had no conferences in Washington. They were not consulted. They were told exactly what was going to happen in connection with this plan as they were in connection with the plan of 1950.

This does not make the plan less desirable. It merely shows that those who perfected the plan, along the basic outlines of the plan of 1950, did two things.

First, they provided for a new Secretary. That new Secretary is well received and honored by Members of Congress and by the citizenry at large.

Second, in order to make sure that a political tempest would not be upon our heads, they made a special concession by providing for the appointment of a special assistant in the field of health. I commend the political sagacity of those who made that proposal. I do not think it necessarily means economy, but it is adroit politics.

I hope that as we go along in the development of these plans the politics will not cost too much, and that we may proceed with a full understanding of the importance of governmental reorganization.

One final word. It is my hope that this new department will take into consideration the recent study made by the President's Commission on the Nation's Health Needs. That Commission had a very fine group of people serving it, and had an excellent staff.

Dr. Paul Magnuson, who happens to come from the State of Minnesota, is a very eminent physician and outstanding leader in the field of medicine, and he has served with distinction as the head of the veterans' medical program. He was the Chairman of the President's Commission. Dr. Magnuson is an accredited, respected, and honored member of the medical profession. He is in good standing with the American Medical Association. I think that he and Dr. Hawley have done more than any other two men to revitalize veterans' medical care and at the same time save millions of dollars, while giving the veterans of our country the best care that any nation can possibly give to its veterans.

Dr. Magnuson's commission made a splendid report, and I would suggest that one of the first duties of the Special Assistant to the Secretary should be to read that report and to advise and consult with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to certain aspects of the report.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] have submitted a bill which carries out a part of that report, I would suggest that it be given favorable consideration by the new department and the staff of that department. I refer, of course, to the proposal submitted by the Senator from New York

and the Senator from Vermont which provides for assistance to the States in the development of voluntary health insurance programs. I submit that the proposal is sound and that it merits immediate consideration by Congress. Certainly it merits favorable consideration by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I am happy to support the reorganization plan, just as I was happy to support the plan in 1949. I submit that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] made a very pertinent comment when he pointed out that a government such as ours should be a government of law and not of men and that this plan is 3 years late. The plan of 1950 was almost identical with the plan before us today, except that it did not provide for a special assistant in the field of medical care. In other words, the 1950 plan was $15,000 a year less expensive than the one on which we are to vote today.

I also submit that this particular proposal will not necessarily save vast sums of money. I think it would be wrong to indicate any such thing to the American people. I do not believe there is very much in the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which will save the taxpayers substantial sums of money. It will provide coordinated services and it will provide cabinet status for the present Security Agency which, on the basis of its record, I believe it merits. I do not necessarily think, however, that we should tell the American people every time we adopt a reorganization plan that it will save hundreds of millions of dollars. We have adopted a number of reorganization plans, and as yet the budget has not been substantially reduced. I do feel that we have had great improvements in efficiency, and I believe that we will have greater efficiency under this program. However, Mr. President, every time we improve efficiency we do not necessarily save money for the taxpayers. What we do is to give better service, which may in the long run actually cost more money than previously.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as I see it, two major objections have been raised to this resolution. One objection is to the resolution itself. The other objection is to the plan itself. The objection to the resolution is that it is affirmative and accelerates the date when this plan goes into effect instead of having the normal 60-day period operate. The objection to the plan is the charge of socialized medicine. I will speak first on the socialized-medicine objection and then on the acceleration objection.

I do not consider this plan to be basically different from previous plans presented to and rejected by Congress on the matters that this plan covers. It involves the same principles, although the personalities have changed. While this change in personalities seems to have caused several who opposed previous similar plans to change their minds and to support this plan instead of opposing it, I say here and now about this plan what I said about Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 on August 16, 1949, on the Senate floor and in a minority report which I submitted on August 11, 1949, that the issue is not one of personalities but rather one of principle.

Although I differ with Dr. James L. Doenges, of Anderson, Ind., who appeared before my subcommittee in opposition to the plan—differ in that I am for this plan and he is against it—I certainly agree with what he has to say on this point of personalities versus principle. Dr. Doenges said:

> I cannot pass this point without mentioning the confusion which seems to be rampant in the minds of many. There seems to be a lack of discrimination between personality and principle. In fact, principle seems to be taking a subordinate position to personality in the thinking of many people. Such confusion is most regrettable in matters of personal importance, but it becomes tragic when matters of Government are concerned.
>
> There is such minor differences between the present Reorganization Plan and the two which were rejected previously that serious questions arise. Can it be the principle is abandoned? * * * Personality has no place in evaluation of principle.

As was the case with the plans of 1949 and 1950, the charge of "socialized medicine" has been made against this plan by the opponents to it. To this I say what I did back in August 1949 that "the issue is not socialized medicine as some would have us believe—were this true I would oppose the plan because I am opposed to socialized medicine."

Now I ask you, Mr. President, how can anyone take this charge of "socialized medicine" seriously when the American Medical Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, former President Herbert Hoover, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and President Dwight D. Eisenhower are all supporting this plan?

