

## SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1953

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis C. Vaeth, pastor, St. Bernardine's Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

O Divine Legislator, from whom all holy desires, right counsels, and just works do proceed, bless these loyal Senators of the United States with that perfect peace which the world cannot give, neither can it take away—that positive peace perpetuated by a consecrated conscientiousness of loyalty and devotion to God, to our Nation, and to our people and their fellow Senators. Enlighten their minds and strengthen their wills that they may direct their hearts to obey Thy commandments and thus, being freed from the fear of both domestic and foreign enemies, may satisfactorily serve their God, their Nation, and their people in peace, in justice, and in truth. Bless them with the courage of their honest and sincere convictions and convince them of their unselfish courage that they may realize in serving the Nation and its people they are truly serving Thee, the omniscient lawgiver and loving Father of all nations and all men. Reward their self-sacrificing service with that satisfying serenity of soul, promised by Thee to faithful servants—"Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord"—and so poetically paraphrased by Father Abrams Ryan:

"Better than grandeur, better than gold,  
Than ranks and titles a thousand fold,  
Is a healthy body and a mind at ease  
And simple pleasures that always please,  
A heart that can feel for another's woes  
With sympathy large enough to enfold  
All men, as brothers, is better than  
gold."

May the peace, blessing, strength, and wisdom of God abide with you always. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. PASTORE were excused from sessions of the Senate for the next few days, while attending to official committee business in New York City.

## MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., FORMER SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I call attention to the unanimous-consent order for today, which reads as follows:

*Ordered*, That on Monday, March 2, 1953, immediately following the approval of the Journal, it be in order for Senators to deliver addresses on the life, character, and public service of the late Honorable Robert

M. La Follette, Jr., formerly a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

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	Goldwater	McCarthy
Anderson	Gore	McClellan
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Bennett	Griswold	Monroney
Bricker	Hayden	Morse
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bush	Hennings	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Capehart	Humphrey	Purtell
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Ives	Russell
Chavez	Jackson	Saltonstall
Clements	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnson, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kefauver	Sparkman
Douglas	Kennedy	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Kuchel	Thye
Ellender	Langer	Tobey
Ferguson	Long	Watkins
Frear	Malone	Welker
Fulbright	Mansfield	Wiley
George	Maybank	Young
Gillette	McCarran	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to express my great distress because of the death of former Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and to say a few words in appreciation of his character and his outstanding public and legislative service.

I first met Bob La Follette when I came to the Senate in 1939. He was then a veteran Senator, having been first elected in 1925, 14 years before that time. He practically lived his entire life as a Senator. Because of a serious illness, he was not able to graduate from the University of Wisconsin, although his outstanding merit was recognized later by the conferring upon him of an honorary degree by that university. Instead of returning to college, he became secretary to his father in Washington and was thoroughly familiar with the practices and procedure of the Senate long before he became a Senator. When his father died he was elected to succeed him, and served continuously for 22 years. Although he was not a lawyer, he had a complete grasp of legal principles, and particularly of parliamentary law, and his outstanding ability enabled

him to be as good a legislator as any lawyer could be.

I served with him both on the Finance Committee and on the Education and Labor Committee, and so I came to know him intimately as a person and in connection with many legislative problems. He believed strongly in the principles of his father and adhered to those principles faithfully, with due regard, of course, to changing conditions. He was brought up in a school which believed in greater Government intervention in various matters, with respect to which he went somewhat further than I, but his abiding interest was always the welfare of the people. He was never a demagogue. He was always sincere, and the soul of honor itself. He had an able mind and could present the most effective arguments and reasons for his views. The speeches he made had a marked effect on many Senators, although he was not of their party.

When I came here he was one of that group, which I joined, which was fundamentally opposed to our entry into the Second World War until we were actually attacked, and he and I attended many meetings with Senators Johnson, of California, Borah, Vandenberg, and others who were concerned to maintain American neutrality as long as that could be accomplished. He was with the rest of us in the battle against the Lend-Lease Act, which was practically the turning point in the final decision to take part in the war.

I remember well our joint work on the Hill-Burton Act in the Education and Labor Committee, and I knew that he was not an extremist on Federal welfare measures, but was willing to protect the rights of the States and to adjust Federal aid to the necessities of particular communities and particular situations. He was a believer in sound finance, the balancing of the budget, and a stable currency. He was intensely interested in social security, and I worked with him on many amendments to that law.

I remember working with him on a subcommittee on the taxation of cooperative and mutual fire liability insurance companies. He was an ardent believer in the cooperative movement and felt that I did not have sufficient sympathy with it, although I thought I was quite friendly and agreed finally to a settlement of the problem which left the mutual insurance companies in almost too favorable a situation.

Many have referred to the work which he did in connection with the reorganization of the Senate. He knew more about the Senate than any other Senator, and had very definite ideas on how our work could be improved. I do not think he agreed with all the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act, but he certainly is entitled to credit for most of them and for modernization of the Senate organization.

In 1946, Bob La Follette suffered the kind of fate that is likely to meet any of us who depend on elective office, in part at least because he felt and expressed such a strong sense of loyalty to his progressive associates in Wisconsin. He never let his defeat affect his good humor or his interest in public matters. He became interested in other

work, and stayed away from the Senate, largely, I think, because he did not like the idea of any former Senator lobbying, or even being accused of lobbying. During these 6 years I have missed very much the personal association with him. Today I pay tribute to a man of outstanding character, a public servant devoted to his public employers, an outstanding statesman, and one of the greatest of Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as long as our people venerate integrity, statesmanship, and loyalty, the name of the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., will be cherished and honored in these United States.

It was not my privilege to serve with him in the Senate, and I make that statement with a deep sense of regret. But no one who lived and worked in Washington during the years of his service could fail to be aware of the contribution he made to his Nation.

The fighting son of a fighting father, Bob La Follette looked upon his position in the Senate as one which carried many obligations and few privileges. He looked upon public service as a challenge—a challenge to battle for the underprivileged and for the Nation.

He was a man who was never afraid of being in a minority—no matter how unpopular. He was a man who frequently found himself in disagreement with his colleagues, but his integrity was never challenged.

He was also a man of achievement—a man whose deeds still live in the form of laws and acts that touch our lives today. The legislative Reorganization Act is but one of his many accomplishments.

Every chapter must come to an end and Bob La Follette has gone to his eternal reward. Before the bar of history, there can be only one verdict—public servant, statesman, great American.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in paying my respects and tribute to a good man and a former colleague. I worked very closely with Bob La Follette from the time I came to this body in January 1941. He was one of the ablest public servants I have ever known. He was one of the few men, so far as I know, who could change a vote on the floor of the Senate by giving his opinion on pending legislation.

He was particularly watchful of those interests which might seek, through legislation, to obtain unwarranted advantages for themselves at the expense of the public or of their competitors. Although he was always watchful of what have come to be known as vested interests, I never knew him to be unfair toward them. He was always mindful of the needs of the laboring man, or the union man, if one wishes to use that term, but he was never their man, because he would not always do what they wanted him to do. He never hesitated to give the representatives and spokesmen of labor warnings when he thought they were trying to do something that they should not be doing, or tried to obtain what was not properly theirs. Perhaps he thus alienated the support of certain union labor interests in his State, which contributed to his defeat the last time he ran for public office.

He was always considerate of what we call the underprivileged, but I never knew of his trying to capitalize on his sympathy for them in the political field.

His last and perhaps his most important work was done on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. As those of us who were here then will recall, the bill came up late in the session. It was finally enacted during July, just before the primaries in Wisconsin which would determine whether he would be renominated for his office in the Senate.

I had heard disturbing rumors from Wisconsin, and in the early part of July I spoke to Bob and told him that he ought to go home, for his own good, to assure his renomination. He expressed himself as being apprehensive about it and felt that probably he would not be renominated; but he said he could not go home because he had to look after the bill. He felt that it had gone to the point where he could not leave it and go home in behalf of his renomination. Undoubtedly if he had gone home he would have been renominated. Nevertheless, he felt that his duty to the people of the Nation was more important than his renomination. There were those of us who disagreed with him on that point, but nevertheless he did what his conscience told him to do. He was defeated.

After his defeat he took up other lines of work. However, after he lost the nomination so far as I know, he never came back on the Hill, except once. Perhaps it was because some of us did not ask him to come back as we should have done. We get very careless about such things. I feel sometimes that we could have done more than we did to have made his outside work happier for him.

A few nights before Bob La Follette's death I was talking with a South American diplomat, who told me of the respect and esteem in which Bob La Follette was held in his country. Even after he left the Senate, he continued this good work.

Many of us who knew him best will miss him sadly, because we thought of him more often than we saw him. I think that the most we can do for him now and the best way in which we can pay our homage to his memory and to the work he did for his country is to try to do our work here as well as he did his work when he was one of us.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise to pay a brief tribute to Robert M. La Follette, Jr. My tribute will be completely unstudied and entirely sincere.

When Bob La Follette first began to serve this body his father was here. I am perhaps the only Member of the Senate who served with Robert M. La Follette, Sr., whom I recall very pleasantly, because shortly after I entered the Senate, he came over to me and talked with me. He knew some people in my State, and felt very close to some of my very warm friends.

Young Bob La Follette was virtually raised in the Senate and around the Capitol. He knew the procedures of the Senate perhaps better than anyone else, because he gave special attention to the work of the Senate, even before he succeeded his father as a Member of this body.

I served for a number of years with Bob La Follette, Jr., as a member of the Committee on Finance and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Bob La Follette became a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations in 1929, as I recall. I had been a member of the committee for perhaps 1 year or more before he entered upon his service on the committee. At that time, as now, distinguished Members of this body served on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Generally speaking, Bob La Follette shared the views of such eminent Senators as William E. Borah, of Idaho; Hiram Johnson, of California; and others, although after Pearl Harbor and after we entered the war, Bob La Follette gave his wholehearted and unstinted support to every effort to win that war.

I knew Bob La Follette perhaps best as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, because I was acting chairman of that committee, and subsequently was chairman of the committee, during a period when he served as a useful member. Bob La Follette always had his own views, in which he earnestly and sincerely believed, on all matters with which that committee had to deal. After he became a member of the committee, it considered not merely matters of taxation, but also matters relating to social security, including the present Social Security System—which was amended in 1950, after he left this body—and practically all veterans' legislation relating to World War I and, subsequently, that relating to World War II.

Bob La Follette had the keenest sympathy for men who labor, for the workers of the country. He had a thorough understanding of their problems. He had deep convictions regarding taxation. He believed profoundly in taxing according to ability to pay. I do not remember reporting a bill to the Senate or studying a bill in the Finance Committee without having Bob La Follette manifest his willingness to make known his views, and to make them known in the strongest possible terms.

Bob La Follette was a man of strong character, Mr. President. He could differ with his colleagues without ever questioning their honesty or integrity. He was a man of rare qualities with respect to his deep conviction that all members of the Finance Committee and all other Members of the Senate were entitled to hold their convictions; and rarely, if ever, did he question the honesty of purpose of anyone who differed with him on any important matter. Time after time he presented his view that taxes should be levied according to ability to pay. When the committee decided against him, as it generally did on that particular question, he acquiesced in the decision of the committee, but reserved his right to come to this floor and present his views. Many times he expressed his ideas here on taxation matters. He did so with great clarity, much force and vigor, and the utmost sincerity, but always with respect for other members of his own committee, and for other Members of the Senate who differed with him.

With respect to the administrative and technical side of the tax acts which the

committee had to formulate with great rapidity, and with respect to general provisions of taxation in which he had no particular interest, he made his contribution, nevertheless, and stood loyally by the committee in the presentation of so much of the tax or revenue measures as he could conscientiously endorse.

Bob La Follette was a realist in the true sense, and approached all subjects as a realist. Likewise he was a liberal in the true sense.

When we were entering the great depression, indeed, when we had entered it, although many men in public life did not comprehend the severity of that terrific economic storm, which was sweeping not only our own country but also a large part of the civilized world, Bob La Follette came upon this floor and urged the appropriation of a staggeringly large sum of money, for that day and time. I remember how he presented that proposal. I think I was the only conservative in this body who voted with Bob La Follette for an appropriation which would have been adequate, had it been resolutely used and applied in the early days of that depression, to have stemmed the terrific economic tide which carried down so many fortunes in this, our land. We were defeated, but Bob La Follette never forgot my vote on that political measure.

After he was defeated as a Member of this body, he came to my office during the first 2 or 3 weeks of every session of Congress and talked to me at length. I not only respected him, but I learned to love him because of his high sense of honor and because of his indefatigable industry and his great ability as a Member of this body.

He not only labored, of course, to bring about the Reorganization Act, but he understood something of the philosophy which lay back of his labors in trying to reform the procedure in the Senate. Time after time he came to me and talked to me about the articles which were appearing during the Second World War and afterward, from the pens of so many writers—articles which were, in fact bold attacks upon the Senate. Bob La Follette understood very early what they meant. He knew that those attacks were inspired by a desire to cripple representative government in these United States, and, indeed, in the free world. With deep conviction on the subject, he anxiously sought an opportunity to revise the rules and the procedure of the Senate. The Reorganization Act was but a feeble expression of what he wished to do. But being a realist, he knew that he had to take one step at a time; he had to make progress slowly.

On the Finance Committee and on the Foreign Relations Committee one could always count upon the position taken by Bob La Follette in committee to be his position steadfastly to the end. He was not given to compromise, but he knew that many pieces of legislation had to be the result of compromise. Consequently, he was willing to agree with his fellow members on those two important committees.

Having served with him on the Foreign Relations Committee, I know with what deep conviction he opposed our entry

into World War II, as his distinguished father before him had opposed our entry into World War I. He opposed every step which he considered to be leading to World War II, which finally engulfed us, of course, following the attack on Pearl Harbor.

It fell to my lot to confer with Secretary Stimson and others who were most interested in what we know as lend-lease legislation. In its formative stage, Bob La Follette often conferred with me regarding that particular piece of legislation. He did not approve it. He regarded it as a certain step toward war. Mr. President, it was as the result of a suggestion made in conference at the State Department with the then Secretary of State, with the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and others, that the lend-lease bill was introduced in both Houses of the Congress by the leaders of the major party. But it fell to my lot on this floor to carry the burden of the fight for lend-lease. Bob La Follette, while strongly and definitely disagreeing with the legislation, nevertheless accorded to me as he always did, complete honesty of purpose in presenting that legislation to this body.

It had seemed to me, Mr. President, for some months that we were becoming involved in the war then going on in Europe, and would ultimately become an active participant in it. But it seemed to me also that through lend-lease we might possibly avoid the necessity of entering it. We all know, of course, what happened. Hindsight, of course, is always better than foresight, particularly in a period of great crisis; but not once did Bob La Follette question the integrity, the motive, the purpose, and the high honor of anyone who sponsored lend-lease or any other piece of legislation which did not have his approval.

I recall that, shortly after we entered the war, a very serious question arose regarding oil. The late Senator Vandenberg, then a distinguished Senator from Michigan, Senator Bob La Follette, Jr., and two or three other Members of the Foreign Relations Committee were members of a subcommittee to study a very important agreement or treaty with respect to oil. Many matters were brought to us in confidence, and, when certain information reached us which, at that time, we were not free to divulge to the general public, Bob La Follette, who heard the facts, said that, regardless of the facts and regardless of every other consideration, he was willing to go all out to procure and to safeguard the oil which might become so vital to us in that great conflict.

So, Mr. President, I was deeply grieved at the passing of Bob La Follette. I suppose that each of us, at some time in life, passes through our Gethsemane.

Bob La Follette was a man of tireless industry, of unsullied integrity, and of fine purpose in life as a public servant. He loved the Senate. He resented every attack upon it as an attack, not only upon this body but upon representative government, upon free government. He acted always in accordance with his deep conviction that he was striving to better the condition of the common man, to better the condition of his fellow citizens. He knew what criticism was. When he

was but a boy he had observed severe criticism aimed at his distinguished father; but he did not carry bitterness as a result of it, he did not harbor any unworthy thoughts. From the first to the last, he was so straightforward in his own thinking, in his own integrity, in his own high purpose as a citizen and as a public servant, that he could not question the position of any man if he believed that the man held his position honestly and sincerely.

To his wife, who was truly his helpmeet, and to his two fine boys, I am sure the Senate wishes to express its deepest sympathy. To the great State of Wisconsin, likewise, I am sure the Senate wishes to express sympathy in connection with the passing of one of her distinguished sons who contributed so greatly to the history of that great State in this body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, when I first entered the Senate I had the privilege of serving with the late Senator La Follette on the Committee on Labor and Education, as it was then called, and, shortly afterward, on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can therefore join with my colleagues who have expressed themselves regarding their association with him in the performance of senatorial duties. Out of my own experience I desire to add a further word of tribute.

Young Bob La Follette commanded the genuine admiration and respect even of those who opposed his views. He was always a courageous, honest, and skillful fighter for the principles in which he believed. He, like his father before him, was a truly devoted public servant.

Bob La Follette, Jr., will chiefly be remembered for his work as chairman of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee. By exposing substandard working and living conditions this committee laid the groundwork for the social reforms which followed during the next 20 years and which have now become accepted parts of our political and economic fabric.

Senator La Follette's skill as a legislator and student of political science was illustrated by his accomplishments in the field of legislative reorganization. The La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act and the great improvements which it brought about in our legislative procedures testify to his energy, persistence, and devotion to the cause of efficient and responsible government.

Young Bob was a radical in a number of respects. With many of his views and ideas some of us could not agree. But he was a man of such great integrity and principle that he inevitably commanded the respect of all those who worked with him. His individual personality, as well as the large part which he played in the development of American political institutions and public policy, will be long and well remembered.