Does anyone really think that the American Medical Association would support a plan of socialized medicine?

Does anyone think that Herbert Hoover would advocate a plan of socialized medicine?

Does anyone honestly believe that either the senior Senator from Ohio or President Dwight D. Eisenhower would become a party to a scheme of socialized medicine through the coverup of a Presidential reorganization plan?

Of course not. You and I know that this talk of socialized medicine in reorganization plans is just as ridiculous in 1953 as it was in 1949 and 1950.

The second major objection that has been raised is that to the affirmative resolution approving the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 that consideration of the plan is being rushed through too fast and that the full 60-day period under the Reorganization Act should be permitted to run before this plan goes into effect so that full time can be given to consideration of the plan.

I must confess that this argument impresses me. Frankly, I am of the personal opinion that the normal 60-day period should be permitted to run its course before this plan becomes law and effective.

But in the interest of team cooperation with President Eisenhower, I am willing to submerge my own personal opinion on this matter to what I understand to be the wishes of President Eisenhower. Apparently he wants this plan to go into effect as soon as possible. Apparently he and his associates feel that time is of the essence in this matter. I am not going to stand in his way or try to hamstring him and his administration. Consequently, I am going along with this policy of acceleration on the plan, even if with considerable reluctance and misgiving.

I might not be willing to permit the desire of the President for accelerated action on this plan to override my own personal reaction on the acceleration were it not for the fact that, as Dr. Doenges stated, there is such minor difference between the present reorganization plan and the plans of 1949 and 1950 which were considered at great length by the Congress and its committees. There is nothing basically new offered in opposition to the principles of this plan that has not been offered before to the previous plans. Congress has studied the basic features of this proposal so much in the past that the great majority of the Members are sufficiently informed on the issue to be able to vote on it without the necessity of repetitious and drawn out hearings.

However, in this connection I am constrained to state that henceforth I shall probably oppose any proposals of accelerated action through affirmative resolutions on such reorganization plans as the President may send up in the future. I do not believe that the situation will be similar on future plans submitted by the President. I do not believe that they will have the striking similarity to past plans on related subjects as Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 has to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 and Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950. They will not have the benefit of such a great backlog of hearings and debate as has Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. They will require more time and study.

Mr. President, is a vote to be taken soon on the joint resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall speak for only a minute or two, because I do not wish to delay the vote on the joint resolution.

After listening to the various substantive comments on this plan and earlier plans, I wish to say, first of all, that institutions can become the lengthened shadows of individuals. If I were seeking a reason why Congress was rather reluctant to do anything about the plan in earlier years, I might say that it was because of the gentleman who had impressed himself so thoroughly upon this instrumentality that he became something of a national issue. Mr. President, an Oscar in Hollywood is one thing, but an Oscar in Washington is quite another. Of course, I am referring to Oscar Ewing, whose name became a symbol, I believe, of compulsory medicine. One cannot very well examine his comments on his trips abroad and on the British system without coming to that conclusion.

There is no use searching for any ulterior reason or for something mysterious. The fact of the matter is that it was the man who headed the Agency who became a symbol of something the Ameri-

can people did not like. So in November of last year a referendum on this issue was held and I believe the way was cleared. So now there should be no objection to the plan.

I share the feeling of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], regarding the acceleration of the taking effect of the plan, namely, that the joint resolution itself calls for effectuation of the plan in 10 days, instead of in 60 days; and normally I would not go along with the plan if there were any real hostility to it.

Inasmuch as there is none, however, I wish to make only the further comment that next year's budget for this Agency will be rather close to $2 billion, I believe. In the wisdom of the Appropriations Committee, that budget may be curtailed somewhat. However, nothing much can be done in that field until the reorganization has been completed.

It has been said that the new Administrator could at this time select only her personal secretary, and that there are at least 100 policy positions in the establishment whose present occupants could not now be displaced in order to carry out a viewpoint which last year was vouchsafed to the country by the new administration. That is an additional argument, I believe, for approving the proposal that the plan take effect within a 10-day period.

So I am not disposed to let the matter run any longer, and thus I believe it might be well for us to vote now on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS AND FISCAL RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the state of the Union message, I expressed my deep concern for the well-being of all of our citizens and the attainment of equality of opportunity for all. I further stated that our social rights are a most important part of our heritage and must be guarded and defended with all of our strength. I firmly believe that the primary way of accomplishing this is to recommend the creation of a commission to study the means of achieving a sounder relationship between Federal, State and local governments.

The way has now been prepared for appropriate action. Shortly after stating my original intention, I called an exploratory meeting of interested officials, including Members of Congress and a group of governors representing the Council of State Governments, to confer with me on such a study. This conference produced general agreement on the importance of the problem and an offer of cooperation in the proposed study. Within a few days representatives of several leading organizations of local governmental officials will meet at the White House with several of my associates to give their considered and needed counsel.

The present division of activities between Federal and State Governments, including their local subdivisions, is the product of more than a century and a half of piecemeal and often haphazard growth. This growth in recent decades has proceeded at a speed defying order and efficiency. One program after another has been launched to meet emergencies and expanding public needs. Time has rarely been taken for thoughtful attention to the effects of these actions on the basic structure of our Federal-State system of government.

Now there is need to review and assess, with prudence and foresight, the proper roles of the Federal, State and local governments. In many cases, especially within the past 20 years, the Federal Government has entered fields which, under our Constitution, are the primary responsibilities of State and local governments. This has tended to blur the responsibilities of local government. It has led to duplication and waste. It is time to relieve the people of the need to pay taxes on taxes.

A major mark of this development has been the multiplication of Federal grants-in-aid for specific types of activities. There are now more than 30 such grant programs. In the aggregate, they involve Federal expenditures of well over $2 billion a year. They make up approximately one-fifth of State revenues.

While by far the greater part of these expenditures are in the fields of social security, health, and education, they also spread into many other areas. In some cases, the Federal Government apportions fixed amounts among the States; in others, it matches State expenditures; and in a few, it finances the entire State expenditure. The impact of all these grants on State governments has been profound. While they have greatly stimulated the development of certain State activities, they have complicated State finances and administration; and they have often made it difficult for States to provide the funds for other important services.

The maintenance of strong, well-ordered State and local governments is essential to our Federal system of government. Lines of authority must be clean and clear, the right areas of action for Federal and State government plainly defined. This is imperative for the efficient administration of governmental programs in the fields of health, education, social security, and other grant-in-aid areas.

The manner in which best to accomplish these objectives, and to eliminate friction, duplication, and waste from Federal-State relations, is therefore a major national problem. To reallocate certain of these activities between Federal and State Governments, including their local subdivisions, is in no sense to lessen our concern for the objectives of these programs. On the contrary, these programs can be made more effective instruments serving the security and welfare of our citizens.

To achieve these purposes, I recommend the enactment of legislation to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources to make a thorough study of grants-in-aid activities and the problems of finance and Federal-State relations which attend them. The Commission should study and investigate all the activities in which Federal aid is extended to State and local governments, whether there is justification for Federal aid in all these fields, whether there is need for such aid in other fields. The whole question of Federal control of activities to which the Federal Government contributes must be thoroughly examined.

The matter of the adequacy of fiscal resources available to the various levels of Government to discharge their proper functions must be carefully explored.

The Commission should be of such size and composition as to permit appropriate representation of the various governmental levels and of outstanding members of the general public. It should be provided with an excellent staff, able to draw on the great amount of work which has already been done in this field.

In order that the Commission may complete its report in time for consideration by the next session of the Congress, I urge prompt action on this matter.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 30, 1953.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on page 2 of the Executive Calendar are 18 nominations of Army officers who are nominated to be promoted to major general, and to be given appointments for an indefinite term, in lieu of their present 5-year contracts. Eight of these officers are in the Ready Reserve, and their nominations should be acted upon

today. Ten of these officers are in the Retired Reserve, and no injury will be done if there is some delay in action on their nominations. The names of the officers in the Retired Reserve have been furnished the clerk. I ask that those nominations be passed over.

I now ask that the other nominations to be major generals, on page 2, and all the following nominations, to be brigadier generals, beginning on page 3, be acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations designated by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations: Julius Ochs Adler, to be major general; William Henry Draper, Jr., to be major general; Thomas Francis Farrell, to be major general; Ralph Maxwell Immell, to be major general; Harry Hubbard Johnson, to be major general; Edward White Smith, to be major general; Leif John Sverdrup, to be major general; and Robert Wilbar Wilson, to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, those nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the other major general nominations on page 2 of the Executive Calendar will be passed over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the remaining Army nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the nomination of Donald Bennett Adams, at the top of page 3 of the Executive Calendar, be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the Air Force nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there is at the desk a list which has been furnished to the clerk, of nominations of officers below the general officer rank. Those nominations have previously been sent to the desk, to remain there until today. The promotions are routine ones, and I ask for their present confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

THE AIR CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotion in the Air Corps, beginning with the nomination of Thomas Gabriel Hepner, to be chaplain, with the rank of major.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for permanent appointment in the Navy, beginning with the nomination of David A. Broad, to be lieutenant commander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry other nominations for permanent appointment in the Navy, beginning with the nomination of Norma C. Furtos, to be commander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations which have been confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. On the Executive Calendar, the first nomination is that of Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White. His name appears twice on page 1 of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The first name on the Executive Calendar is not included in the Reserve officer category and the category of those who are to be given indefinite terms under the law. In that category, the first nomination appearing on the first page of the calendar is that of Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted. That nomination is for a routine promotion to the rank of major general. Therefore, since there is no objection on the part of the committee, it was our desire that that nomination be confirmed at the present time.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well. I have no objection, Mr. President.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, during the adjournment period following today's session, bills and joint resolutions found to be duly enrolled.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, April 1, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 30, 1953:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Ancher Nelsen, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Clifford M. Raemer, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, vice William W. Hart, resigned.