Mr. President, in the shock of his sad passing, I am overcome by the thought that one who worked among us here should have been the victim of a sad and uncontrollable depression. In the crowded hours through which we are all living do we become unaware of the sufferings of our close friends? He was able to sense the sufferings of his fellow human beings and he gave of himself, during

his life with us in the Senate, to alleviate those sufferings. When his hour of suffering came, were we too busy? Did we pass by on the other side? I cannot raise the question without a pang in my heart.

But I can say to his family and those whom he loved that he gave to us all a great something for which we are eternally indebted.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at its meeting on February 25, the Foreign Relations Committee authorized me, as chairman, to send to the widow and family of the former Senator from Wisconsin, Robert M. La Follette, Jr., a letter of condolence. I should like to read that letter now, and to incorporate it in the record of today's proceedings:

FEBRUARY 26, 1953.

Mrs. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. LA FOLLETTE: At a meeting on yesterday, February 25, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on which Senator La Follette served so long and so ably, authorized and directed me, as chairman, to convey to you the committee's deep sense of grief at the tragic death of your distinguished husband, and to extend to you its heartfelt sympathy in your hour of bereavement.

Those of us who were privileged to serve with Senator La Follette in the Senate and particularly in the closer companionship of the Foreign Relations Committee knew and loved him as a friend and a comrade whose courage, honesty, and integrity were an inspiration to us all. He was a man of high ideals, strong character, and extraordinary devotion to the principles of this Republic.

We were inexpressibly shocked and grieved, and we feel a deep sense of personal loss.

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Mr. President, I spoke briefly on the floor of the Senate on February 25 in memory of Bob La Follette, and submitted Senate Resolution 85, which was unanimously agreed to by the Senate as a whole. Mere words, however, are not sufficient to express our sense of sorrow at the passing of this great and good American though I do not think I have ever heard a finer encomium paid anyone than that which was paid this morning by the distinguished Senator from Georgia to my former associate Robert La Follette.

The vitality of Bob La Follette's ideas, his philosophy of living, indeed the strength of his personality make it impossible to think of him as less than alive and serving a cause in which he believed and in which he was deeply interested. It is immeasurably comforting now to know that he has but exchanged the shadow for the substance of existence, and that while he walked with other men, he gave the best of himself for the improvement of others. He had a great heart for humanity, a warmth and compassion for others that will not be forgotten.

One of his unique talents was an ability to translate that feeling for others into positive terms. The thousands of little men who profited from his contribution to a better way of life, to an elevated place in the sun, to an enhanced self-respect, cannot, indeed should never, overlook Bob La Follette's rich understanding of their needs, and, to the best of his ability, the supplying of those needs.

His was a mind not fenced in with dogma and preconceived notions of how to attain a worthy objective. If red-tape and outworn procedures stood in the way of progress, Senator La Follette was the first to find a way around such obstacles. And find a way he did, although he sometimes had to endure criticism and condemnation from those who wanted to stand still. In both word and deed he was a progressive in the true sense of that term.

A tireless and indefatigable worker, he was also selfless in his labor in the Senate. One might say of him that in the interests of increased efficiency in the legislative arm of his Government, he sacrificed his personal interests for the over-riding good; he neglected political considerations for what seemed to him far worthier goals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, there is nothing I can add to the eloquent statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in his tribute to young Bob La Follette, as he was affectionately called. The proudest and greatest privilege I have had in life was to serve in the Senate with such statesmen as George Norris, Hiram Johnson, William Borah, Burton K. Wheeler, and young Bob La Follette. All those men were true liberals in the best sense of that much abused word—they were progressives. Bob La Follette was by no manner of means the least of those men; in my book he did not take second place to any man. His heartbeat in understanding and sympathy for the oppressed; for the farmer; for the "little man"; for the man who could not be here to speak for himself. He was not radical in any sense of that ugly word; he was liberal and progressive in his thoughts about people and political theories. He was sound in his desire for good government. He wanted this Government to be the very best and he wanted it to be sound to the nth degree. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia has pointed out, he had a great love and a sincere respect for this body in which we are privileged to serve.

Approximately 3 weeks ago Bob La Follette called at my office and we had another of those delightful visits which I shall always remember. He visited me once or twice every year. We discussed many things. He was as interested as he ever was in what was taking place in the Congress, in the United States, and in the world and he was wide awake and alert as to what was happening. Although he has been in business—big business—for 6 years, none of his political views had undergone any revision.

Mr. President, I shall remember so long as I live the last visit I had with Bob La Follette.

I wish to associate myself with everything the Senator from Georgia had to say this morning with reference to Bob La Follette. I completely concur in his detailed and eloquent statement. I served on the Finance Committee with Senators GEORGE and La Follette and heard the arguments made there, and I know how sound Bob La Follette was on all tax questions.

As the Senator from Georgia put it, Bob La Follette insisted that taxes be

levied on the basis of ability to pay. He wanted Government to be based on the principle of justice, equality, and human welfare, and he fought for it along that line without compromise and without surrender. That should give us a true insight into the views of this thoughtful and forceful statesman on all political questions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., whose untimely passing we mourn today, was known as young Bob.

He will always be young Bob, for his spirit and mind were characterized by youthful courage, flexibility, and the quest for truth and facts. It has always been the young who seek new paths, new ways for meeting old problems; who reject the tyranny of labels.

Young Bob successfully carried on the magnificent work of his father, the old but ever new fight of independence in thought and politics.

Both old Bob and young Bob knew no allegiance but their loyalty to their country and to the principles of democracy. They waged courageous battles for freedom as a matter of conscience. They rejected the mere formalism of allegiance to a political party and embraced the more meaningful allegiance to ideas and programs.

As a Senator, young Bob was a Progressive—before that name was sullied by lesser men. He was an independent, and his work is a monument to freemen.

The work of the La Follette committee of the 1930's was one of the great contributions of modern times to the advancement of freedom. With courage and without favor, young Bob uncovered violence and repression and the more subtle interference with the freedom of action and mind which marks free citizens. He did not seek sensational headlines. He sought facts, and he sought realistic solutions which were consistent with democratic principles.

His final work as a Senator was the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That great reform, which compelled admiration and respect from both sides of the aisle, was accomplished in large measure by the leadership of young Bob. Disagreements and doubts were resolved by his intervention because of his earned reputation for integrity and devotion to the public good.

I hope I will be excused for making a personal comment. Young Bob was born in Madison, Wis., near my birthplace. Each year at the Dane County Fair I enjoyed a very happy association with the La Follette boys. They raised Shetland ponies, as did I. On most occasions they were successful in defeating me in the show ring. But I had one pony which they could not defeat. I shall never forget the fine lessons of sportsmanship young Bob taught me when I was a boy, because each year when that pony would win the blue ribbon, it would be young Bob who would be first to enter the ring to shake my hand, congratulate me, and say, "I still would like to own that pony."

I have felt a special kinship of spirit to the crusading independence of both the La Follettes, because of the great inspiration which their leadership has

been to me from the time I was a small boy.

Young Bob La Follette made a record of independent judgment and action which we cannot duplicate. But we can seek to follow and emulate the principles which guided the two Senators—which have staked out for them an immortal place in American history—which have contributed to a more vital and more free America.

Young Bob was a lover of the poems of Robert Burns. In my judgment, Burns wrote a great monument to young Bob when he penned these immortal lines:

**EPIGRAPH ON A FRIEND**  
(By Robert Burns)

An honest man here lies at rest,  
As e'er God with His image blest,  
The friend of man, the friend of truth,  
The friend of age, and guide of youth.

Few hearts like his, with virtue warm'd,  
Few heads with knowledge so inform'd.

To Bob La Follette's wife, Rachael, and his two boys, Mrs. Morse and I extend our deep sympathy, and pray for them God's comfort and blessings.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, few Senators throughout our history had such a wide and lasting impact upon America as did Robert M. La Follette, Jr.

Looking back upon the history of the years in which he served in this body, from 1925 to 1946, the imprint of "Young Bob" on the idealism of our democracy is found on the milestones of our progress.

Using different methods, but still aiming at fundamental improvements in democracy which his distinguished father had waged a single-handed fight to achieve, Bob La Follette lived to see many of these reforms become a permanent part of American life.

His success in following through on the paths charted by his father was due primarily to his devotion to his work and to his great appreciation of his responsibility as a Member of the Senate. He always knew and understood every fact of the problem with which he was dealing. He had an unbounded energy to carry through, regardless of the odds. His great skill as a parliamentarian, and the respect all Senators, regardless of political views, entertained for his sincerity and for his knowledge of any subject with which he was concerned, gave him leadership that few other Senators have enjoyed.

His efforts to guarantee to labor fundamental freedom to organize, his zeal for investigation into cases of oppression and violation of civil rights, and his desire to relieve the disaster of unemployment made him a leader in this field of legislation.

But his interest did not stop there. He spoke out strongly for a strong and a sound fiscal policy, and was one of the leaders in establishing a fair base for Federal revenue, one that put in plain focus the part of the load that every taxpayer was expected to carry.

His recognition of the aim of Stalin for world imperialism came early, and his exposure of it, and his constant efforts to safeguard American foreign policy against Communist duplicity, proved his foresight against this danger.

The finest experience of my service in the Congress came through my association with Bob La Follette. I was privileged to serve with him in the efforts to reorganize the Congress, and I well know the scope and breadth of his understanding of our legislative machinery. It was largely his vast knowledge of parliamentary government, its artificial roadblocks, and its deficiencies that led to the acceptance of the report of the Committee on Legislative Reorganization of which he was the chairman.

Hardly was the ink dry on the report when Bob La Follette was busy translating the report into legislation. With enthusiasm and energy, he completed the complicated drafting of the bill and then moved swiftly to secure its passage. I am firmly convinced that it was the personal leadership and recognized ability of Bob La Follette that secured consideration of the bill by the Senate and the House and opened the way for its enactment into law. Day after day, with patience and good humor, he explained the complicated bill and won for it the support that brought about its final passage.

As in most of his other efforts, he completely ignored his own personal political fortunes and stayed on the job to see the legislation through to final enactment, despite the fact that he was facing the most difficult political race of his career. Had he been able to return to his State for the primary campaign, instead of remaining in Washington, his loss of the nomination by 5,000 votes undoubtedly would not have occurred.

Because of his character, his leadership, his determination always to fight hard, but fairly, for the things he believed in, he added stature to the United States Senate. He scorned hypocrisy, demagoguery, and pretense. He had the courage of his convictions to fight alone, if necessary, for the things he believed were good for the country he loved. He had the good humor, the friendship, and the love of his fellow man that helped to carry through to enactment his ideas and ideals of good government.

It is small wonder that the record made by Robert La Follette, Jr., properly won for him national and international recognition.

Mr. President, so many of the great newspapers of our country have written of his contributions to our Government that I ask unanimous consent to have some of them included at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington News of February 25, 1953]

**BOB LA FOLLETTE**

News of the suicide of former Senator Robert M. La Follette comes as a shock to his thousands of friends and to the multitude of Americans who followed his public career.

Despondency over ill health is the only explanation offered, and indeed the only one that could make sense, for Bob La Follette was a man of tough and logical mind and of stout heart, with a body that long seemed to lack the stamina for the hard endeavor to which he applied himself.

Bob practically was born to public life. He was only five when his father, old Bob, was elected Governor of Wisconsin. After old

Bob went to the Senate, and the son reached the age to do the work. Young Bob served as his father's secretary, and upon his father's death, young Bob succeeded to his seat, and was reelected 3 times—serving, in all, 22 years in the Senate.

He grew in stature, usefulness, and influence. Bob never took the Senate floor without first mastering the subject on which he chose to speak—and when he spoke, other Senators listened. He was a progressive of the school founded by his father, among men of the caliber of Burton Wheeler, George Norris, and Bill Borah; men of a time and a philosophy not to be associated with the muddle-headedness which has been passed off as progressivism and liberalism in recent years.

Bob La Follette scorned pretense and hypocrisy and demagogery. He supported all the early reforms of the Roosevelt administration, but he parted company with the New Deal on its fiscal irresponsibility. He believed in pay-as-you-go government.

He opposed hidden taxation, and thought all taxes should be visible, painful, and broadly based, so that the people would be encouraged to police their Government's spending. At one time when the Roosevelt administration shifted its tax policy for punitive and political purposes, Senator La Follette stood up and said something which those who heard him will not forget.

"American business," he said, "can adjust itself to progressive legislation. But American business can never adjust to constant uncertainty."

A list of his accomplishments would fill many pages of this newspaper. We mention only a few:

His 1937 investigation of the "little steel" strike, which threw so much light on the labor-management troubles of that time. His coauthorship of the Congressional Reorganization Act, which won him the 1946 Collier's award as the outstanding Senator. His early understanding of and warnings against the Communist menace. His alertness to the dangers inherent in President Roosevelt's secret dealings with Stalin. His quick recognition that the United Nations would founder on the San Francisco Charter provision of the veto power.

We extend condolences to his family, and we regret to say that since Bob La Follette's defeat in 1946, we have not known his like in the United States Senate.

[From the Washington Post of February 26, 1953]

**ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.**

Robert M. La Follette, Jr., was the model of a high-minded and responsible Senator, and he left a lasting imprint on Congress in the Reorganization Act of 1946. He always regarded the modernization of the archaic procedures of Congress, embodied in the La Follette-Monroney Act, as his outstanding achievement, and doubtless it will be so recorded. But his 21 years of legislative service from 1925 to 1946 were filled with achievement. He fought hard for the progressive ideals charter by his father in such varied fields as minimum-wage legislation and the protection of civil liberties. He was a skilled parliamentarian and a clean fighter, and his gifts of persuasion won many to what had been a minority view. Even in his prewar isolationism he had the respect of his opponents for the sincerity of his conviction.

Bob La Follette was in a sense the victim of his own idealism. During the 1946 campaign he was too busy with the Reorganization Act to go back to Wisconsin and campaign. He had taken root in Washington, and he relied on the Progressive tradition in Wisconsin to see him through. He was less fortunate in this respect than Senator Vandenberg in Michigan. The Progressive Party had decayed, and Senator La Follette lost the Republican nomination by a mere 5,000 votes. Ironically it was the groups

he had befriended most—the liberals and particularly the labor unions—that ganged up to defeat him, and put in JOSEPH McCARTHY.

Mr. La Follette took his defeat stoically and without rancor. He threw himself into the battle for the Marshall plan; he became a member of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report; and he went into business as consultant to several large firms having interests in Latin America. His death by his own hand, no doubt occasioned by his persistent ill health, is deplorable.

[From the Madison Capital Times of February 25, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

The tragic gunshot that ended the dramatic life of young Bob La Follette Tuesday took from Wisconsin and the Nation a man whose greatness is denied by none. But it left, in bold relief, the monumental achievements of the 58 years of his life's span.

A great son of a great father, few men in America have packed into so short a time such outstanding achievement, so exciting a career, or so much devoted service to his fellow man.

Bob La Follette, it has been said, was born to serve. As a boy he stood by the side of his great father, striving in the monumental work that made the La Follette name and the name of Wisconsin familiar to the world. As a young man, he was with his father through the storm-tossed years of the fight to translate Wisconsin's achievements to the national scene. He knew what it meant early in life to feel the sting of calumny that so often falls on the head of a public servant devoted only to the welfare of the people. He stood by his father's side on the floor of the Senate of the United States and watched him escape assassination only by the intervention of other Senators with the assailant. As a sensitive young man, he lived through the era when his father was hung in effigy because of his stout-hearted battle for what he considered to be the best interests of the people of his country.

Another man, made of weaker stuff, would have emerged from these experiences cynical and embittered. But young Bob came through these experiences to take his own place in the public life of the Nation and carry on the tradition of public service which his father had established.

At the early age of 30 he took his place in the United States Senate to begin a career that was to extend over a period of 2 decades of noble achievement in the service of the people his father served so devotedly. It has been said, even by some of those who fought him hardest, that in those two decades he left a record that accords him the right to be considered among the greatest of the statesmen who have sat in the Senate.

To enumerate his achievements there is to recite a litany of the obvious. Respected, feared, and admired, he was the watchdog of the people's interests. Many of the great achievements of the New Deal era, which bore the name of other Senators, were the fruit of his long struggle alongside other independents such as Norris, of Nebraska; Cutting, of New Mexico, and Borah of Idaho. The Tennessee Valley Authority, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Wagner Act, unemployment relief, bank insurance, farm relief, and the other monuments of progressive government were but a few of the projects he helped to start and saw through to a successful conclusion.

Under his hand the La Follette Liberties Committee in the thirties exposed the conspiracy of force and corruption aimed at denying American workers their right to organize and bargain collectively. His patient work and long years of experience

shaped and put through the La Follette reorganization bill in the 73rd Congress.

Few men ever came to the Senate with greater responsibility. It was his task to fill the seat of a man whose ability, courage, and incorruptibility had won the admiration of a nation and a large part of the world. With simplicity and deep dedication young Bob went to work at the job of meeting that responsibility.

He suffered the same abuse and vilification his father suffered. He was red baited from one end of the country to the other. When he acquired a small piece of real estate to develop for a home for his family his enemies, by the use of fraudulent pictures, told the people of Wisconsin that he had purchased a large Virginia estate. He paid the price of devoted service to the people.

And, at last, when he was cut down and his 20 years of service were ended, it is perhaps his greatest tribute that it took a combination of the extremists on the right and on the left to do the job. It was the alliance of the right-wing Republicans and the Communists, then in control of the Wisconsin CIO, which brought his public career to an end.

It was characteristic of Bob La Follette that he could take this ironical twist of the political fates with the same good grace that marked his acceptance of the treatment given his father. He was able to do so because he was born and reared in the tradition of serving the people. He had learned well from his father that, in the cause which he served, the rewards are few and bitter.

But like his father he never lost faith through the long years of service in the ultimate success of the cause. He saw the many things for which his father fought become part of the lives of the people of his State. And after the death of his father he saw them take shape and become a part of the lives of the people of the Nation. And his great reward was to have had a part in shaping them in the United States Senate.