Edward L. Scheufler, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri, vice Sam M. Wear, resigning.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Joseph Ira Kincaid, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone, vice John E. Hushing, resigned.

Omar L. Schnatmeier, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Otto Schoen.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Edward Hale Brooks, [redacted] Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. George Price Hays, [redacted] commanding general, United States Forces, Austria (major general, U. S. Army).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 30, 1953:

IN THE ARMY

The officer named herein for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted, [redacted].

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of section 224, the Armed Forces Reserve Act (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major generals

Julius Ochs Adler, [redacted].
William Henry Draper, Jr., [redacted].
Thomas Francis Farrell, [redacted].
Ralph Maxwell Immell, [redacted].
Harry Hubbard Johnson, [redacted].
Edward White Smith, [redacted].
Leif John Sverdrup, [redacted].
Robert Wilbar Wilson, [redacted].

To be brigadier generals

Donald Bennett Adams, [redacted].
Wayne Russell Allen, [redacted].
LeRoy Hagen Anderson, [redacted].
Hugh Barclay, [redacted].
Frank Frederick Bell, [redacted].
Frank Brown Berry, [redacted].
Carroll Owen Bickelhaupt, [redacted].
Ralph Gates Boyd, [redacted].
Clarence Lemar Burpee, [redacted].
Robert West Chamberlin, [redacted].

Edwin Norman Clark,
Robert Hunter Clarkson,
Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr.,
James Alexander Crothers,
Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr.,
Carlton Spencer Dargusch,
Robert Charles Dean,
John Ross Delafield,
Brice Pursell Disque,
Georges Frederic Doriot,
Henry Russell Drowne, Jr.,
John Bettes Dunlap,
Ken Reed Dyke,
Daniel Collier Elkin,
Edward Arthur Evans,
Charles Birdsall Ferris,
Charles Lyn Fox,
James Calvin Frank,
Michael Joseph Galvin,
Robert Joshua Gill,
Thomas Rodman Goethals,
Harold Leroy Goss,
Edward Samuel Greenbaum,
Robert Dinwiddie Groves,
Clement Bates Ellery Harts,
Ernest Henry Hawkwood,
John David Higgins,
Maurice Hirsch,
Gordon Cloyd Hollar,
Julius Cecil Holmes,
Whitfield Jack,
Ephraim Franklin Jeffe,
William Rodes Jesse,
Bernhard Alfred Johnson,
Edwin Whiting Jones,
Kenneth Barnard Keating,
Henry Kirksey Kellogg,
Francis Rusher Kerr,
John Reed Kilpatrick,
Rudolph Charles Kuldell,
Norman Miller Lack,
Andrew Frank McIntyre,
Ralph Hendricks McKee,
Hugh Stanford McLeod,
Richard Leeson McNelly,
William Claire Menninger,
Hugh Meglone Milton II,
John Williams Morgan,
William Robert Clayton Morrison,
Harry Paul Newton,
Henry Carlton Newton,
John Joseph O'Brien,
George Hamden Olmsted,
Frederick Henry Osborn,
Ralph Albert Palladino,
Washington Platt,
Russell Archibald Ramsey,
Isidor Schwaner Ravdin,
Francis J. Reichmann,
Henry Joseph Reilly,
Benjamin Franklin Riter,
James Thomas Roberts,
Francis Willard Rollins,
Charles Eskridge Saltzman,
David Sarnoff,
Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf,
Harry Hodges Semmes,
Henry Alden Shaw,
John Henry Sherburne,
Conrad Edwin Snow,
Oscar Nathaniel Solbert,
Albert Hummel Stackpole,
Carl Ferinand Steinhoff,
Arthur Elsworth Stoddard,
William Miles Stokes, Jr.,
Frederick Smith Strong, Jr.,
Carl Thomas Sutherland,
John Thomas Taylor,
Telford Taylor,
Samuel Morgan Thomas,
Lamar Tooze,
Kenneth Castle Townson,
Thomas Edison Troland,
Morris Carlton Troper,
Alfred Girard Tuckerman,
Elbert Parr Tuttle,
Herbert Harold Vreeland, Jr.,
Frederick Marshall Warren,
Arthur Pope Watson,
Richard Seabury Whitcomb,
Lawrence Harley Whiting,
L. Kemper Williams,
William James Williamson,
Thomas Bayne Wilson,

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James Harold Doolittle,

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Victor Emile Bertrandias,
Maj. Gen. Edward Peck Curtis,
Maj. Gen. Cyrus Rowlett Smith,

To be brigadier generals

Brig Gen. Walter Gelvin Bain,
Brig. Gen. John Marza Bennett., Jr.,
Brig. Gen. Thomas Donald Campbell,
Brig. Gen. Robert Emmet Condon,
Brig. Gen. Merian Coldwell Cooper,
Maj. Gen. Robert Lynn Copsey,
Brig. Gen. Frederick Trubee Davison,
Brig. Gen. Lawrence George Fritz,
Brig. Gen. Joseph Johnson George,
Maj. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham,
Brig. Gen. Pierpont Morgan Hamilton,
Maj. Gen. Thomas Oates Hardin,
Brig. Gen. Harold Ross Harris,
Brig. Gen. John Philip Henebry,
Brig. Gen. Theron Baldwin Herndon,
Brig. Gen. James Howell Howard,
Brig. Gen. Ray Willis Ireland,
Brig. Gen. Bruce Johnson,
Brig. Gen. Douglas Keeney,
Brig. Gen. Henry Christopher Kristofferson,
Brig. Gen. Walter Barton Leach,
Brig. Gen. Timothy James Manning,
Brig. Gen. Charles Maylon,
Brig. Gen. Chester Earl McCarty,
Brig. Gen. Arthur Lee McCullough,
Brig. Gen. Joseph Fenton McManmon,
Brig. Gen. Richard Lewis Meiling,
Brig. Gen. Henry Terry Morrison,
Brig. Gen. Lacey Van Buren Murrow,
Brig. Gen. Will Faust Nicholson,
Brig. Gen. Charles Freeman Nielsen,
Brig. Gen. Russell Isaac Oppenheim,
Brig. Gen. Dick Royal Petty,
Brig. Gen. William Leroy Plummer,
Maj. Gen. Thomas Randall Rampy,
Brig. Gen. Franklin Rose,
Brig. Gen. Howard Archibald Rusk,
Brig. Gen. Peter Constant Sandretto,
Brig. Gen. Robert James Smith,
Brig. Gen. Ray James Stecker,
Brig. Gen. Luther Wallace Sweetser, Jr.,
Brig. Gen. Joseph Lafeton Whitney,
Brig. Gen. Walter Wallace Wood,
Brig. Gen. Albert McIver Woody,
Brig. Gen. William Tandy Young, Jr.,

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officer in the United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard of the United States under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

Brig. Gen. Leonard Ewing Thomas, , to be major general, California Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

Col. Joseph Peter Gentile, , to be brigadier general, Massachusetts Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

Col. Rollin Bascom Moore, Jr., , to be brigadier general, California Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

Col. George Robert Stanley, , to be brigadier general, Connecticut Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

COMMANDING GENERAL, AIR UNIVERSITY

Lt. Gen Laurence Sherman Kuter to be United States Air Force commanding general, Air University, with rank of lieutenant general and date of rank April 11, 1951, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

REGULAR AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be majors

CHAPLAINS

Hepner, Thomas Gabriel,
Brennan, George Joseph,

To be captains

AIR FORCE

Shepard, Leland Casper, Jr.,
Aikens, Edwin Corry,
Kuehl, Albert Robert,
Gibson, Ralph Duane,
Murray, Francis Peter,
Dean, Louis Jefferson,
Keeler, William Joseph,
Jones, Arthur Meriwether,
Anthony, William Harold,
Weatherford, Ross Holmes, Jr.,
Buchta, Joseph,
DeGrothy, Cornell,
Messmer, Eugene John,
Hunter, Cedric Vernon,
Kult, Milton Louis,
Carroll, Bill, Jr.,
×Wier, Charlie Younger,
Gasiewicz, Sigmund Ignacy,
Hurn, James Lee,
Mutch, Alex Young,
Bridgers, Sam, Jr.,
Jewell, Harold Roger,
×Mackie, John Victor,
Adair, Luther Ewell, Jr.,
Cathcart, Charles Earl,
Joseph, Adolph Davis, Jr.,
Kelly, Charles Edward,
Bryan, Donald William,
MacKinnon, Robert Louis,
Cunningham, Arthur Sylvester, Jr.,
Burcham, Lee Aubrey,
O'Neil, Earl William, Jr.,
×Miller, Sumner Stark,
Barr, Thomas James,
Augustyn, Frank Joseph,
Immig, Richard Graham,
Crisp, Harold Newark, Jr.,
Grossmiller, William John,
Shackelford, Dave Seale, Jr.,
Carroll, Thomas Lee,
Lindeman, Jack Ray,
Smith, Clyde Barton,
Posvar, Wesley Wentz,
Poytress, Earl Francis,
Creveling, Louis Gregory,
Temple, William Alan,
Bryan, Robert Howell,
Strain, Bailey Toland,
Adams, George Talmadge, Jr.,