His father, like the great mass of the people of Wisconsin who today lead a better life because he lived, would have been proud of him.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 25, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

In the 105 years of its statehood, Wisconsin has been represented by 21 men in the United States Senate, and Robert M. La Follette, Jr., served the longest of any of them.

His senatorial career covered 22 years. That record is approached only by his father, with 19, and Timothy Otis Howe, who served 18 years between 1861 and 1879.

Young Bob entered the Senate in 1925 on his father's name. He was the youngest Member of that body since Henry Clay. He was scorned by the then controlling ultra-conservative leadership for his youth and for his allegiance to the midwestern liberal group that was soon to be labeled "the sons of the wild jackass." But when he departed in 1946, he held the highest respect of most Members of the Senate whatever their political leanings.

He earned this respect chiefly by his industry and his skill as a legislative technician. He was not the dramatic figure that his father had been, nor the brilliant orator, nor the stubborn fighter. He carried his points by his hard work in committee and by his mastery of subjects under discussion on the floor. He was the sort of Senator most appreciated by other Senators.

His last, and probably his greatest, contribution to the Congress and to the Nation was the Reorganization Act. In this he made a start on the streamlining of the legislative machinery. He had to overcome tradition and custom. Congress has back-tracked on the Reorganization Act since 1946, but it still stands as a monument to La

Follette's ability and as a model for future congressional reformers.

The Journal often disagreed with Senator La Follette on issues of the day—particularly his chronic isolationism (like his father's) and what appeared to be opportunistic exploiting of labor issues in the quest for votes.

But this newspaper never doubted his industry, ability, and personal honesty—and his essential desire to be of public service.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 25, 1953]

YOUNG BOB

The tragic death of Robert M. La Follette, Jr., will shock every American who has come to regard the family name he bore as the symbol of a tradition which America cannot do without.

Young Bob not only bore the name. As a United States Senator from Wisconsin for 21 years, he ably carried on the tradition. He may not have had as wide a range as his father, but by and large he stood for the same fearless independence, the same passionate regard for the rights of ordinary men, the same concern for economic justice widely distributed. Among the notable achievements of his career was the committee which investigated strikebreaking and oppressive labor practices in the thirties.

It was always the essence of political irony that when young Bob at length sought to find a home within the Republican Party, he was rejected in the Wisconsin primary and his distinguished senatorial career was ended. Subsequent history has doubled the irony of that 1946 primary which La Follette lost by 5,000 votes, for the man who beat him was JOSEPH P. McCARTHY, who now swaggers about the United States Senate as the living antithesis to the La Follette tradition.

On whatever evil days that tradition may fall, American politics cannot do without it. And if there are no La Follettes to carry it on, there will be others of other names and from other States. For what old Bob and young Bob stood for is the very essence of American democracy.

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, other Senators have expressed more ably than I can the views of Bob La Follette on public matters; but I would not want this occasion to pass without paying my very brief and small tribute to him as a man.

He was one of the first who came and shook my hand and offered to help me when I became a Member of this body. I shall never forget his kindness at that time. His friendship and helpfulness always remained available to me, and I took advantage of it.

I believe that the qualities of his which appealed to me most were his friendliness, his fairness, his objective look at questions of public policy, and his jealousy for the prestige of the body in which we sit. One could always approach Bob La Follette and expect a friendly reception and a fair appraisal of the question which one might ask. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] so well said, he was always listened to when he debated on the floor of the Senate. When he felt strongly he expressed himself forcefully and well on his side of the subject. Whether one agreed with him or not, he commanded respect.

I had many talks with him concerning the rules of the Senate and what could be done to improve them. He was very jealous of the prestige of the Senate. He was one of the best presiding officers

the Senate ever had. He insisted on order. He insisted on the rules of debate being observed. No matter who might be violating them, he never hesitated to express himself, and to endeavor to bring the Senate back within its rules.

One of the pleasantest afternoons of my life was an occasion when Bob La Follette visited the school in Massachusetts which his son was attending. He asked me to come to the school and take part in a debate in which he was acting as moderator, and in which his son was the leader on one side. We passed a very pleasant afternoon in friendly association with the young friends of his son. I shall always remember that occasion. Afterward we carried on a correspondence on the subject of the debate. Bob La Follette and I did not fully agree on certain points.

We certainly shall miss him as a man. The Senate has missed him as a Member of this body. I never felt that I knew him well enough to be called a really intimate friend. However, I shall always miss him, because of the respect in which he was held, and because of the opportunity which we always felt we had to approach him when we wished to do so. I have the utmost sympathy for the members of his family. I shall never forget my high regard for him.

**Mr. DOUGLAS.** Mr. President, the lives of Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and Robert M. La Follette, Jr., were closely joined. In a sense the son was the continuation of the father. They were both lives in the best American tradition. They were also lives which had in them a certain musical quality beginning with the stormy period of the career of the elder La Follette, and continuing into a period of relative serenity for the son.

The real political lives of the two spanned a period of approximately 60 years. It was in 1895, I believe, that Robert La Follette, Sr., made the fateful decision to challenge the entrenched political forces which were then dominating his State. The struggle was extremely bitter for 5 years, from 1895 to 1900, and Bob La Follette, Sr., was repeatedly defeated.

In 1900 he was elected Governor of Wisconsin, and he became probably one of the three or four great governors in the history of the United States. Reform after reform was put into effect—reforms which at the time were bitterly opposed and bitterly denounced, but which have virtually all proved their worth. I refer to such things as State income taxes, the regulation of the rates of public utilities, protective labor legislation, negotiation between labor and management of rules for the government of labor-management relations, the encouragement of farm cooperatives, and, perhaps most striking of all, the introduction of civil service into Wisconsin, under which there were blanketed into the civil service many of his political opponents who then held office. This demonstration of sincerity in connection with the civil service, even at his own cost, made a profound impression. The principle spread gradually to other States, such as New York and Massachusetts. Wisconsin under Fighting Bob

became a synonym for honesty and integrity.

It was a stormy period. In 1904, as I recall, Bob La Follette, Sr., was elected as a United States Senator. When he rose on the floor of the Senate to make his first speech, on the control which he thought big business interests exercised over the Nation, he was met with one of the most bitter slights any man could experience. Virtually the entire membership of the Senate rose and walked out into the cloakrooms, leaving him speaking alone. His reply was, "There will come a time when you will stay and listen."

Bob La Follette, Sr., was a stormy character. He lived in stormy times. He fought for unpopular ideas. People were either for or against him. There were no neutral opinions. He carried on his fight to defend the humble people of his country, whether they were workers, farmers, or consumers, against the great economic and political powers of the Nation. He took an extremely unpopular view at the outbreak of the First World War, a view which, from the standpoint of history, looking back, I now personally believe was mistaken, but a point of view which was honest, and which he followed at great personal cost to himself. At one time it nearly brought him expulsion from the United States Senate and possibly even a jail sentence.

He came through that terrible period with the respect not only of the Senate, but of the country. He was reelected in 1922, and in 1924 he ran for the office of President of the United States. Millions of us loved and respected him, and asked for nothing better than to tie his shoelaces. The campaign in 1924 was bitter and exhausting, and at its conclusion the father died.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said, Bob La Follette, Jr., was secretary to his father during this stormy period. He shared the anguish of his father. He experienced the sense of reflected unpopularity of his father; but it never dimmed his spirit.

He was appointed by the Governor of Wisconsin to succeed his father. So for 40 years there was a Robert M. La Follette representing the State of Wisconsin in the United States Senate. Never was a name better represented.

Bob La Follette, Jr., represented not only the State of Wisconsin, but also the United States of America. He represented wage earners who had little or no protection in the economic or political field. He represented farmers who were weak economically, and at that time weak politically. He represented humble housewives. As the Senator from Georgia has said, he was ever fair to those who held a different point of view; and while he opposed their policies, he loved them as people. The history of the Senate and the history of our Nation are the better for his life. He was a man of honor and integrity. He was a defender of civil liberties, an advocate of social security, and a supporter of decent labor legislation. He was never animated by hate but was always animated by love. He was a skilled

parliamentarian. He was one of the noblest of all Americans.

In a sense this is the best of the American tradition. In a sense the La Follettes remind me of one of the great symphonies of Beethoven. They begin with a stormy first and second movement, and then, despite the tragic end, move into the quieter movements. Struggle merges into reconciliation and a measure of serenity.

A noble contribution has been made to American life by the lives of these two great men, father and son. I am sure that not only do we send our love and greetings to Bob's wife, his children, and his family, but we also feel grateful and humble for his life, determined to be in some measure better men because we knew Bob La Follette.

**Mr. TOBEY.** Mr. President, I wish to endorse every word that has been uttered today by my colleagues in tribute to Bob La Follette. If ever a man was motivated by principles it was Bob La Follette. One of the principles by which he lived all his life was the principle first enunciated by Grover Cleveland: A public office is a public trust. Bob La Follette lived out that principle on the floor of the Senate and in his public life. He was a powerful defender of the people. He was their tribune.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my remarks. When the time comes for all of us to meet God, I hope we may be able to say with Bob La Follette, in all good conscience, "I have fought a good fight. I have kept faith. I have not been idle."

I close with the quotation, "Ave atque vale."

**Mr. HILL.** Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] had planned to be present today to pay his tribute to the memory of Bob La Follette. Unfortunately the Senator from New York is ill and cannot be here. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from New York.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The tragic death of former Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., is a source of sadness not only to those who were his friends and colleagues but to thousands of people who knew him only by name and reputation.

He was a great man and represented one of America's great traditions. He was the son and political heir of a great father—a man who broke ground for liberalism in the United States. Under the leadership of the La Follettes, the State of Wisconsin became one of the Nation's testing grounds for liberal ideas, most of which are now permanently enshrined in the laws of our land. When the La Follettes, father and son, espoused some of these ideas they were denounced as radical and revolutionary. Now they are accepted as part of the American way of life.

The people of New York especially have a deep feeling for the La Follette family and for the tradition which they helped to found and lead. What La Follette, the father, was doing in Wisconsin our own beloved Al Smith was doing in New York. New York and Wisconsin together pioneered in the field of social legislation—in the matter of workmen's compensation, child labor, and

the protection of working women. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt carried on in the State of New York, young Bob La Follette carried on in the State of Wisconsin. The two lines met when in 1936 young Bob La Follette, although by political label a Republican, supported Franklin D. Roosevelt, a Democrat, for reelection to the presidency.

It was my great privilege both as lieutenant governor and as governor of New York to maintain the close association between New York and Wisconsin which had existed under my predecessors. I recall that during the time I was lieutenant governor and our State was held in the grip of terrible unemployment, all of us took heart from the fight led by young Bob La Follette in the United States Senate to provide Federal relief for unemployment, to bring out into the light of day the stark and compelling facts of human misery which the national administration of that day would have preferred not to have acknowledged.

Bob La Follette was never a physically robust man. All his life he fought against poor health. He had great courage, both physically and morally. He was a deeply sincere man and a dedicated man.

I did not always agree with his viewpoint, especially on foreign policy in the years preceding World War II, but I always respected the integrity of his beliefs. Although I believe he erred in some respects, he was deeply and profoundly right in his understanding of the threat of communism. His bold and outspoken condemnation of that threat at a time when others were silent or actually "soft" toward communism, was a contributing factor, I am told, to his political defeat in 1946. It took only a few years to show the deep wisdom that was his. His spirit was crushed by the rejection he suffered at the hands of the voters of his party, and now 7 years later he has left the land of the living.

I did not have the privilege of serving in the Senate with him, but his spirit has been here even in his physical absence from the Senate. The spirit of Bob La Follette will remain here as one of the great traditions of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, last Wednesday, the day after the death of Bob La Follette I sought to pay my tribute to his memory, to his life, and to his services to his country. I shall not today repeat those words, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the fine tributes which have been paid to the memory of Bob La Follette by some of the leading newspapers of the country.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 26, 1953]

SENATOR ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

To those who knew the first Senator La Follette, the son who succeeded him was always affectionately called young Bob. But during his 22 years in the United States Senate the son proved himself time and time again as a mature, brave and skillful fighter for the principles in which he believed. Father and son were devoted public servants all their lives. It was comparatively early in his senatorial career that Robert Marion La Follette, Jr., chaired and directed the Senate Civil Liberties Committee in an exposure of working conditions and living standards that laid the groundwork for the reforms of the last 20 years.

The social legislation under which for the first time workers were protected in their right to organize, the breaking up of company-dominated unions, the development of the Fair Labor Standards Act and of the Social Security Act were made possible because

Senator La Follette exposed the abuses of social and economic power which made legislative correction imperative. The modern and model reorganization act designed to streamline legislative procedures in Congress stands as testimony to his legislative skill and understanding. In fact, it is widely believed that his determination to see that piece of work completed, even though it prevented him from returning to Wisconsin to campaign for his reelection to the Senate, permitted McCARTHY to win. Bob La Follette's great tradition and training in the field of civil liberties must have made him wonder whether the triumph of the reorganization bill's enactment was worth the price—for he had real respect for human beings.

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

It is true that Robert M. La Follette, Jr. got his political start in life because he was the son of his father, but he was much more than that. With none of "Fighting Bob's" flamboyance but with all of his intensity, the younger La Follette made an honored name in his own right and became one of the most esteemed and useful Members of the Senate of the United States.

Succeeding in 1925 to the Senate seat long held by his father, young Bob served the people of Wisconsin and of all the Nation for 21 eventful years. When he went down to defeat in the Republican primary of 1946 at the hands of one JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, he was still a relatively young man with promise of future political activity before him. But he decided otherwise, and it is safe to say that the Nation was the loser. For Bob La Follette had amply demonstrated that he was a public servant of integrity, industry, and ability.

Long before the economic collapse that led to the great depression Senator La Follette had shown his social consciousness by taking an active interest—and attempting to interest others—in the problems of national unemployment. By 1936 he had become chairman of the famous Senate Subcommittee on Civil Liberties, whose exposure of the methods then used to prevent union organization and collective bargaining had a profound effect on public thinking. If he had an inadequate perception of foreign relations, he had a keen understanding of domestic affairs, and he knew that one of the great problems of democratic government was to make its machinery work with a maximum of efficiency. To this end he helped fashion a far-reaching congressional reorganization act during his last term of office.

Insurgent and Independent, Republican, and Progressive—La Follette was in many ways a pioneer; and, as is so often true of pioneers, he made some political enemies as well as many devoted friends. But all of them held him in high respect, and his self-inflicted death brings to a tragic close a career of high distinction and of great service.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 26, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

Men in middle life will reflect with a start that to their younger colleagues the death of Robert M. La Follette, Jr., can have no special meaning. Yet for the first 45 years of this century, the La Follette name was one of the mightiest and most attractive in American political life. With Young Bob's defeat in 1946 as Senator from Wisconsin, the La Follettes went out of office, but the former Senator stayed on in Washington, a knowing and friendly man.

The elder La Follette with his famous white mane of hair embodied the best in the tradition of indigenous midwestern American radicalism. Constitutionally suspicious

of any power based on money, he looked upon the East and the easterners as almost by definition given to easy political sin. An isolationist in World War I, he had the older dream of an aloof America, a spot of paradise-like calm in an ugly and passion-torn world. He never really yielded that vision.

Young Bob had served as his father's secretary, and it was a natural thing for the Wisconsin electorate to name him Senator in his father's place. Coming to Washington in 1925, the youngest Senator since Henry Clay, the son rose rapidly to a place of real power in the insurgent wing of the Republican Party. The late Senators Norris and Borah were the vocalists of this bloc, in the late twenties and early thirties. "But the politics," wrote Frank R. Kent in the Sun, "the policies, the strategy, the organization and the energy are supplied by 'Little Bob.' He is the dynamo. \* \* \*"

In the Senate the younger La Follette made some injudicious sallies in the direction of his father's isolationism. But special prestige came from his investigations into employer abuses against labor unions in the pre-Wagner Act days. His lasting monument is the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by which the Congress was adapted for better service in a tumultuous age.

Since he was always not merely a liberal but a stoutly anti-Communist liberal, it was a dark paradox that La Follette was defeated in the end by Senator McCARTHY. Perhaps the spectacle of a La Follette in private life—and in Washington rather than Wisconsin—seemed to the ex-Senator as incongruous as it seemed to many political observers of his generation. His death will cause a special pang to those who knew him.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of February 26, 1953]

"YOUNG BOB" LA FOLLETTE

Robert M. La Follette, Jr., of Wisconsin, owed much to the magic name of his father, "Fighting Bob," for his rise in politics. But his own abilities and popularity enabled him to build a political career that kept him in the Senate for 21 years.

"Young Bob's" death at his own hand, apparently because of despondency over ill health, removes from the national scene one who was consistently liberal and independent. The pattern of liberalism and progressivism that maintained the La Follettes—father and sons, Robert and Philip—in political power for nearly half a century shifted in 1946 when "Young Bob" lost the Republican senatorial nomination to JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, then a little known circuit court judge. After succeeding his noted father in the Senate in 1925 he was elected to a full term in 1928 and twice was reelected on the Progressive ticket.

Senator La Follette found the atmosphere of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Dealism congenial, supporting the late President in his first three presidential campaigns. In FDR's campaign for a fourth term he stood aloof. He objected strenuously to Roosevelt's foreign policy before this country entered World War II. Sometimes he was referred to as an isolationist. He opposed lend-lease to Britain, neutrality law revision permitting American ships to carry munitions to belligerent ports, and selective service. But after the war he threw his support behind the Marshall plan for European recovery and the United Nations.