Stewart, Robert Benfred, [redacted].
McKinney, Joseph Tomlinson, [redacted].
Harper, Gilbert Stewart, Jr., [redacted].
Lengnick, Roger Horace, [redacted].
Wheat, Allen Albert, [redacted].
Yeoman, Wayne Allen, [redacted].
Cahill, Laurence James, Jr., [redacted].
Bellis, Benjamin Neil, [redacted].
Welch, Standford Alden, [redacted].
Studer, William Francis, [redacted].
Blazina, Thomas David, [redacted].
Naleid, Jerome Frederick, [redacted].
Bradburn, David Denison, [redacted].
Adams, Ranald Trevor, Jr., [redacted].
×Tallman, Kenneth Lee, [redacted].
Cole, Frank Ellsworth, [redacted].
Atkinson, Anderson Watkins, [redacted].
Christensen, Everett Eugene, [redacted].
Hafer, Frederick LeRoy, [redacted].
Allen, Lew, Jr., [redacted].
Colladay, Martin Grimes, [redacted].
Logan, Lewis Benjamin Castle, [redacted].
Lyman, Walter Alfred, [redacted].
Knight, Harry Russell, [redacted].
Wright, Robert Kenneth, [redacted].
Sherman, Milton, [redacted].
Hildebrandt, James Edwin, [redacted].
Buckley, Robert Clarence, [redacted].
Jernigan, Ernest Deloy, Jr., [redacted].
Williams, Henry Kirk, 3d, [redacted].
Evans, William John, [redacted].
Hauenstein, Charles Judd, [redacted].
Brothers, William Wesley, Jr., [redacted].
Lobdell, Harrison, Jr., [redacted].
Gorman, Robert Thomas, [redacted].
Chapman, Kenneth Richard, [redacted].
Brechwald, Edward Joseph, [redacted].
Williams, Harold, Jr., [redacted].
Hopkins, Herbert Ziegler, Jr., [redacted].
Fryberger, Philip Henry, [redacted].
Lester, Frank Gibson, [redacted].
×Heiberg, Harrison Howell Dodge, Jr., [redacted].
Lusk, Joe Fenton, [redacted].
Barricklow, John Alan, [redacted].
Deatrick, Eugene Peyton, Jr., [redacted].
×Baugh, Hale, [redacted].
Dresser, Richard Lloyd, [redacted].
Hackney, Donald Ingram, [redacted].
Upland, Robert Theodore, [redacted].
Berge, Truman Kent, Jr., [redacted].
Felices, Salvadore Enrique, [redacted].
Smith, Sam Hugh, [redacted].
Dunlap, Lloyd Leslie, Jr., [redacted].
Dosh, Robert Nathaniel, Jr., [redacted].
Burgess, Richard Benton, [redacted].
Clemenson, Robert Carey, [redacted].
Baisley, William Denton, [redacted].
Lundholm, Donald Alfred, [redacted].
Molchan, John Eugene, [redacted].
Galt, Richard Russell, [redacted].
×Poe, Bryce, 2d, [redacted].
Jenkins, William Henry, [redacted].
×Shawe, Hamilton Bruce, Jr., [redacted].
MacWilliams, Malcolm Means, [redacted].
Wayne, Robert Earl, [redacted].
Hamilton, Francis Frazee, [redacted].
Doolittle, John Prescott, [redacted].
Tribolet, Robert Webb, [redacted].
Hunt, Senour, [redacted].
Pitts, John Emmett, Jr., [redacted].
×Harton, William Martin, Jr., [redacted].
Wilson, Donald, Jr., [redacted].
Griffin, William Aiken, [redacted].
Jones, Gerald Marshall, [redacted].
Dorman, George Stanton, [redacted].
×Nemetz, Albert Michael, [redacted].
×Minor, John Max, [redacted].
Plank, David Heber, [redacted].
White, Richard Taylor, [redacted].
Umlauf, John Louis, [redacted].
Lowry, Robert Mason, Jr., [redacted].
Zeh, Theodore George, Jr., [redacted].
Stringer, Elbert Madison, [redacted].
McBride, Benjamin Ransom, [redacted].
Roddenberry, Harry H., Jr., [redacted].
Kimball, Jack Quentin, [redacted].
Paschall, James Ernest, [redacted].
Birdsall, Alan Homer, [redacted].
Richards, Marion Rich, [redacted].
Kellogg, Richard Allan, [redacted].
Hairston, Guy Edward, Jr., [redacted].
Hutto, Merl Galbreath, [redacted].
×Longarini, Edmond Charles, [redacted].
Clements, Philip Lee, Jr., [redacted].
Bodie, Jack Lowman, [redacted].
Denniston, Clyde Roscoe, Jr., [redacted].
Bowers, Grayson Hunter, Jr., [redacted].
Safford, Philip Riviere, [redacted].
Turner, Richard Hugh, [redacted].
Hilovsky, Steve Edward, [redacted].
Langstaff, Thomas Corbett, [redacted].
Withers, William Price, Jr., [redacted].
Carbine, James Thomas, Jr., [redacted].
Castle, Johnny Rudd, [redacted].
Green, Jesse Edward, [redacted].
×McPhee, Harry John, Jr., [redacted].
Grier, Samuel 3d, [redacted].
Lembeck, Edward Adams 2d, [redacted].
Burke, Robert Oscar, [redacted].
Reed, William Preston, [redacted].
Carnright, Richard Glenn, [redacted].
×Lacouture, Harold Francis, [redacted].
×Dobbs, Robert Lee, [redacted].
Korn, Alden Davis, [redacted].
Wilson, Robert Seedorf, [redacted].
Walsh, Robert Arthur, [redacted].
×Skladzien, Thaddeus Stephen, [redacted].
Weber, Marvin Octavius, Jr., [redacted].
Minnich, E. Scott, [redacted].
Whitfield, Raymond Palmer, Jr., [redacted].
Messmore, Donald Morgan, Jr., [redacted].
Gordon, Lawrence Norman, [redacted].
Gilbert, Raymond Harlan, Jr., [redacted].
Hughes, James Donald, [redacted].
Schmitt, John Jacob, Jr., [redacted].
Furuholmen, James Bjarne, [redacted].
Hudspeth, Roy Ritter, [redacted].
Cameron, Burton Gordon, [redacted].
×Wiedman, Charles Orion, [redacted].
×Moore, Arthur Raymond, Jr., [redacted].
×Yancey, William Burbridge, Jr., [redacted].
Miller, James Robert, [redacted].
Feibelman, Max Milton, [redacted].
Eichenberg, Robert John, [redacted].
×Berry, Waldron, [redacted].
Buckingham, Charles Edward, [redacted].
Newell, Richard Gordon, [redacted].
Horton, Clarence Frost, Jr., [redacted].
Ruggiero, Charles, Jr., [redacted].
×Clapp, William Lafayette, Jr., [redacted].
Fox, Harold Paul, Jr., [redacted].
Nelson, George Joseph, [redacted].
McMillan, Cornelius, Jr., [redacted].
Gordon, Mose William, Jr., [redacted].
Brosius, Charles William, [redacted].
×Rountree, Fred Brinson, [redacted].
Reed, Marvin Chapman, [redacted].
Memminger, Charles Gustavus, [redacted].
Melo, Eugene Emil, [redacted].
Bartholf, John Copeland, [redacted].
×Roney, William Rogers, [redacted].
Hopkins, Philip Bird, Jr., [redacted].
Harris, Edgar Starr, Jr., [redacted].
Martin, John Alexander, [redacted].
Norris, Paul Maxfield, [redacted].
×Walker, Robert Lawrence, [redacted].
Stees, Hubert Sheldon, Jr., [redacted].
Bowley, William Theodore, [redacted].
Parsons, Charles Henry, 2d, [redacted].
Chatfield, James David Lloyd, [redacted].
VanSickle, Earl Rosenquist, [redacted].
Jackson, John Wallace, [redacted].
Daye, Thomas Maldwyn, [redacted].
Flavin, Michael John, [redacted].
Schmidt, Julius Henry, Jr., [redacted].
Freshwater, Robert Earl, [redacted].
Zuppan, Lawrence Louis, Jr., [redacted].
Bajcura, Orestes Methodius, [redacted].
Norwood, Billie Jack, [redacted].
Murphy, Robert Denslow, [redacted].
Trexler, David Howerter, [redacted].
French, James Raymond, [redacted].
Potter, Campbell McLeod, [redacted].
Baxter, William Dee, [redacted].
Hicks, Arlie Hugh, Jr., [redacted].

MEDICAL

Clark, Ernest James, [redacted].
Wright, Walter Dick, [redacted].
Does, Charles Wordsworth, [redacted].
Crabtree, Sam Ferrell, [redacted].
George, John Wendell, [redacted].
Reynolds, George Edward, [redacted].
Gregory, R. D., Jr., [redacted].
Donnell, Alonzo McDonnell, Jr., [redacted].
McGrade, Hugh Patrick, [redacted].
Dewey, Walter Webber, [redacted].
Adams, Robert Harold, [redacted].
Schwarting, Bland Hugh, [redacted].
Fraysse, Louis Augustus, 3d, [redacted].
Austin, George Nicolo, [redacted].
Talley, Thomas Peter, [redacted].
Spiro, Franklyn Cyrus, [redacted].
Staples, Pelham Porter, Jr., [redacted].
Kruse, Francis, Jr., [redacted].
Hensen, James Paul, [redacted].
Smith, Arthur Gene, [redacted].
Levine, Robert, [redacted].
Graf, John Edward, [redacted].
Simmons, Frederic Rudolph, Jr., [redacted].
Eastwood, Herbert Kendrick, Jr., [redacted].
Van Pelt, James Fred, Jr., [redacted].
Hough, Jerald Pat, [redacted].
Sanford, Clarence Edward, [redacted].

DENTAL

×Sunberg, Paul Vernon, Jr., [redacted].
Strong, William Lawrence, [redacted].

VETERINARY

Dalziel, George Teddy, [redacted].

CHAPLAINS

Alt, Eugene Runkle, [redacted].
Shelton, David Knight, [redacted].
Puseman, Edmund Alexander, [redacted].
Carlock, Freddie Willard, [redacted].
Terry, Roy Morton, [redacted].

To be first lieutenants

AIR FORCE

×Collier, James Carlton, Jr., [redacted].
×Refson, Jacob Spencer, [redacted].
Oles, Francis John, [redacted].
Woods, John Paul, [redacted].
Stevens, Patrick Roy, [redacted].
Courlas, John George, [redacted].
Strother, James Williams, [redacted].
Proffitt, James Vernon, Jr., [redacted].
Schuman, Richard Paul, [redacted].
Bock, Charles Cornelius, Jr., [redacted].
Yingling, John Wright, [redacted].
×Duncan, Kenneth James, [redacted].
Geil, William Clinton, [redacted].
Coward, Roderick William, [redacted].