Senator La Follette's political beliefs frequently were at variance with those of his colleagues and he was sometimes out of tune with the voice of the country. But he earned respect, nevertheless. Said Senator WILEY of Wisconsin: "Whether or not we may have always agreed with him, we knew him as a determined fighter for his ideas—just, fair, friendly, industrious. He was a worthy heir of the unforgettable La Follette tradition of public service."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 26, 1953]

END OF A DYNASTY

The unfortunate death of Robert M. La Follette, Jr., ends a political dynasty that made its influence felt in this country for nearly half a century. Young Bob did not possess the magnetic personality of his famous father, nor his drive, but he carried on the family tradition of political independence and liberalism during his 21 years in the Senate.

Elected in 1925 to fill the seat left vacant by his father's death, he was the youngest Senator to enter Congress since Henry Clay.

In 1928 he was reelected as a Republican, but 6 years later he organized the Progressive Party with his brother, Philip, and was reelected in that year and again in 1940 as a Progressive. In 1946 he announced his return to the Republican fold, but ironically was defeated by a political unknown, JOSEPH R. McCARTHY. Since then he had been an economic adviser in Washington.

A dynasty has come to an end, but the tradition it symbolized remains.

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

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

The La Follettes of Wisconsin wrote a chapter in American politics that lives now only as a tradition. Young Bob was a part of that tradition. But in the hour of his tragic death it is not the political tradition but a certain gentleness, gallantry, and humility in his character as a man that is treasured as the personal memory of those who knew him. He fought cleanly and vigorously for what he believed, and defeat never robbed him of grace or dignity.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis., of February 25, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

Beyond the duties of the sociologist and the requirements of the law, it is probably within the province of no man to inquire into the reasons for another's self-destruction.

Yet the act that ended the life of Robert M. La Follette, Jr., was so foreign to the personality that it calls up bewilderment almost to the point of disbelief.

He was always the fighter. Though his once-brilliant and powerful political career may have been done, he was successful by any material standard. He was wealthy. He was important. He was respected. He was too big a man to have let political defeat corrode his soul. He was too responsible a man to have sought anything without reason sufficient unto himself and others.

It is left now, then, only to speculate upon and sympathize with the terrible tortures of ill health he must have suffered, more awful than his closest intimates must have known.

It is left, too, to sorrow and to regret this man's passing.

These words are set down by the Wisconsin State Journal through no mere dictate of taste and tradition of saying only well of the dead.

Through all his political lifetime, this newspaper and young Bob La Follette were political opponents. This newspaper fought him politically with every honorable means at hand. And he never pulled a punch at us, either.

Yet all the time you were fighting him you could like him, admire him, respect him for his fine intellect and his personal integrity.

The man who quarreled with him through the newspaper or on the platform could meet him personally and be greeted with grace and charm and good-hearted manliness. There was nothing petty or mean or vindictive about Bob La Follette. From his boyhood

in this, his hometown, he was known as a good fellow.

Even in his political record there was much to praise, much for gratitude from his bitterest enemies. They could and did count him dead wrong in his philosophies, attitudes, and approaches, yet grant him brilliance and courage in the technique of statesmanship. And he gave much of great good to national legislation.

He was blessed with strength and brains and the ambition to use both.

It is doubly tragic that such a man could not have had longer to give more from this great store.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of February 25, 1953]

BOB LA FOLLETTE

News of the suicide of former Senator Robert M. La Follette comes as a shock to his thousands of friends and the multitude of Americans who followed his public career.

Despondency over ill health is the only explanation offered and indeed the only one that could make sense. For Bob La Follette was a man of tough and logical mind and of stout heart, with a body that long seemed to lack the stamina for the hard endeavor to which he applied himself.

Bob practically was born to public life. He was only 5 when his father, old Bob, was elected Governor of Wisconsin. After old Bob went to the Senate, and the son reached the age to do the work, young Bob served as his father's secretary. And upon his father's death, young Bob succeeded to his seat, and was reelected three times—serving in all 22 years in Senate.

He grew in stature, usefulness and influence. Bob never took the Senate floor without first mastering the subject on which he chose to speak—and when he spoke, other Senators listened.

He was a progressive of the school founded by his father, among men of the caliber of Burton Wheeler, George Norris, and Bill Borah—men of a time and a philosophy not to be associated with the muddle-headedness which has been passed off as progressivism and liberalism in recent years.

Bob La Follette scorned pretense and hypocrisy and demagogery. He supported all the early reforms of the Roosevelt administration, but he parted company with the New Deal on its fiscal irresponsibility. He believed in pay-as-you-go Government.

He opposed hidden taxation, and thought all taxes should be visible, painful and broadly based, so that the people would be encouraged to police their Government's spending. At one time when the Roosevelt administration shifted its tax policy for punitive and political purposes, Senator La Follette stood up and said something which those who heard him will not forget.

"American business," he said, "can adjust itself to progressive legislation. But American business can never adjust itself to constant uncertainty."

A list of his accomplishments would fill many pages of this newspaper. We mention only a few:

His 1937 investigation of the Little Steel strike, which threw so much light on the labor-management troubles of that time. His coauthorship of the Congressional Reorganization Act, which won him the 1946 Collier's award as the outstanding Senator.

His early understanding of and warnings against the Communist menace. His alertness to the dangers inherent in President Roosevelt's secret dealings with Stalin. His quick recognition that the United Nations would flounder on the San Francisco Charter provision of the veto power.

We extend condolences to his family, and we regret to say that since Bob La Follette's defeat in 1946, we have not known his like in the United States Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I never had the privilege of serving in the Senate with Bob La Follette, but during 7½ years he served in the Senate I was honored by being a Member of the House of Representatives, along with the present junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY] and my colleague, the present junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who were also Members of the House. We were interested, along with Senator La Follette, in legislative reorganization proposals. The resulting legislation became known as the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act of 1946. Senator La Follette was not only considerate always of Members of the Senate, but I doubt that any Member of the Senate has spent more time conferring with Members of the House of Representatives than he did. He was always interested in working with the Members of the House in connection with this particular legislation.

I feel we have lost one of the greatest Americans of this time.

I shall not go into detail, but, in my opinion, one of the finest tributes that I have read on what Bob La Follette's life meant to our Nation was written by the thoughtful columnist, Thomas L. Stokes. His tribute was published in the Chattanooga Times of March 1, 1953. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in the remarks.

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

LA FOLLETTES KNEW HONESTY IN DISSENT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—The death here—tragically by his own hand—of the figure known for so many years as young Bob casts a shadow of sorrow for his host of friends while at the same time it throws a twilight nostalgic glow on a whole era of our history.

Former Senator Robert Marion La Follette, Jr., of Wisconsin, symbolized, as did his father before him, a native American progressivism, an honest and brave dissent, which left a deep and salutary imprint upon our American democracy.

That progressivism carries on today, though more freely, for it is confused and without the magnetic and sure leadership of its heyday. It copes with new and strange problems and issues in a Nation suddenly grown so big in itself and before the world, with its economic life highly organized and consolidated and, in some respects, regimented into giant industry, giant labor, and giant government. A clear path is hard to pick in the morass. The answers no longer are easy, though they never were so really.

But it survives, if we but stop to recognize it, wherever the dignity and independence of the human being shine out today. They do shine brightly, contrasted with the appearance on the scene of the elder Bob La Follette around the turn of the century, when men, women, and children worked at long hours in bleak surroundings for pitiful wages in the era of the exploiters. \* \* \* When our sometimes sainted empire builders, more vulgarly called robber barons by some historians, juggled railroads for stock market plunder and held State governments in their greedy hands, and took their toll from farmers in extortionate freight rates \* \* \* when their compatriots of like instinct ravaged our forests, as they did in Bob La Follette's Wisconsin, with no thought of the future \* \* \* when our farmers had little say about the marketing of their crops and the prices they would get and were victims of economic forces which they could not

understand and about which they could do little.

In changing all of this the American progressive tradition of dissent, in which the La Follettes were forceful leaders, had its influence. So great an influence, indeed, that eventually millions rallied about the La Follettes and those who stood with them, when the father was Governor and Senator, and when the son was a Senator. This became in time so great a multitude that the two great political parties blatantly cribbed from the Progressive philosophy, and inserted it, piece after piece, into the law of the land. What we call the New Deal bore in many of its worthy aspects the imprint of La Follette progressivism when it ultimately poured in a flood of legislation from a frantic Congress struggling to stem the tide of depression. It was a fertile yeast.

La Follette history goes way back, back far beyond the first-hand knowledge of this reporter who, however, knew and watched the elder in the sunset of his career, and knew and watched the younger through all his career of 21 years here in the Senate, which ended in 1946 with his defeat in the Republican primary by Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY. Flashbacks of remembered scenes tell much of the La Follette story in American politics and American life.

That late afternoon of July 4, 1924, in a dim hall in Cleveland when the 29-year-old young Bob, his round face aglow, accepted for his father, not present, the nomination for President on an independent ticket. The exultant delegates thrilled over the young man's rousing reading of his father's statement. Here it may be interpolated that Senator La Follette the father, bucking Coolidge prosperity, so-called, gave witness by the nearly 5,000,000 votes he polled of the distress and discontent then in the farm belt, for he polled a considerable vote in all the area beyond the Mississippi, running ahead of the Democratic candidate, John W. Davis, in 10 of those States. But the GOP hierarchy was unheeding of the cloud in the West, which broke in political catastrophe over its head 8 years later.

Memory brings back young Bob again, now a Senator in the seat of his father who had died in 1925, as he stood before the 1928 Kansas City Republican convention and offered once again, in vain, as so often before, the "La Follette platform." It was, of course, rejected, though virtually all of it now is law. He was, however, given a great ovation, a sportsmanlike gesture in lieu of votes for his platform—and in lieu of political vision.

Once again, after depression had broken over the land in waves of unemployed, young Bob comes back as he stood in his place in the Senate, day after day, and read in desolate detail, city by city, of what was happening to our people in depression. It was a grim and moving story that finally moved Congress to act.

And again, as he sat at the head of the table in a committee room directing the investigation into the abuse of civil liberties of American workers. That paved the way for reforms in a system of labor relations that still had jungle aspects. These reforms included the outlaw of brutality, with accompanying sawed-off shotguns and tear gas against strikers.

It is a story of political dissent and of economic progress. That would seem to have some meaning in this day when so many would squelch dissent, would suppress traditional native American progressivism, would confuse the issue by name-calling—Socialist, Communist, leftist, and such subterfuges.

Forgetting how we came to be what we are.

The VICE PRESIDENT. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair would like to make a brief statement.

Obviously there is little that can be added to the eloquent tributes which have been paid to Robert M. La Follette, Jr., by those who served with him. The present occupant of the chair, like the Senator from Tennessee, did not have that privilege. When I came to Washington in 1947 as a new Member of the House of Representatives I had the privilege of meeting and knowing Bob La Follette through mutual friends. He made a great and lasting impression on me, as he had on the many Members of the Senate who served with him. That impression particularly was that here was a man of great intellectual ability who was not plagued with what often goes by the name of intellectual arrogance or pride. Here was a man of great ability and humility who had respect for the abilities and views of others whom he could consider as not being his intellectual equals.

An indication of the esteem in which Bob La Follette was and is held by his colleagues is, as the Parliamentarian has informed the Chair, that this is the first time in the history of the Senate that a special day has been set aside for memorial services for a man who was not a Member of the Senate at the time of his death.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is investigating waterfront racketeering, be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the remainder of the week. The subcommittee proposes to hold executive hearings in New York during the remainder of this week. The members of the subcommittee are Mr. TOBEY, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. COOPER, Mr. POTTER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. PASTORE.

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

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Subcommittee on Judgeships of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Subcommittee on In-

vestigations of the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Foreign Relations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. WILEY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. CAPEHART, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

##### REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF, EXPENDITURES BY, AND DONATIONS TO THE LIGNITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the year 1952; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

##### REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

##### REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

##### AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Housing Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

##### AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

##### AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal National Mortgage Association, for the year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

##### REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ON PROGRAM FOR DISPOSAL TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the program for

disposal to private industry of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### 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 Illinois; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Resolution 25

"Whereas the State of Illinois has within its boundaries on Lake Michigan 976,640 acres of submerged lands which have been owned and claimed by the State and its grantees for over 100 years, and the State, its political subdivisions and grantees have expended millions of dollars in improvements along the shores of Lake Michigan on lands formerly covered by the waters of Lake Michigan; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Illinois Central R. R. Co. v. State of Illinois* (146 U. S. 387), held the Great Lakes to be 'open seas' and that Illinois' ownership of that portion of Lake Michigan within its boundaries rested upon the same rule of law as 'lands under tides-waters on the borders of the sea'; and

"Whereas State ownership of lands beneath the waters within the seaward boundaries of the State has been challenged and clouded by Federal officials in recent years, all of which constitutes a threat against the State of Illinois, its political subdivisions, and grantees in connection with its ownership of the above-mentioned lands; Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to enact legislation at the earliest possible date which would confirm and recognize in this State and its political subdivisions, its and their ownership and full rights in all lands beneath navigable waters within its boundaries, subject only to necessary Federal regulations in connection with international relationships, navigation, and defense; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President, the Vice President, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, and to each member of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives of the Congress."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Resolution 35

"Whereas the Federal Government annually takes from Illinois motorists millions of dollars in Federal motor fuel and automotive excise taxes; and

"Whereas the amount of these taxes collected in Illinois greatly exceeds the amount contributed by the Federal Government for the construction and maintenance of Federal highways in Illinois; and

"Whereas the continued policy of draining automotive revenues from Illinois without a commensurate benefit to the people of the State has seriously crippled our highway program; Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respectfully request the Federal Government to return to the State of Illinois all of the excise taxes collected in Illinois from automotive sources, including motor fuel, and that these excise taxes be used exclusively for the construction and maintenance of Federal highways in Illinois; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Presi-

dent of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Congress representing the State of Illinois."

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

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

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent, that—

"Whereas the State of Idaho produces and ships annually in interstate commerce an average of 50,000 carloads of potatoes classified as to United States grades; and

"Whereas a practice has arisen in marketing centers of repacking Idaho potatoes in inferior packs and without proper designation as to grade or quality; and

"Whereas Idaho potatoes are being repacked and reclassified and improperly displayed as to origin, grade, and quality; and

"Whereas the consuming public is being misled and deceived by the above practices; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 32d session of the Legislature in the State of Idaho (the House concurring), That we hereby urge upon the Congress of the United States to pass an act protecting the consumers of fresh vegetables as to the grades and origin, and that a fine be imposed upon any wholesale or retail dealer repacking under inferior grades or failing to properly advertise the origin of said fresh vegetables, or failing to reinspect such repacked potatoes by Federal inspection to determine the proper grade of such potatoes when displayed for sale or sold under any United States grade; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he is hereby authorized and directed, to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 11

"Memorializing Congress to deed the title to all of the area of Fort Logan except that area now used as a national cemetery, to the State of Colorado together with all appurtenances thereto

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein):

"SECTION 1. That whereas the State of Colorado is in urgent need of adequate housing facilities for the aged infirm.

"SEC. 2. That the facilities at the Pueblo State Hospital are no longer capable of handling increasing admissions.

"SEC. 3. That the State of Colorado faces financial crisis in apportioning available money to cover necessary State service.

"SEC. 4. That the city and county of Denver lacks a proper situs for the care, control, and treatment of alcoholics.

"SEC. 5. That the problem of caring for alcoholics has not been satisfactory and adds to the increasing tax load of Denver taxpayers.

"SEC. 6. That by deed in 1887 the State of Colorado deeded to the United States Government without cost 640 acres of land near Denver for the use of the United States Government as a military post. This was designated as Fort Logan, Colo. This land has been exempted from taxation by the State of Colorado for any purpose since that date.

"SEC. 7. That except for approximately 40 acres set aside as a national cemetery, Fort Logan is no longer a military post.

"SEC. 8. That Fort Logan has adequate brick and stone buildings containing sun

porches and wide expanses of lawn ideally suited for the proper housing and recreation of aged people. These buildings can be served from a central heating plant and water supply, and a central facility is available for preparation and distribution of food to the different housing units.

"SEC. 9. That there are available housing facilities for the people employed to care for the aged people residing there.

"SEC. 10. That certain buildings are located on the situs of Fort Logan which would be ideal for the housing, care, and treatment of alcoholics presently crowding the jail facilities in Denver and, whereas, the State of Colorado may contract with the city of Denver that the city of Denver may have the use of property belonging to the State of Colorado for so long as that specified purpose shall continue.

"SEC. 11. That certain facilities are being occupied by veterans as a veterans' housing project on part of the grounds of Fort Logan; that these facilities are not feasible for use for housing of aged people or for treatment of alcoholics; that the State of Colorado can contract with a legal entity set up to manage and operate such veterans' housing project; that the said legal entity shall have authority under such contract to manage and operate such veterans' housing project for so long as the project is operated as a veterans' housing project, and when said veterans' housing project shall no longer be operated as a veterans' housing project then and in that event the entire use, management, and control of said land constituting the area now used as a veterans' housing project shall revert to the State of Colorado absolutely.

"SEC. 12. That there are areas of tillable land in the Fort Logan area which can be well used for rehabilitation of alcoholics; be it further

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

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

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Whereas building of roads and highways since the inception of our Government has been primarily a State responsibility; and

"Whereas every State of the Union has tremendous problems in maintaining, extending, and building highways and bridges due to the lack of building program during the war-year period; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has always collected much more than they have sent back to the States for road-building purposes; and

"Whereas the costs of building and maintaining roads and highways have increased tremendously; and

"Whereas States have demonstrated they are willing, have, and do cooperate in building the federally designated highways; and

"Whereas the States sensed the responsibility of an integrated highway system as it relates to the national welfare; and

"Whereas the States have demonstrated that they can build adequate highways; and

"Whereas in many instances, many economies can be effected through sole State responsibility of building highways; and

"Whereas because of the foregoing facts and after due consideration, the Council of State Governments in national meeting December 7 in Chicago passed a resolution supporting this proposition, and the Governors' Conference in the national meeting in July 1952 unanimously passed a resolution supporting this proposition: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring

herein). That the 83d session of Congress give serious consideration to the question of eliminating the Federal gasoline tax and leaving that area of taxation entirely to the States; and be it further.