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, 81st Congress. The officer whose name is preceded by the symbol (×) is subject to physical examination required by law:

To be first lieutenants

NURSE

Selleck, Ada Louise, [redacted]
×MacDonald, Goldia Nadine, [redacted]

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Francis S. Low 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 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., 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 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 to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics).

The following-named line officers for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy, with the grades indicated:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

David A. Broad
Frederick D. Forger

LIEUTENANT

Roy D. Neufeldt

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Cecil G. Allison	Theodore E. Lide, Jr.
Richard S. Baird	Gale W. Nuernberger
George G. Dunn	William J. Shoemaker
John E. Fishburn III	Carlton B. Smith

ENSIGNS

Daniel S. Curran	Derrell B. Hauser
Gorman L. Fisher, Jr.	Murray A. Luftglass

The following-named ensign of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy for permanent appointment in the line:

Frederick J. Orrik, Jr.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Norma C. Furtos

SUPPLY CORPS

Dorothy M. Quinn

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

John Abbott	Edgar K. Lofton
James J. Ash	Preston Luke
Kenneth W. Atkinson	Frederick C. Marshall
Keith R. Bare	John E. Marshall
Albert T. Barr	Daniel N. Mealy
Robert E. Bennett	Robert E. Morgan
Joseph Brecka, Jr.	Charles P. Moore
Warran R. Brown	Fred S. Newman
Richard B. Campbell	Robert D. Norman
Charles C. Carter	William R. O'Connell
Thomas M. Castner	Louis C. Page, Jr.
William E. Clark	James H. Pressley, Jr.
James C. Clarke	Harold A. Riedl
Robert J. Duffy	George G. Russell
James R. Edixon	William G. Sizemore
Kenneth E. Enney	Gordon H. Smith
Jack E. Everling	Donald E. Sparks
Harry N. Farnsworth	Robert G. Stammer-
Robert W. Fero, Jr.	john
Arthur S. Fusco	Charles A. L. Swanson
William M. Golding	Benjamin W. Taylor
Jerome E. Hamill	Harold L. Terry
Martin H. Henry	Harry E. Thomas
Robert A. Holden	Richard G. Thomson
John C. Humphrey	William E. Tillerson
Roy T. Hynes	Ralph J. Touch
Robert N. Johnson	Marland W. Townsend
Francis N. Jones	Dennis A. Tuck
Isaac F. Jones	John H. Wachtel
Paul T. Karschnia	Edwin S. Wallace, Jr.
Jack E. Keller	Albert J. Weil
Edward J. Klapka	Henry T. White
Edward V. Laney, Jr.	George H. Willey
Robert L. Leydon	William O. Wirt

NURSE CORPS

Irene N. Dowe	Mary V. Redfern
Dorothy S. Mathewson	Clarissa M. Shaw
Rose M. Miller	

The following-named line ensigns of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Richard J. Biederman	Ward W. DeGroot III
Carl Courtright	Robert L. Jones
Walter E. Davis, Jr.	Warren G. Stevens

The following-named warrant officer of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CHIEF CARPENTER

Naaman Dingness

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS TO THE GRADES INDICATED

To be major general

William O. Brice

To be brigadier general

William J. Scheyer

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS TO THE GRADES INDICATED

To be major generals

Randolph McC. Pate	George F. Good, Jr.
Clayton C. Jerome	Merrill B. Twining
James A. Stuart	

To be brigadier generals

Frank D. Weir	Ion M. Bethel
Alexander W. Kreiser, Jr.	Nels H. Nelson
	David M. Shoup
Wilburt S. Brown	Francis B. Loomis, Jr.
John N. Hart	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Oswald C. J. Hoffman, director of public relations, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus Christ, son of the living God, who for our redetmption didst take the road to the palace of Pilate, to the brow of Calvary, and to the tomb of death, Thou wast smitten with our hands; Thy head was crowned with our thorns; Thou wast accused, condemned, and led as an innocent lamb to the slaughter, bearing the cross we had prepared for Thee; Thou wast pierced with our nails and given our gall to drink; our spear did wound Thee.

We walk the way with Thee in this week of Thy passion, O Redeemer of the world. Do Thou, by these most sacred pains deliver us from all our sins, and by Thy holy cross bring us sinners to the place where he came who prayed from the other cross, "Lord, remember me."

O God the Father, who didst remember us in sending Thy Son to be our redeemer, remember our Nation in its efforts to establish national well-being. Be with us, O God, in our endeavor to arrive at international concord. Make Thy power and presence known among us. Give us faith and love to serve Thee, together with faith and love to serve each other and all our fellow men. In the shadow of Thy Son's cross, and for His sake, we ask this. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 26, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 25, 1953:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives.

On March 27, 1953:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin.

On March 28, 1953:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

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 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.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1229. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 53–4.

RESIGNATION FROM STANDING COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 30, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY A. FINE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 30, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, The Capitol.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Standing Committee on House Administration.

Sincerely,

J. L. PILCHER,
Member of Congress.