*Resolved*, That attested copies of this memorial be sent to the Presiding Officers of each House of the Congress and to each member of the Colorado delegation in Congress, and that copies thereof, showing that said memorial was adopted by the General Assembly of Colorado, be sent to each house of each legislature of each State of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States bills to grant aid to the Israeli Government; and

"Where it is the purpose of these bills to give financial aid in the form of grants to the Government of the ancient and traditional democracy now known as the Israeli State; and

"Whereas such assistance to the people of Israel in developing their natural resources, expanding their agricultural and industrial economy will mean a great productive capacity and will further the promotion of the security and general welfare of the United States and of Israel and will strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of the United States and of Israel; and

"Whereas such grants would further the basic objectives of the Charter of the United Nations: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to give intensive study and consideration to such bills now pending before the Congress of the United States, and to use its best efforts to have such proposed legislation enacted into law; and be it further.

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolution adopted by the Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, and Miami Townsend Club No. 22, both of Miami, in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of legislation to substitute the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan for the present social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, at Denver, Colo., relating to the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, at Denver, Colo., relating to international treaties and covenants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*House Concurrent Resolution 6*

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal section 1154 of title 18, U. S. C. A., known as the Indian liquor law and all laws and parts of laws in respect thereto which would treat an Indian differently than any other citizen of the State of South Dakota and of the United States of America

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):*

"Whereas Indians were declared to be citizens of the United States by act of Con-

gress in the year 1924 and have ever since assumed a share and responsibility in our Government not unlike other citizens; and

"Whereas Indians have fought and died for the right of full citizenship in all wars in which our country has been engaged. It is noted that many young Indian men are now lying dead and wounded on the battlefields of Korea; and

"Whereas the existence of the law aforementioned has resulted in unjustified discrimination against Indians; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has failed to enforce this law adequately and there is no prospect of improvement in this regard; and

"Whereas the prohibition in this regard, not unlike that imposed on the whole citizenry of this country before the repeal of the 18th amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, has had the effect of enhancing the value and desirability of obtaining and consuming these alcoholic beverages with disastrous results; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that the existence of this discriminatory law has had the effect of setting the Indian apart from other citizens and by so doing has materially retarded his assimilation into the general population; and

"Whereas the Office of Indian Affairs, numerous veterans organizations, medical groups, and the Indian people and non-Indian people alike, are unanimous in their desire for full repeal of this out-dated law: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to repeal outright section 1154 of title 18, U. S. C. A., known as the Indian liquor law and all laws or parts of laws in respect thereto which would treat an Indian differently than any other citizen of the State of South Dakota and of the United States of America; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators from South Dakota, to the Honorable E. Y. BERRY and the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress of the United States."

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

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

*"House Concurrent Resolution 1*

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the appropriation for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States and the allocation of funds to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry in the State of South Dakota in order to more adequately prosecute cooperative programs of livestock disease control and eradication

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):*

"Whereas the livestock industry of the State of South Dakota has for years past been faced with problems of animal diseases and control and eradication of such diseases; and

"Whereas the livestock sanitary authorities of the State of South Dakota have in the past been granted the thorough and adequate cooperation of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States; and

"Whereas the State of South Dakota has consistently from time to time increased the appropriation and emergency funds necessary for the use of the South Dakota Livestock Sanitary Board; and

"Whereas the present allocation of funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture of South Dakota is inadequate to successfully carry on the routine problems of TB retesting and control and to cope with the increasing problems of Bang's disease control, and problems involving the cooperation of the South Dakota Livestock Sanitary Board in the widespread program of solution of the problems of these and various other livestock diseases: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to materially increase the appropriation for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, and substantially increase the allocation of funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry for use in the State of South Dakota; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable KARL MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators from South Dakota, to the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE and the Honorable E. Y. BERRY, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress of the United States."

*"House Concurrent Resolution 5*

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds in lieu of taxes not received from nontaxable Indian land to the State of South Dakota for the benefit of the counties therein and to direct that such funds be used for welfare, law enforcement, road construction and maintenance, health, and education

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):*

"Whereas the Federal Government in times past entered into certain treaties with the Sioux Tribes in the State of South Dakota whereby large tracts of land located within said State were relieved from State taxation; and

"Whereas in recent years the Federal Government appropriation for Indian activities has been inadequate and has been taken up for the most part in administrative expenses including large Federal salaries, necessitating large expenditures by the State of South Dakota for Indian welfare and other activities with no probability of reimbursement therefor; and

"Whereas it is a solemn obligation of the United States Government to take care of all needy Sioux Indians until they become self-supporting and to keep such lands in a non-taxable status: Now, therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the use of the State of South Dakota and its counties in lieu of taxes not re-

ceived from nontaxable Indian lands, and thereby relieving counties in this State from the burden imposed by nontaxable Indian land and to direct that such funds be used for welfare, law enforcement, road construction and maintenance, health and education; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators from South Dakota, to the Honorable E. Y. BERRY and the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

**FARM PRICES — LETTER FROM HOLST-COPLEY FARMERS UNION, CLEARWATER COUNTY, BAGLEY, MINN.**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Holst-Copley Farmers Union Local, Clearwater County, Bagley, Minn., concerning the present situation with respect to falling farm prices be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

BAGLEY, MINN., February 23, 1953.  
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: As Secretary of the Holst-Copley Farmers Union Local, Clearwater County, I was instructed by resolution to write to you concerning the present falling farm prices. We, the northern Minnesota farmers, are much disturbed about these conditions and we urge that immediate action be taken to remedy this. We appreciate the splendid efforts you always put forth in the interest of the family farmer and will continue to support you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

ONNA SORENSEN,  
Secretary.

**FARM CREDIT—RESOLUTION OF RENVILLE COUNTY FARMERS UNION, RENVILLE, MINN.**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Renville County Farmers Union, Renville, Minn., on February 13, urging immediate and adequate funds for long-term agricultural credit at interest rates not to exceed 3 percent, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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 ON FARM CREDIT BY RENVILLE COUNTY FARMERS UNION, FEBRUARY 13, 1953**

Whereas the farmers of Renville County and the State of Minnesota have been hard hit by the drastic drop in prices they receive for their produce; and

Whereas the prices they must pay for the things they buy have not dropped; and

Whereas the farmers need adequate, long-term credit at fair interest rates to tide them over this difficult period; and

Whereas existing credit sources do not in fact provide such credit; and

Whereas failure to act promptly on this credit emergency means disaster for the family-size farm: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we petition our United States Senators and Congressmen and our State legislators to immediately introduce and press passage of legislation providing immediate and adequate funds for long-term agricultural credit at interest rates not to exceed 3 percent.

DALE D. HAEN,  
Secretary.

**RESOLUTIONS OF WHISPERING PINES FARMERS UNION, BAGLEY, MINN.**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three resolutions adopted at a recent meeting of the Whispering Pines Farmers Union at Bagley, Minn., be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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:

**RESOLUTION 1**

Whereas the drafting of our farm youth for military service has affected the productive efficiency of thousands of American farms, broken up homes and brought grief to thousands; and

Whereas three cooperative creameries in Minnesota have closed up because of labor shortages in their respective communities caused by the draft: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Whispering Pines Farmers Union Local, urge deferment from military duty of all boys whose knowledge and experience is contributing to the farm and factory production so essential to America's domestic welfare.

**RESOLUTION 2**

Whereas farm income has already dropped to dangerous levels; and

Whereas the 90 percent of parity price supports on butter will expire as of March 31: Be it

*Resolved*, That we urge price supports on dairy products of not less than 90 percent of parity be extended to guarantee continued safe farm income and abundant supplies for export to a hungry world which is violently revolting against hunger, poverty, and oppression.

**RESOLUTION 3**

Whereas President Eisenhower made specific and implied promises during this campaign: Be it

*Resolved*, That we remind President Eisenhower of those promises for "not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity" farm income; let us remind President Eisenhower, too, of his implied promise to end the Korean war and to provide a domestic "prosperity not based on war."

Respectfully submitted, we urge your official attention to help carry out these ideals.

WHISPERING PINES FARMERS UNION LOCAL,

MARTIN FREDERICKSON, President.

MRS. JOHN A. OLSON, Secretary.

**SALE OF DOMESTIC GOLD IN MARKETS OF WORLD—JOINT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF COLORADO**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have before me a joint resolution which was adopted by the Legislature of the State of Colorado. It is entitled "Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation granting domestic producers of gold to sell their product in the markets of the world—memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation authorizing the domestic producers of gold to sell the product of their labors in the markets of the world."

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and thereafter be properly referred.

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

**House Joint Memorial 3**

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation granting domestic producers of gold to sell their product in the markets of the world—Memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation authorizing the domestic producers of gold to sell the product of their labors in the markets of the world

*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation authorizing the sale of gold from domestic mines by the producers thereof on the open markets of the world at prices which prevail on those markets, without further restriction; be it further*

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to investigate the reasons for present restrictions upon the buying and selling of gold within and without the United States by citizens of the United States, which privilege is denied citizens of this country although extended to citizens of other countries, with no apparent harmful effects upon the economics of the respective countries in which gold is allowed to be bought and sold without government restriction; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States investigate and determine the reasons why the International Monetary Fund has consistently sidetracked the issue involved in raising the price of gold on an international basis to a realistic figure commensurate with the costs of production within gold-producing countries; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to take action now pending: "Recoinage of the \$10 gold pieces"; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and Congressmen representing those States in which gold is produced either as a primary product or as a byproduct from the production of other metals, and to the President of the United States, with the additional plea directed to the Chief Executive that immediate steps be taken to bring about the objectives set forth in this joint memorial.

**DEFINITION OF CERTAIN GASOLINE AND OTHER PETROLEUM PRODUCTS—LETTER FROM GENERAL COUNSEL, TREASURY DEPARTMENT**

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter from Elbert P. Tuttle, the new General Counsel of the Treasury Department, to Colin Stam, chief of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue and Taxation, with respect to changes in the definition of gasoline and other petroleum products now taxable under the Internal Revenue Code.

It will be noted that Mr. Tuttle's letter makes reference to and indorses in principle a bill I have introduced, S. 218, designed to repeal the tax on certain types of tractor fuel which are now taxable. Although the tax on these fuels is collected, it brings no revenue into the Treasury since it must all be refunded on the basis that it is not used in a highway-using vehicle. My bill is designed to cut out this needless red tape of collecting a tax which is all to be refunded, and, if enacted, my bill should save the Government a great deal of administrative expense.

It will be noted that Mr. Tuttle has asked for legislation to be drafted in general terms correcting this situation and also several similar situations. I have notified him that I intend to cooperate with the Treasury Department fully in this matter, and I have asked that all possible speed be made in drafting such legislation so that it can be acted upon very promptly.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD my bill, S. 218, following Mr. Tuttle's letter.

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

MR. COLIN F. STAM,

*Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Room 1011, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

FEBRUARY 17, 1953.

DEAR MR. STAM: Further reference is made to your letter of October 7, 1952, requesting the Department's views on a proposal which you have received to amend regulations 44, relating to the tax on gasoline, to redefine the term gasoline so as to exempt commercial solvents and naphthas from the tax on gasoline.

Under existing law the manufacturers' excise tax on gasoline applies to all products commonly or commercially known or sold as gasoline, including casinghead and natural gasoline, and including any petroleum product satisfying the volatility requirements of United States motor gasoline, whether it is ultimately used as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats, or airplanes, or whether it is used for any other purpose. However, commercial solvents and naphthas (as well as certain other similar products) are not taxable as gasoline when they are sold under an exemption certificate, obtained prior to or at the time of sale by the importer or producer, certifying that such products are purchased for use (1) otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats or airplanes, and (2) otherwise than in

the manufacture or production of such a fuel. Moreover, if commercial solvents or naphthas are sold tax-paid by the producer or importer to dealers, and such products are ultimately resold for non-motor-fuel uses, the producer or importer may secure a refund or credit where the ultimate user furnishes the required exemption certificate.

Your correspondent recommends that the regulations be amended by redefining gasoline so as to exclude commercial solvents and naphthas, thus eliminating the tax on these products regardless of their end use, and thereby eliminating the need for exemption certificates where these products are sold for non-motor-fuel uses. In support of this recommendation your correspondent argues that practically none of the commercial solvents and industrial naphthas are usable either alone or blended as fuel in engines. For the reasons indicated below the Department would not object to an amendment of the law which exempted commercial solvents and naphthas from the tax on gasoline, but does not feel that it could provide an exemption for these products under existing law by amendment of the regulations.

It is appropriate to note, in the consideration of this proposal, that it has the same basic purpose as one made by Senator HUGH BUTLER of Nebraska in a bill which he introduced in the 81st and 82d Congresses, and which he has again introduced in the present session of Congress, to exempt farm tractor fuel from the tax on gasoline. Senator BUTLER's bill would accomplish this purpose by amending section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, so as to exclude from the definition of the term gasoline any product 10 per centum of which is recovered at not less than 250 degrees Fahrenheit and not more than 90 per centum of which is recovered at 446 degrees Fahrenheit. When it last reported to the Senate Finance Committee on Senator BUTLER's proposal (report dated July 7, 1952, on S. 2758, 82d Congress, 2d Session), the Department indicated that it would have no objection to a bill which exempted farm tractor fuel from the tax on gasoline, provided this was done by simply naming farm tractor fuel as a kind of fuel exempt from the tax rather than by providing for an exemption through specifically prescribed distillation tests. In taking this position the Department recognized that there is a relatively limited possibility that farm tractor fuel would be used as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, and that elimination of the need for exemption certificates in the case of farm tractor fuel would have certain advantages both for the taxpayer and for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

It would appear that the arguments in favor of exempting farm tractor fuel from the tax on gasoline are equally applicable in the case of commercial solvents and naphthas, and, accordingly, the Department would not object to an amendment of section 3412 of the Internal Revenue Code which exempted these products by name from the tax on gasoline. As in the case of farm tractor fuel, the Department feels that an exemption should not be provided through specifically prescribed distillation tests. If commercial solvents and naphthas were named as products exempt from the tax, the Department would by regulations prescribe the distillation tests which it would be necessary for such products to meet in order to be within the exemption. Such an approach would provide a desirable degree of administrative flexibility so that, as new fuels are developed or new uses found for old fuels, the distillation tests could be changed to meet the new conditions. Moreover, this approach would be consistent with the approach previously used in providing specific exemptions for kerosene, gas oil, and fuel oil.

While the Department would not object to a statutory exemption for commercial

solvents and naphthas, it does not feel that it can provide an exemption for these products under existing law by amendment of the regulations. After the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1932, which originally imposed the tax on gasoline, numerous conferences were held with representatives of the Bureau of Standards and members of the petroleum industry in order to determine the dividing line between those products commonly or commercially known as gasoline which are taxable regardless of their classifications or uses and those products which are only taxable when sold as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats, or airplanes. As a result of these conferences the conclusion was reached that in determining the taxability of the various products the Department would be required to rely on their distillation temperatures.

In determining the taxability of the liquids other than gasoline which are specifically named in the law, like naphtha, and of all other liquids which are taxable because they are prepared, advertised, offered for sale, or sold for use as, or used as, motor fuel, the Department has relied on the Standard Method of Tests for Distillation of Gasoline, Naphtha, Kerosene, and Similar Petroleum Products (A. S. T. M. designation: D86) of the American Society for Testing Materials. It has been found since June 21, 1932, the effective date of the statute imposing the tax on gasoline, that most commercial solvents and naphthas meet these specifications. Thus, in order to maintain a consistent policy the Department has held that sales of commercial solvents and naphthas, 10 percent of which has been recovered when the thermometer reads 347 degrees Fahrenheit, or 95 percent of which has been recovered when the thermometer reads 464 degrees Fahrenheit, are subject to tax unless sold under exemption certificates for use otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats, or airplanes.

In view of the fact that naphtha is specifically named in the law as a liquid subject to the gasoline tax except when used for nonmotor fuel purposes, the Department feels that it does not have the authority to exempt naphtha from the tax on gasoline without regard to its end use by amendment of the regulations. In this connection it should be noted that specific exemptions have been provided by the code for certain liquids without regard to their end use, namely, kerosene, gas oil, and fuel oil. Moreover, in view of the specific provisions of the code, the Department is of the opinion that it could not by regulations exempt commercial solvents from the tax without affording a similar exemption to other products having the same or comparable distillation temperatures and sold for nonmotor fuel uses. Under the circumstances it would seem that an exemption from the gasoline tax for commercial solvents and naphthas, or for any other liquids which study may indicate could properly be exempted from the tax without regard to end use, should be accomplished by an amendment of the law.

I have asked the Bureau to undertake a complete study of the base of the gasoline tax and to prepare a draft of legislation which would exclude from the tax base commercial solvents, naphthas, farm tractor fuel, and any other products which the study indicates are not used as fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats, or airplanes.

Very truly yours,

ELBERT P. TUTTLE,  
General Counsel.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on gasoline), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or any product 10 percent of which

is recovered at not less than 250 degrees Fahrenheit and not more than 90 percent of which is recovered at 446 degrees Fahrenheit."

#### LONGSHOREMEN STRIKES — RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF HAWAII

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii relating to my bill which is designed to protect the people of the Territories against the crippling effects of the periodic strikes among the longshoremen and in the shipping industry, such as they have experienced in the past.

I am afraid most people in the 48 States do not realize how terribly destructive such strikes have been to the economic life and prosperity of the people of Hawaii and Alaska. I am not so much interested in the kind statements about myself contained in this resolution, although they are very flattering, of course. I would like to have this resolution incorporated in the RECORD to demonstrate to the Senate how urgent this problem is and how strongly the people of Hawaii feel about it. I recommend this resolution to the attention of the Senate and House committees which are now studying proposed changes to the Taft-Hartley Act.

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

Whereas in recent years labor disputes along the waterfront have frequently interrupted ocean transportation service between the mainland of the United States and the Territory of Hawaii; and

Whereas the effect of these waterfront disputes have been to paralyze and severely damage the economy of the Territory; and

Whereas the Honorable HUGH BUTLER, United States Senator from the State of Nebraska, has on January 7, 1953, introduced a bill, S. 225, in the United States Senate designed to prevent interruptions to ocean transportation service between the United States and its Territories and possessions as a result of labor disputes; and

Whereas Senator BUTLER has, by the introduction of S. 225, further indicated his genuine interest in the welfare and economic well-being of the people of the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That we do by this means express our appreciation to Senator BUTLER for his intense interest in the welfare and economic well-being of the people of the Territory of Hawaii and commend him for his effort to free Hawaii from shipping tieups by the introduction of S. 225; and be it further*

*Resolved, That a duly certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to Senator BUTLER.*

#### RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION, SALINA, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, preliminary to the gathering again this year in Washington of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Kansas Society Daughters of the American Revolution assembled in their 55th annual conference, in Salina, Kans., has adopted a number of resolutions, pro-American in character and indicative of the love and loyalty the members of this organiza-

tion show toward the principles upon which this country was founded.

I ask the unanimous consent for the insertion of these resolutions in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTIONS OF THE KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, 55TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, SALINA, KANS., FEBRUARY 18 THROUGH 21, 1953

*Resolved, That the 55th State Conference, Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at this session ratify the resolutions still applicable adopted by the 61st Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Washington, D. C., April 14 to 18, 1952; and*

*Resolved, That we quote for reemphasis a number of the resolutions of our national society by incorporating them, wholly or in part, into our resolutions here.*

#### II. OBSERVANCE OF PATRIOTIC ANNIVERSARIES

##### *American Independence Day*

Whereas the character of a nation is judged and its people inspired by its national celebrations; and

Whereas many citizens in the United States seem to forget or disregard the original patriotic and spiritual intent of our national holidays; and

Whereas we sorely need greater devotion to the principles of our Declaration of Independence: Be it

*Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, heartily commend those communities, counties, and cities in Kansas that on the Fourth of July, 1952, made of it a day of fine patriotic celebrations and programs; be it further*

*Resolved, That we urge all members and chapters to lend every influence and assistance toward making the day one of real patriotism on which the deeds and the principles for which our forefathers gave their talents, fortunes, and lives, be recounted in song and story; and be it further*

*Resolved, That we make it a duty to see that the Stars and Stripes are displayed in all proper public places, and at our own homes.*

##### *Constitution Day, September 17*

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by resolution which in turn was signed by the President on February 29, 1952, created Citizenship Day, designed to replace Constitution Day: Be it

*Resolved, That Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge its members and chapters to continue to observe and preserve the original significance and name of Constitution Day; and be it*

*Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be encouraged to rescind the action establishing Citizenship Day to replace Constitution Day.*

#### III. THE FLAG

##### *Display of the flag*

Whereas the flag of the United States of America is the revered symbol of national sovereignty and represents the unity of our Nation; and

Whereas misguided efforts have been made on United States soil to fly other flags in the position of honor upon certain occasions; and

Whereas our national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, through insistent effort has called such circumstances to the attention of the Congress; and

Whereas by such effort the United States Army chiefs responded in April 1952 by clarifying in the minds of citizens the proper honor to be accorded the Stars and Stripes of our Nation; therefore be it known to all citizens and to the members of Daughters of the American Revolution that no other flag,

national nor international, shall be displayed over, or in place of, the flag of the United States of America on United States soil, nor on United States ships at sea: Be it

*Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge through its Senators the immediate action by the Judiciary Committee of the House upon S. 2039, passed by the Senate April 22, 1952, which prohibits the display of any flag in the United States of America in a position of equal or superior prominence to the Stars and Stripes.*

##### *Scouts pledge to the flag*

Whereas it has been reported that some overenthusiastic or misinformed leaders of some of our Girl and Boy Scout troops in some States have made the error of having the troop under their guidance give a pledge of allegiance or a flag salute to the United Nations flag; and

Whereas we are all very proud of the fine patriotism and splendid training of our 3 million Scouts in America: Be it

*Resolved, That we, as members of Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, and as guardians of American girls and boys, the flower and the hope of our Nation, be very alert to any influence of any individual who would regiment these groups toward any loyalties inimical to our Nation's welfare.*

##### *The flag at polling places*

Whereas Federal law 829, the flag code, requires that the flag be displayed at all polling places on election days: Be it

*Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge members to protest any neglect of such observance in our State and our own voting places.*

#### IV. GOVERNMENT BY TREATIES

Whereas the battle for the freedom and independence of the United States has moved from battlefields to the State Department through negotiations of international conventions and treaties, which become the supreme law of the land as soon as ratified by the Senate; and

Whereas treaties already ratified and others now in the process of negotiation and ratification will destroy our time honored constitutional protections for life, liberty, and property; wipe out the finely balanced constitutional jurisdiction of our individual States; and subject every citizen of the United States to the enforcement of laws enacted by internationalists and an assortment of world parliaments; and

Whereas all these provisions and conventions presented under the plan of the various and numerous divisions of the United Nations are deftly set forth in the folder literature of the named division—as for example, to name but several—the subtle International Labor Organization (the ILO and ITO), the oft-exposed Genocide Convention, and UNESCO's educational program for world citizenship; and

Whereas in the Steel case, three Justices of the Supreme Court expressed the opinion that some of the recently ratified treaties had given the President of the United States authority to seize the property of the steel companies, the Constitution of the United States notwithstanding; and

Whereas State courts have held that these same treaties have suspended the marriage laws and land laws of several States in our Union: Be it

*Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in this 55th State conference, give unqualified support to the passage of Senate bill 1, called the Bricker amendment, which would place all treaties as subservient to the Constitution of the United States and would limit the time, during which treaties might be operative, to the administration under which they were negotiated: Be it*

*Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend the position of President Eisenhower that*

past secret treaties negotiated by any Government officials be repudiated.

#### V. UNITED NATIONS

Whereas, since the adoption of the United Nations Charter to promote and maintain peace, the world has continued in a state of turmoil and hostility, with member nations arraigned on opposite sides in this titanic struggle of communism versus freedom; and

Whereas frequently the General Assembly of the United Nations is used as a sounding board for free dissemination of Communist propaganda; and

Whereas the United States Secretariat provides asylum for spies and disloyal citizens: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, deplores this abuse of the privileges of the United Nations and, while the wisdom of remaining a member of this organization has been questioned, commends the McCarran committee in its attempts to eliminate subversive employees from the United Nations Secretariat.

#### VI. UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas thinking Americans know there is a need for constant vigilance against all subversive forces in our midst: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, expresses thanks to the Congress of the United States for its support of a Committee on Un-American Activities and urges its continued support of this committee.

#### VII. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, reaffirms its unqualified faith in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the present Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

#### VIII. IMMIGRATION

Whereas there has developed a campaign to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act which became a law of the United States on December 24, 1952; and

Whereas this bill was the result of a 4-year careful study and analysis of our immigration practices, which had not had revision in over a century; and

Whereas the act was passed by an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives and again overwhelmingly carried over President Truman's veto: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution urges Congress to retain the McCarran-Walter act to ward off attempts to weaken or modify this act; and to continue to screen aliens carefully and keep the present immigration quotas.

#### IX. OUR AMERICAN YOUTH

##### *Education for Americanism*

*Resolved*, That United States history which is offered in the curriculum of our Kansas schools be emphasized as the core of the social studies, and that it be actually taught rather than neglected and sometimes left out by a busy teacher in favor of some more intriguing portion of the unit; and further

*Resolved*, That the subject of history of the United States be presented from textbooks and by teachers in such manner as to inspire students with respect, appreciation, and a desire to emulate the Founding Fathers and all of those patriots who have preserved, protected, and maintained our American way of life.

#### X. UNESCO BOOKLETS

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution commands the Los Angeles School Board for banning the booklets of UNESCO from its schools and urges all of its members to work to ban UNESCO teaching from all our schools.

#### XI. CHILDREN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Whereas the conflict between the principles of our Republic and the doctrines of to-

talitarianism is growing in strength and tenacity, thereby with ever increasing insistence, threatening the future of the youth of today; and

Whereas the Society of the Children of the American Revolution is devoted to the instruction of its members in the fundamental principles of our Government, respect for constitutional authority, obedience to law, and devotion to the United States of America and its flag: Be it

*Resolved*, That the members of the Kansas Society Daughters of the American Revolution continue their interest in the Society of the Children of the American Revolution who are naturally entitled to be cherished as the special charges and dearest wards of the parent society; and further

*Resolved*, That we express our great pride in the growth and the activities of our Kansas Children of the American Revolution.

#### XII. NARCOTICS

Whereas chiefs of police throughout America have reported within recent weeks an alarming trend in the increase of drug addiction and the growing narcotic traffic among minors, a most serious menace to the youth of our country in all localities and on all economic levels; and

Whereas adequate laws to punish have not been enacted that are commensurate with the degree of the crime committed by the narcotic peddler; and

Whereas the State of Georgia now gives life imprisonment for the first conviction of selling narcotics to a minor and shows a decrease in the use of narcotics in the State: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, requests the passage of laws, similar to Georgia, by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, wherein life imprisonment is the penalty for the first conviction for selling narcotics to a minor.

#### XIII

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Society Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its opposition to Federal aid to education; to socialized medicine; and to compulsory health insurance; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its opposition to the adoption of the Covenant on Human Rights and to the Genocide Convention.

#### XIV. RETURN TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Whereas the Federal Government of the United States now owns 27 percent of the land in the United States, besides controlling vast enterprises for military production and a number of huge authorities over water and power, all operated at costs far above their returns; and

Whereas such deficit operations must be met with taxpayers' money: Be it

*Resolved*, That Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express its conviction that as rapidly as possible such acquired lands as are capable of agricultural or other private enterprise be opened for resale or allocated to returned soldiers for homemaking, and that all those operations where the Government is a competitor of private business be resold to persons, or companies, capable of operating them at a profit for individuals interested. Thus the taxes upon such individual operation can be used for the support of legitimate government; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, heartily endorse the release of controls and that we support all such administrative and congressional measures as shall set the American citizen free to think and act independently, and to live by the sweat of his brow, earning an honest wage for an honest day's work which is the avowed principle of the new administration.

#### XV. EISENHOWER INAUGURAL PRAYER

*Resolved*, That the 55th State Conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, command the Kansas State Legislature for its timely and appropriate action in having printed and distributed to be read and memorized by the pupils in the public schools of Kansas, the devout inaugural prayer of President Eisenhower.

Committee on Resolutions: Mrs. Bruce Josserand, Chairman; Mrs. Roy V. Shrewder; Mrs. Wm. L. Ainsworth; Mr. J. W. Gowans; Mrs. Frank Davis; Mrs. Jonathan B. Carter; Miss Maude B. Skinner; Mrs. Hugh H. Monahan.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, second session; without amendment;

S. Res. 16. Resolution to provide for loyalty checks on Senate employees; with amendments (Rept. No. 50); and

S. Res. 49. Resolution to investigate certain matters respecting postal rates and charges in handling certain mail matter; with amendments (Rept. No. 51).

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

S. Res. 81. Resolution relative to the plight of Palestinian Arab refugees; without amendment (Rept. No. 52); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. 56. A bill for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert (Rept. No. 53);

S. 59. A bill for the relief of Felix Kortschak (Rept. No. 54);

S. 65. A bill for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy (Rept. No. 55);

S. 100. A bill for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co. (Rept. No. 56);

S. 152. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines (Rept. No. 57);

S. 248. A bill for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb (Rept. No. 58);

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson (Rept. No. 59);

S. 484. A bill for the relief of J. Don Alexander (Rept. No. 60);

S. 615. A bill for the relief of Altoon Sapirchian (Rept. No. 61); and

S. 837. A bill for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky (Rept. No. 62).

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

S. 101. A bill for the relief of Phed Vosniacos (Rept. No. 63);

S. 102. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo (Rept. No. 64);

S. 140. A bill for the relief of John W. McBride (Rept. No. 65);

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Harry Ray Smith (Rept. No. 66);

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert (Rept. No. 67);

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro (Rept. No. 68);

S. 255. A bill for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter (Rept. No. 69);

S. 522. A bill for the relief of George F. Ruckman (Rept. No. 70); and

S. 682. A bill for the relief of George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya) (Rept. No. 71).

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

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Sizuko Kato (Rept. No. 72); and

S. 720. A bill for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Connell, United States Naval Reserve (Rept. No. 73).

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON  
SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. 49)

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit the annual report of that committee covering its work during the second session of the 82d Congress. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who was not a member of the Small Business Committee in the 82d Congress, did not participate in the preparation of the report. The report has the unanimous approval of all of the other members of the committee.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. By way of explanation, I may say that, not having participated in the hearings and in the consideration of the subject, I did not join in the report. That does not indicate that I do not agree with the report, nor does it indicate that I disagree with any particular part of it. However, I felt that before one should become a party to a report, he should have first-hand and intimate knowledge of the contents of the report.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is entirely correct. He was not a member of that committee during the past year. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that he not share any of the responsibilities of the annual report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED  
"PUBLIC POLICY AND COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF CERTAIN UNIONS"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report of the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations of the 82d Congress on public policy and Communist domination of certain unions, be printed as a Senate document.

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

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION  
PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 2, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

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. HUMPHREY:

S. 1146. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:  
S. 1147. A bill for the relief of Karen Ruth Bauman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (by request):  
S. 1148. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1149. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine and render judgment upon the claim of Antoine Gazda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1150. A bill to extend the franking privilege to, and to provide office facilities and secretarial assistance for, former Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1151. A bill authorizing the transfer to the State of Tennessee of certain lands in the Veterans' Administration center, Mountain Home, Tenn.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1152. A bill to extend for a period of 5 years the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to fur farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

S. 1153. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1154. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bentivegna; and

S. 1156. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jaganath P. Chawla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1157. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to permit the reimportation free of duty of certain articles exported under lease to foreign manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1158. A bill for the relief of Stayka Petrovich (Stajka Petrovic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1953

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a proposed National Health Act of 1953. I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 3 minutes on the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1153) to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by

Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the bill, among other purposes, will facilitate the broader distribution of health services and increase the quantity and improve the quality of such services and facilities. Identical legislation is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative HALE and Representative JAVIRS. If enacted, this bill will be called the National Health Act of 1953 and will provide a voluntary program of health insurance in response to the health needs of the people of the United States.

This is substantially the same bill which we cosponsored and introduced in 1949 in the first session of the 81st Congress. We are reintroducing it in modified form, in the belief that it is designed to provide adequate health care in a manner consistent with our country's traditions of freedom, and that it should be considered along with other proposals having a similar purpose, which may come before the Senate. By such a course of action, the health needs of the Nation can be met realistically within the framework of our free institutions and without resort to Government intervention and control.

The cornerstone of the national health-insurance program advocated in this bill is the local, voluntary, prepayment health service plan. Many such plans are in operation today. Unfortunately, their cost is beyond the means of a large segment of the population. The increasing popularity of these plans, however, demonstrates that the voluntary approach to the exigencies imposed by ill health is the solution desired by the majority of the people—if it is designed in consideration of their financial resources.

The voluntary health and medical service program embodied in this bill basically is financial assistance to voluntary, nonprofit, prepayment, health plans.

Primary responsibility for the development of adequate health services is placed in the States and local communities, with the fullest encouragement to local initiative. The people are thus offered the maximum in assistance with the minimum of governmental interference.

Through this proposed legislation, the health problems of the Nation are met in terms of present available services, while the necessary incentives are provided for additional medical facilities.

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

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wondered whether it included domestics and farmers.

Mr. IVES. It includes everyone. It is entirely voluntary. There is nothing at all compulsory about it.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask to have printed in the RECORD the text of a résumé of the National Health Act of 1953.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

RÉSUMÉ OF NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1953

The proposed National Health Act of 1953 would amend the already existing Public Health Service Act by (a) adding a new title VII which provides an immediate health and medical service program; (b) adding a new title VII, which provides for a long-range survey of national health needs; (c) expanding existing provisions for hospital construction and adding new provisions for aid to medical and nursing schools; and (d) adding provisions for local public-health units.

NEW VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The purpose of this program is to provide immediate assistance so as (1) to enable voluntary prepayment health service plans to make their services generally available in the communities which they serve at charges based on the income of the subscribers; (2) to encourage the establishment of local administrative facilities embracing functional health service regions and districts in order to facilitate the effectuation of present and future health programs; (3) to enable non-profit hospitals and medical and nursing schools to maintain and improve their services and facilities; and (4) to assist voluntary prepayment health service plans to construct and equip personal health service centers.

The key to the new health and medical program is the local voluntary prepayment health service plan. Many such plans are in operation today. Both new and existing plans, to qualify for Federal-State aid, would be required to base their rates of payment by subscribers upon a percentage of the subscribers' adjusted gross income (up to \$5,000); and under each plan a majority of the Board of Directors must be laymen.

Primary responsibility for the development of adequate health services would be placed in the States and local communities. In order to participate in the program, each State would set up a State health council. This council would divide the State into several regions, a number of which have already been established under the Federal Hospital Construction Act. Each region would be managed by a health region authority, composed of laymen appointed by the governor.

Individuals who obtain medical care for themselves and their families by voluntarily subscribing to a cooperating, voluntary, non-profit, prepayment health plan. Membership would be in a group plan or on an individual basis—with the Health Region Authority determining the number of non-group applicants the plans can accept. Further provision would be made regarding the limit on the number of out-of-State beneficiaries a plan might include.

A national yardstick in the form of a comprehensive range of benefits would be established. The cost for this particular coverage would be estimated by the health region authorities for each health region. The subscription charge for this range of benefits could not be less than 3 percent of the subscriber's income under \$5,000. Plans could offer more or less comprehensive benefits than those contained in the national yardstick and as the range of benefits offered might vary, so the rates would be required to vary from the 3-percent minimum for national yardstick benefits. The State through the State health council would determine the maximum range of services all the plans in the State might offer. The minimum charge for participation in a plan would be \$6 a year.

FEDERAL-STATE AID TO LOCAL PLANS

The States would be able to expend funds, a percentage of which would be reimbursable by the Federal Government, for payments to voluntary plans to meet any deficit be-

tween the aggregate of income from subscription charges and the "allowed cost" calculated by each health region authority, as the normal cost of supplying benefits under each approved contract.

The basic formula for Federal aid under this bill would follow the lines of the Hospital Construction Act. Federal aid would be granted a State in inverse proportion to its per capita income. States qualifying for the maximum percentage would receive Federal aid at a ratio of three Federal dollars for every State dollar devoted to the program; those with the highest per capita income, subject to the minimum percentage, would get one Federal dollar for two State dollars. The amount of Federal aid could not exceed \$15 a year for each person covered under health plans in the respective States.

A State would begin to receive its Federal contribution as soon as it passed the appropriate legislation and the required machinery was in operation.

When financial help might be needed for the inception of a qualified nonprofit plan, the Federal Government would also help. Provision would be made for State non-interest-bearing loans, reimbursable under the "Federal percentage," to match funds provided for the establishment of a plan from private contributions or non-interest-bearing loans.

LONG-RANGE SURVEY OF NATIONAL HEALTH NEEDS

A bipartisan commission to be known as the "Federal Health Study and Planning Commission" would be created under this act. This commission, to be appointed jointly by the Congress and the President, would direct, supervise, and coordinate continuing health studies with respect to the most pressing problems, such as the financial condition of the country's hospitals, the recruitment and training of health personnel, the provision for care for the chronic diseases (heart disease, cancer, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, poliomyelitis, and other crippling diseases of children, etc.), and provision for dental care. The commission would utilize the research facilities of existing governmental agencies and other organizations as far as practicable.

The commission would be instructed to formulate and submit to the President and to the Congress within a period of 4 years a 20-year national-health program. Provision would be made for interim reports to the President and to the Congress pending submission of its findings and program. In formulating this long-range plan the commission would be required to take into account the recommendations of the cooperating local and national organizations. Thereafter the commission would submit, every 2 years, further plans, on a 20-year basis, designed constantly to improve the Nation's health services.

HOSPITAL-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The present hospital-construction program would be modified to permit State grants and Federal contributions for the construction of diagnostic centers, and personal health-service centers, serving ambulatory patients, as well as hospitals and public-health centers. The appropriation under this program would be increased from \$150 million to \$175 million per year.

ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL AND NURSING SCHOOLS

The act would provide assistance in maintaining and increasing the number of individuals trained annually in the fields of medicine and nursing.

Payments to medical schools of \$500 for each enrolled student, plus an additional \$1,000 for each enrolled student in excess of average past enrollment would be authorized. Comparable provisions would be provided for nursing schools.

The Surgeon General would be authorized to grant up to 50 percent of the costs of construction and equipment of new medical or

nursing schools or expansions of existing schools.

LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS

The act would make provision for assistance to States for the development and maintenance of local public health units organized to provide basic full-time public health services in all areas of the Nation and for the training of all types of personnel for public health unit work.

If a State were to provide a plan for extending the coverage and services of local public health units, it would be entitled to receive a percentage of the expenditures under the plan, the percentage varying inversely with the State's per capita income, but not exceeding 66 2/3 percent.

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

Mr. IVES. I yield, provided I have time. If not, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield.

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

Mr. IVES. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether he believes his proposal meets in basic outline or basic purposes the recommendation which was made by the committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Paul Magnuson, recently?

Mr. IVES. As a matter of fact, I may say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota, I have not gone through the whole program, although I have very perfunctorily examined the recommendations. It occurs to me that in large measure those recommendations are met by the ideas and plans embodied in the bill which I have just introduced on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself. So far as I know the bill conforms to the general purpose of the plan and proposal submitted by the Magnuson committee. If such is the case, I am very glad to note that we are in substantial agreement. It is all voluntary; there is nothing compulsory about it, in any way, shape, or form. That is the way it should be in a free society.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator it is my understanding, from having read the report, that his proposal follows the outline of the suggestions made by the Committee on Health Needs.

Mr. IVES. I think their proposals are followed, because this bill was introduced in 1949.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that. I commend the Senator again, and I may say I hope the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will work speedily on his proposal, because it seems to me to make good sense, and it represents a sound middle ground.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] I introduce for appropriate reference another bill, which is a companion to the bill just introduced.

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

The bill (S. 1154) to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

**AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for not to exceed 3 minutes on the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1146) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill which seeks to incorporate into legislation some of the legislative recommendations of the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, with respect to the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act. The subcommittee directed the staff to conduct an investigation of the reasons for excessive delay in processing cases before the National Labor Relations Board under the Taft-Hartley Act. The factual background for my recommendations may be found in a subcommittee staff report titled "The Problem of Delay in Administering the Labor-Management Relations Act."

What I have tried to do in this bill is to put these recommendations in legislative form. I should add that I do not feel committed to every word in the bill. I offer it in the hope that there may emerge some relief from the intolerable situation in which it takes more than a year to process fully an unfair labor practice case. If we add to this the time taken by enforcement proceedings in a court of appeals, this means another year.

My bill seeks to do the following:

First. To provide a pool of legal assistants to trial examiners. The trial examiners conduct the hearings and write the reports in unfair labor practice cases, on the basis of which the Board issues its decisions. At the time when our investigation was made, it took more than 2 months from the close of the hearing to the issuance of the intermediate report by the trial examiner. The Congress ought to consider whether providing legal research assistants will have the effect of cutting down this time appreciably.

Second. To permit the Board to organize its legal staff in its own way. The effect of the present provision is to establish separate legal staffs of about 15 lawyers each for every Board member. One investigation indicated that the legal staff work could be handled more economically and more efficiently if the Board were permitted to decide, in the light of all of the circumstances, how to organize its legal staff.

Third. To permit, at the Board's discretion, prehearing elections in representation cases. The prehearing election device was developed in the latter days of the Wagner Act period. It is a technique whereby the Board directs an election even though there may be issues in dispute which are unresolved. It was

found that many of the unresolved issues were washed out by the results of the election. The Taft-Hartley law eliminated the prehearing election. It is my conviction that the time consumed in processing representation cases can be materially reduced if the prehearing election is reinstated.

Fourth. To permit the Board to use various methods in determining the existence of a majority in a representation case. The Board is now restricted to an election, even though in its judgment a card check may be equally reliable, more economical, and less time-consuming.

Fifth. To permit a regional director of the National Labor Relations Board to exercise final authority on all issues in representation cases, subject to a limited right of appeal to the Board itself. Most of the representation cases are of a routine character and involve no novel issues. One or another party to the proceeding will insist on a Board-directed election, more for reasons of expediency than for reasons concerned with the merits of the issues. My proposal would permit the regional director to make final determinations of all issues in a representation case, subject only to an appeal to the Board if the Board feels that a useful purpose will be served by entertaining an appeal. Otherwise, the Board would have the right to reject an appeal in much the same way that the Supreme Court refuses to grant certiorari.

Sixth. To permit the Board to issue a decision in an unfair labor practice case where the parties waive the right to a hearing and agree to a stipulation of the facts. Here, again, is an economy measure which would speed up Board decisions and would eliminate the expense to the parties and to the Government incidental to the conduct of a hearing.

Seventh. To establish a court of labor appeals with the same jurisdiction as the circuit courts of appeal now exercises in review and enforcement cases. The judges of the court would be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court from the current roster of judges in the district courts and the circuit courts of appeal. It would function in much the same way that the Emergency Court of Appeals functions with respect to orders of the Office of Price Stabilization. My proposal would provide specialized machinery, without necessarily having specialized judges. Petitions for enforcement or review are now heard in 11 different courts of appeal, each with different rules and procedures. The proposed court of labor appeals could sit at a place most convenient to the parties. The experience of the Emergency Court of Appeals shows that it can process cases more speedily than can the ordinary Federal courts.

My proposals have no partisan purpose. They are designed to achieve two major objectives:

First. To provide timely adjudication of cases arising under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Second. To economize on the expenditure of time and money by the Government and the litigants before the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that these proposals will be given immediate consideration by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They are submitted after careful study and research, and I believe they represent the views of a number of the members of the committee.

**PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF DOCUMENT RELATING TO POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE, 83D CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION**

Mr. CARLSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed additional copies of Senate Document No. 18 of the 83d Congress, first session, entitled "Positions Not Under the Civil Service," as provided for by existing law, for the use of the Senate document room.

**REVIEW OF DISABILITY STATUS OF PERSONS DISCHARGED FROM ARMED SERVICES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE**

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 25, 1953, the bill (S. 1067) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of persons discharged from the armed services, was introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A reading of the bill convinces me that the subject matter of the bill is under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee rather than the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I therefore ask that the Labor and Public Welfare Committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Armed Services Committee.

I may say Mr. President, that I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who has examined the bill, and we are agreed that the reference now suggested by me is the proper disposition of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? 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. BRIDGES:

Address entitled "Young Americans, the Future Belong to You," delivered by Senator Harry P. Cain, of Washington, before the Republican National Convention on July 10, 1952.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Article entitled "Some of America's Chief State School Officers," written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., of Arkansas A. & M. College.

## By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Safeguard," under the general title "Legislation by Treaty," published in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, of February 23, 1953.

## By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "Job for an Expert," relating to waste in the defense program, written by Fred Brinkerhoff, editor, published in the Pittsburgh (Kans.) Headlight.

## By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Confused Trade Policy," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of February 28, 1953.

Editorial entitled "To a Bewildered Russian," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U. S. News & World Report for March 6, 1953.

## By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Editorial entitled "Offshore Oil," published in the New York Times of March 2, 1953.

Editorial entitled "A Good Stewardship," published in the Santa Fe New Mexican of January 19, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Letting the Public Know," published in the Paris (Tenn.) Post-Intelligencer of February 11, 1953.

## By Mr. WATKINS:

Article entitled "Crusaders in Washington," written by Holmes Alexander, and published in the Salt Lake Tribune of February 26, 1953.

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that, at the conclusion of the morning hour, the reading the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion of the Senator from Ohio is agreed to.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO CIVIL ACTIONS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS FOR RECOVERY OF TAXES ERRONEOUSLY OR ILLEGALLY ASSESSED OR COLLECTED

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 6, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 252, permitting all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with the right of trial by jury. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ANTHONY JULIAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Anthony Julian, of Massachu-

sets, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice George F. Garrity, term expiring. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ENARD ERICKSON, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Enard Erickson, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota, vice John J. McGowan, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT HENRY BEAUDREAU, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Robert Henry Beaudreau, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts, vice Arthur J. B. Cartier, removed. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF J. EDWARD LUMBARD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Myles J. Lane, resigning. At the indi-

cated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE E. MACKINNON, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of George E. MacKinnon, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota, vice Philip Neville, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

## THE WALTER-McCARRAN IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Port of New York Longshoremen Post, No. 7095, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, signed by John A. Condon, commander, New York County Veterans of Foreign Wars, Americanism chairman, dated February 21, 1953, relative to certain phases of the Walter-McCarran Immigration Act.

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

PORT OF NEW YORK  
LONGSHOREMEN POST, No. 7095,  
VETERANS OF FOREIGN  
WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
New York, N. Y., February 21, 1953.

The Honorable Senator McCARRAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This post would like to go on record as unanimously endorsing the section of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act pertaining to the screening of foreign seamen.

We feel we are in better position to judge the merits of this section of the act than the so-called experts that have criticized something they know little about.

If at any time you need assistance in your fight to keep this section of the act from being deleted please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,  
JOHN A. CONDON,  
Commander, New York County, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Americanism Chairman.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD an article which I have prepared for publication in the magazine U. S. A., the magazine of American affairs, en-

titled "The Background of the McCarran-Walter Act."

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

THE BACKGROUND OF THE McCARRAN-WALTER ACT

(By Senator PAT McCARRAN)

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, more commonly referred to as the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, went into operation on Christmas Eve, 1952. One would think that opponents of any legislation passed over a Presidential veto, including this act, would allow such legislation a reasonable period in operation before trying to destroy it. But such has not been the case with the McCarran-Walter Act. From the day it was enacted, its enemies have sought ways and means to strike it down. Why this persistent opposition? What kind of a law is it? What does it do? Is it discriminatory? Those are some of the questions to be dealt with in this article.

Recognizing the need for a comprehensive evaluation of our immigration laws, the 80th Congress, in 1947, empowered the Senate Committee on the Judiciary " \* \* \* or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, \* \* \* to make a full and complete investigation of our entire immigration system." It was learned during the course of the Senate subcommittee's 4-year investigation that the pattern of our old immigration system had been established not only by 2 comprehensive immigration laws, but by over 200 additional legislative enactments. In addition, there had been a number of treaties, Executive orders, proclamations, rules, regulations, and operating instructions which were in effect. The immigration laws were, moreover, so closely intertwined with the naturalization laws that it was essential for the two sets of laws to be considered together. The subcommittee concluded early in its study that it would be unwise and impracticable to submit the proposed changes in the form of numerous amendments to the patchwork of the old immigration and naturalization laws. It was, therefore, decided to draft one complete omnibus bill which would embody all of the immigration and naturalization laws. The subcommittee undertook a task which had never before been accomplished in the history of this country; namely, the revision and codification of all of our numerous immigration and naturalization laws.

The subcommittee studied not only the history of the immigration policy of the United States, but the immigration policies of other countries. We delved into the history and development of international migrations and the problems of population and natural resources. We studied the characteristics of the population of the United States, insofar as they were related to our immigration and naturalization system. We studied the organization and functions of the agencies of the Government which are concerned with the administration and operation of our immigration and naturalization laws. We studied each of the thousands of provisions of our immigration and naturalization laws with the end in view of appraising their adequacy, force and effect, and in conjunction therewith we studied the judicial and administrative interpretations of those provisions and the rules and regulations implementing them. We learned that at least 60 percent of the total world immigration from early in the nineteenth century to 1930 has come to the United States. Canada, which has ranked next to the United States as a receiving country, has received 11.5 percent of total world immigration, or less than one-fifth as much as the United States. Argentina has received about 10 percent of total immigration, while Brazil has been the place of destination for 7 percent to 8 percent of world im-

migration. Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa have received most of the remainder. So, it is not an idle boast that we have the most liberal immigration policies in the Western Hemisphere.

In the course of our work, the subcommittee obtained and considered appraisals and suggestions from several hundred officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the visa and passport divisions of the Department of State. In addition, we received and considered appraisals and suggestions from numerous individuals and representatives of various interested nongovernmental organizations.

The study and investigation disclosed many inequities, weaknesses, loopholes, and inconsistencies in the old hodgepodge immigration and naturalization system. The gravity of this situation was not merely academic, nor was it confined to the question of serious inconvenience to those who undertake to administer or understand our laws. Today, as never before, a sound immigration and naturalization system is essential to the preservation of our way of life, because that system is the conduit through which a stream of humanity flows into the fabric of our society. If that stream is healthy, the impact on our society is salutary; but, if that stream is polluted, our institutions and our way of life become infected.

The law as it was finally enacted went through several drafts before it was approved. In that work, we were assisted by not only the staff of the Senate subcommittee, but also by experts from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Visa and Passport Divisions of the Department of State, and the legislative counsel of the Senate.

After the introduction of the original bill in April of 1950, copies were circulated to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies for study and comment. The Immigration and Naturalization Service assigned two experts who prepared a detailed critique of the bill, and the Department of State set up a special committee within the Department which performed a similar function. In addition, a number of nongovernmental agencies submitted analyses and suggestions. In the course of numerous conferences over a period of several weeks, the various suggestions and analyses were considered and the bill was further refined. Following that, extensive joint public hearings were conducted by subcommittees of the Senate and the House Judiciary Committees on the immigration bills then before the Congress. On April 25, 1952, the House passed the bill by an overwhelming vote of 206 for and 68 against. The Senate followed suit shortly thereafter, and sent the bill to the White House. When President Truman vetoed the bill, it was enacted over his veto.

The cardinal principle which guided us in determining what this act should contain was simply this: The best interests of the United States of America must be served. In the light of that principle, let us examine the chief features of the act.

We have retained the national origins quota system as the basis for our quantitative restriction of immigration to this country. This formula for computing quotas is that the quota for each quota area shall be one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of inhabitants in the continental United States in 1920 attributable by national origin to such quota area. In addition, several countries which previously had no quotas are allotted minimum quotas of 100. The national origins quota system has been an integral part of our immigration policy since its establishment in 1929, and, while it has been frequently criticized and attacked, no one as yet has come forward with an acceptable substitute. Congress had two purposes in mind when it adopted the national origins formula. The first was to provide a

basis for determining quotas for the numerical restriction of the flow of immigrants to this country. The second, and broader purpose, was to preserve the composition of the population of the United States on the basis of the proportionate contribution made by the various nationality groups. The legislative history of the Immigration Act of 1924 shows that Congress never intended the 150,000 quota immigrants allowed to be a minimum limitation, but intended that it should be the maximum number of quota immigrants to be admitted annually. Even those who would whittle away the principle of national origin quotas, by providing for the distribution of unused quota numbers among the low-quota countries, seemingly profess adherence to the principle of national origins for the maintenance of the composition of our population according to the contribution by various nationalities.

How has this formula served us in reality? During the period from 1924 to 1946 immigration from northern and western Europe amounted to 43.1 percent of the total, whereas slightly over 79 percent of our white population, according to the 1920 census, was attributable to that area. During that period, immigration from southern and eastern Europe amounted to 18.9 percent of the total, whereas 15 percent of the white population of 1920 was of southern and eastern European origin. Immigration from the Western Hemisphere countries amounted to 36.2 percent of the total, whereas 5.6 percent of the 1920 white population was attributable to that area.

Although the flow of immigration has not followed the pattern contemplated under the national origins formula, it has provided a fixed and easily determinable method of controlling immigration which is not subject to the whims and caprice of administrative interpretation, and which is automatically resistant to pressures for special treatment. Experience has shown that the national origins formula has been more of a numerically restrictive measure than a means of automatically selecting immigrants from the various nationalities, since the countries of northern and western Europe have used a much smaller percentage of their quotas than the countries of southern and Eastern Europe. The national origins quota formula was and is a rational and logical method of numerically restricting immigration in such a manner as to preserve best the sociological and cultural balance in the population of the United States. It is eminently fair and sound for visas to be allocated in a ratio which will admit a preponderance of immigrants who will be more readily assimilated because of the similarity of their cultural background to that of the principal components of our population.

The act removes from our immigration laws any racial discrimination in a realistic manner. Under its terms, national origin quotas are made available to all countries of the world, and no immigrant is barred solely because of race, nor are aliens barred from naturalization because of race. However, fixed limitations are included to prevent an influx of more orientals than can be assimilated. No one is inadmissible to the United States solely on the basis of race, but all persons indigenous to an area designated as the Asia-Pacific Triangle are assigned to the quotas for that area. By removing the racial bar to immigration and naturalization, about 85,000 orientals in the United States and Hawaii, who have been our friends and neighbors for a quarter of a century, became eligible for citizenship.

Parenthetically, let me say that the Asia-Pacific triangle provision received the endorsement of every major oriental group in the United States as the only fair and reasonable solution to the problem presented. The opponents of the Asia-Pacific triangle provision sponsored legislation which would have swept away all of the control provisions of

the old law without substituting any reasonable limitations in their place. Under their proposals an estimated 600,000 orientals, who are natives of nonquota countries of the Western Hemisphere, would have become immediately eligible for immigration to the United States. Thousands upon thousands of orientals, without statutory limitation, would have become immediately eligible for immigration to this country for permanent residence because of the greatly expanded nonquota categories which would have been established pursuant to the above legislation. This would have been in addition to the quotas which have been assigned to each of about two dozen oriental countries in the Far East. Again, let me repeat that these proposals were so fantastic, so drastic, and so unrealistic that the major oriental groups in this country shied away from them and endorsed the McCarran-Walter version as the only fair and reasonable solution of the problem of racial ineligibles.

It was urged by some that we pool unused quotas and apportion them to low-quota countries. Let me point out, however, that the pooling of unused quotas would be in direct conflict with the national origins quota principle, which is the foundation of our protective immigration system, and which seeks to maintain the relative composition of our population. The effect of pooling unused quotas would be not only to increase substantially the number of aliens coming to the United States for permanent residence but would, in the course of a generation or so, tend to change the ethnic and cultural composition of this Nation. Much has been said about it being the duty of our country to open wider and wider the gates in order to alleviate the surplus population of the overpopulated countries of the world. I insist, however, that an immigration and nationality code is not the proper vehicle for the solution of the surplus population problems of the world. Other means should be utilized, and are being utilized, to find a solution to the problem of overpopulation of Europe. I do not know what the answer to this vital world problem may be, but I do know that the answer will not be found through the destruction of our own immigration system.

Another significant change made by the new act is the removal of discriminations based on sex. Certain of its provisions would permit American women citizens to bring their alien husbands to this country as non-quota immigrants, and enable alien husbands of resident women aliens to come in under a quota in a preferred status. Under the old law men were accorded favored treatment, so that a wife's status could not be used to enhance the husband's chances of keeping the family together. That is no longer the case. For example, under previous law a wife from a low-quota country could accompany her husband from a high-quota country and was chargeable to the high quota. But it did not work the other way around. If the wife were from the high-quota country and the husband from the low-quota country, he could not accompany her on the high quota. The new act changes that, so that the husband from the low-quota country can accompany his wife from the high-quota country. And, under this new act stepchildren are accorded the same treatment as natural children for the first time in the history of our immigration laws.

One of the most significant changes made by the new act is the introduction of a principle of selectivity into our quota system. Under this provision, 50 percent of each quota is allocated to aliens whose services are needed in this country because of their special knowledge or skills.

This new act also revises those provisions of the law relating to the qualitative grounds for exclusion of aliens so that the criminal and immoral classes, the subversives and other undesirables can be excluded from ad-

mission into this country. This has been done in a sincere effort to insure that when millions of aliens are storming our gates we shall not be admitting into our society those who would contaminate or subvert it. Likewise, the deportable classes of aliens and the deportation procedures have been strengthened so that subversive and undesirable aliens are not permitted to remain in our midst.

It is charged that the McCarran-Walter Act introduces new racial discriminations into our immigration laws. The truth is that all racial barriers to the naturalization of aliens are removed and that the racial bars to immigration are removed within certain limitations. Under the old law certain Orientals were absolutely excluded from entering the United States as immigrants, but under the McCarran-Walter Act no alien is inadmissible solely because of race, and quotas are available for all the peoples of the world. Some have charged that the quota system militates against Catholics and Jews, but this is not so. Between 1920 and 1950, 5,670,679 immigrants entered the United States. The largest number were from Canada (1,204,760) and Latin America (1,026,797). Many Canadians are Catholic; practically all Latin Americans are Catholic. From European countries the largest immigration was in this order: Germany, Italy, Great Britain, Ireland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, France. Four of these are Catholic countries, and none of the others is wholly, some not even predominantly, Protestant. Jews immigrated on all quotas, not being classed as a separate nation. In no year were the Jews less than 3.3 percent of all immigrants; and after 1933 they rose from constituting 10.28 percent of all immigrants to 52.3 percent in 1939; 52.20 percent in 1940; 45 percent in 1941; 36 percent in 1942. Half of all the world's Jews now live in the United States and Canada, with the overwhelming majority being in the United States. There is, therefore, not the slightest substance for the charge that the national quota system has had anti-Semitic or anti-Catholic applications.

Never before have our nationality and naturalization laws been integrated with our immigration laws, as is the case in this new act. Race is eliminated as a bar to naturalization. No one who has been lawfully admitted to this country for permanent residence will be denied the privilege of citizenship solely because of his race.

Other significant provisions of the naturalization part of this act broaden and redefine the exceptions to expatriation by residence abroad of a naturalized citizen. These exceptions are designed to meet more realistically the varied problems which arise in connection with those citizens who have bona fide reasons for foreign residence.

It has been suggested that we treat the Communists too harshly in the new Immigration Act. Frankly, they are accorded the type of treatment deserved by traitors to this country, which is what they are. If anyone in this land of ours still doubts that the Communist Party of the United States is part and parcel of the international Communist conspiracy, he has only to read the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Documentary Proof on the subject, and the conclusions of the Subversive Activities Control Board. After 14 months of public hearings, a panel of the Subversive Activities Control Board found that the United States Communist Party was directed, dominated, and controlled by the Soviet Union, and that it should register with the Attorney General under the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950. Such registration would force the Communist Party not only to reveal its secret membership lists, but also to open its propaganda and financial activities to Federal scrutiny and control. The panel's decision asserted that the Communist Party lives for the day when it can install a dictatorship of the proletariat in the United States. \* \* \*

Nurtured by the Soviet Union, it strives incessantly to make the United States a Soviet America. Does anyone still have doubt? Should they be handled with kid gloves?

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was passed by the Congress on June 27, 1952, over President Truman's veto. On September 4, 1952, 2 months before the general election and more than 3 months before the new act went into effect on December 24, 1952, the President appointed a special Commission on Immigration and Naturalization to study and evaluate the immigration and naturalization policies of the United States. This Commission was to render a final report on the administration and operation of our immigration laws on January 1, 1953, one week after this new law went into effect. This was done despite the fact that it is the duty and prerogative of Congress to determine policy and make the laws, and despite the fact that this new act provides for the creation of a Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy to make a continuing study of our immigration and nationality problems and policies. No measure which has been passed by Congress in recent years has received more attention, more hard work, more thoughtfulness, more study, or has been the concern of more interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies and individuals than this Immigration and Nationality Act. We realized that such an intensive study of so technical a subject comes very seldom—the last one was in 1911—so no avenue was left unexplored, no idea was discarded without serious thought.

I believe that this Nation is the last hope of western civilization and if this oasis of the world shall be overrun, perverted, contaminated or destroyed, then the last flickering light of humanity will be extinguished. I take no issue with those who would praise the contributions which have been made to our society by people of many races, of varied creeds and colors. America is indeed a joining together of many streams which go to form a mighty river which we call the American way. However, we have in the United States today hard core indigestible blocs who have not become integrated into the American way of life but which, on the contrary, are its deadly enemies. Today as never before untold millions are storming our gates for admission and those gates are cracking under the strain. The solution of the problems of Europe and Asia will not come through a transplanting of those problems en masse to the United States. A solution remains possible only if America is maintained strong and free; only if our institutions, our way of life, are preserved by those who are part and parcel of that way of life so that America may lead the world in a way dedicated to the worth and dignity of the human soul. I do not intend to be prophetic, but if the enemies of this legislation succeed in riddling it to pieces, or in amending it beyond recognition, they will have contributed more to promote this Nation's downfall than any other group since we achieved our independence as a nation.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, recently Chairman Paul M. Herzog, of the National Labor Relations Board, appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor and made a statement which is worthy of thoughtful consideration by all who are interested in labor-management relations. Without at this time going into its substance or even the recommendations it contains, I would call to the attention of the Congress two editorials concerning this statement, which appeared in the February 26 issues of the New York Times

and the Washington Evening Star. At this point in my remarks, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD the texts of the New York Times editorial entitled "NLRB's Case" and the Washington Evening Star editorial entitled "Give the States a Chance."

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

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1953]

NLRB'S CASE

The testimony of Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, before the House Committee on Education and Labor was a well-balanced presentation of the Board's administration of the Taft-Hartley Act. It merits the careful consideration of Congress. Particularly is this true because, as Mr. Herzog pointed out, congressional intent is not clear in some of the law's provisions, which can be construed in several ways.

The Board proposes, among other things, that the non-Communist oath for union leaders be discarded and that the problem of communism in unions be turned over to some outside tribunal such as the Subversive Activities Board. But on disputed interpretations of the law itself Congress cannot expect the Board to offer a unanimous remedy, since on these matters the Board would obviously split, as it has, when specific cases involving the selfsame controversial sections have come before it. Clearly the Board needs more guidance from Congress on its intent as to the law's provisions governing union-shop elections, jurisdictional disputes, the obligation to bargain, free speech, and secondary boycotts. These may appear at first thought to be technical matters, but they go to the root of labor-management relations and give rise to controversies which entail strikes, litigation, and loss of time to employers and employees.

Congress should comply with the Board's request to free it from the statutory chains which now make it all but impossible to cede jurisdiction over local controversies to State labor boards. There is no reason why the Board should retain control over local establishments where, even though Federal jurisdiction may attach as a matter of constitutional law, the impact upon interstate commerce is negligible in practice. Indeed, the Board has made some progress in this area, for it has voluntarily abstained from assuming jurisdiction in the New York taxi industry, over which it has been at loggerheads with the New York State Labor Relations Board. This, however, is not enough. Congress should permit the Board to make agreements with State labor boards to cede jurisdiction over cases predominantly local in character.

It is rather refreshing to hear the head of a Federal agency inform Congress, as Chairman Herzog did, that it seeks not more power but less. The Board argues persuasively that its role should not be enlarged "because the freedom of American employers and labor organizations, dealing from approximately equal strength, to make their own collective bargaining with a minimum of Government intervention still seems to us the best road to industrial stability."

The Board's record in speeding up case handling is commendable. In the past long delays have sometimes tended to worsen labor relations.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 26, 1953]

GIVE STATES A CHANCE

In these times of expanding Government it is news when the head of a Federal agency asks Congress to reduce its authority and activities. Chairman Paul M. Herzog, of the

National Labor Relations Board has made such a request before the House Labor Committee, which is studying proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley law. Mr. Herzog believes that the Federal Government, through the NLRB, is concerning itself with many labor-management disputes that the States could handle more effectively and more expeditiously.

The NLRB Chairman complained, specifically, about a provision of the present act which has prevented the Federal Board from waiving jurisdiction in favor of State agencies in cases that have little national significance. Section 10 of the law authorizes such waivers, but under conditions which have proved to be a complete block to any cession of cases to State agencies. This section empowers the NLRB to cede to State authorities any local case that can be handled under a State law not "inconsistent" with the Federal law. The trouble with the restriction, Mr. Herzog said, is that no State has a labor law that seems to meet the condition. Consequently, no NLRB cases have been referred to State boards since 1947.

"We believe," Mr. Herzog told the committees, "that the NLRB has more than enough to do, without dissipating its energies upon predominantly local controversies where, even though Federal jurisdiction may attach as a matter of constitutional law, the impact upon interstate commerce is negligible in practice; that the States should not be inhibited from experimenting with labor relations legislation where local enterprises are concerned; and that there should no longer be a no-man's land in those border-line trades where the NLRB, in a spirit of self-abnegation, declines to exercise jurisdiction but where the States do not dare proceed because of the present limitations contained in section 10."

Such a diversion of local disputes to State boards would give the Federal agency more time to devote to major cases touching the national interest. So would the suggested transfer to some other Federal authority of the task of dealing with the threat of communism in labor unions. Mr. Herzog advocated repeal of the anti-Communist oath provision of the act, largely because it has failed of its purpose of eliminating Reds from unions. He recommended several "clarifications" of the present law which would help in enforcing it. As one who has had first-hand experience in administering the act, his suggestions should receive careful consideration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Harry N. Routhzohn, of Ohio, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be Am-

bassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to make a few remarks in regard to the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Italy.

Mrs. Luce has had a long and varied career in journalism, in the theater, and in politics. She is a former member of the House of Representatives, where she served from 1943 to 1947, and she has written and spoken a great deal on public issues. Her views are well known.

Mrs. Luce appeared at an executive hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee February 17. On February 24, the committee voted unanimously to report her nomination favorably to the Senate.

Mrs. Luce is familiar with Italy and she speaks the Italian language. She has in the past made broadcasts for the Voice of America in Italian directed especially to Italian women. She told the committee that, in her opinion, "an American Ambassador abroad is a representative of all the people to all the people of the country to which he goes, regardless of party or class or creed, and so while abroad I think he is both the mirror of the highest aims and aspirations of his country, and a window through which our country may see what the true aims of that country are abroad."

Mr. President, I think there is a great deal to be said for that point of view.

Some question has been raised about Mrs. Luce's nomination on the grounds that it might lead to the appointment of an Ambassador to the Vatican or that Mrs. Luce herself might serve in a dual capacity.

I want to give the Senate categorical assurance that the question of an Ambassador to the Vatican is in no way involved in Mrs. Luce's nomination to be Ambassador to Italy. The corps of diplomats accredited to the Vatican is separate and distinct from the corps accredited to the Italian Government. We have Mrs. Luce's own statement to the committee on this point as well as a strong statement affirming her belief in the deeply rooted American idea of the separation of church and state.

Whether or not the United States should have diplomatic representation at the Vatican is an entirely separate issue which is wholly irrelevant to this nomination as Ambassador to Italy.

I hope that the nomination will be confirmed unanimously.

I attach to my statement a biographical sketch of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MRS. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

Born: New York, N. Y., April 10, 1903. Family background: Daughter of William F. and Ann (Snyder) Boothe. Education: St. Mary's, Garden City, Long Island, N. Y., 1915-17; The Castle, Tarrytown, N. Y., 1917-19.

Marital status: Married Henry R. Luce November 23, 1935.

Experience: Associate editor, *Vogue*, 1930; associate editor, *Vanity Fair*, 1931-32; managing editor, 1933-34; newspaper columnist, 1934; playwright since 1935; member of 78th and 79th Congresses (1943-47) 4th Connecticut District, Republican.

Other: Author: *Stuffed Shirts*, 1933; *Europe in the Spring*, 1940; plays: *Abide With Me*; *The Women*, 1937; *Kiss the Boys Goodbye*, 1938; *Margin for Error*, 1939. Contributed articles and fiction to magazines.

Home: Ridgefield, Conn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at the last call of the Executive Calendar I objected to considering the nomination of Mrs. Luce at that time. The reason I objected was that I wanted to invite the attention of Members on the other side of the aisle to the serious condition we are facing at the present time in Italy. I was fearful, among other things that a change in the Ambassadorship to Italy prior to the election there might cause some disturbance in our relations which might affect the election in the wrong direction for us. That was the reason I objected at that time. Since then I have talked with some of the Members, and I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin this question: Is it true that Mrs. Luce will not be sworn in until after the election in Italy?

Mr. WILEY. I have heard rumors to that effect. I should like to say, in relation to the fear expressed by the Senator from South Carolina, that, knowing Mrs. Luce as I do, and having known her for quite a number of years—as a girl she used to visit in my own State, and I have met her, of course, on the platform—I think, if her nomination were confirmed at this time, with her wonderful ability to sell a bill of goods for America, she would do a grand job.

I may say, Mr. President, that there was some talk in the committee to the effect—it was very indefinite, and perhaps the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] can enlighten me—that her appointment was to be deferred until May.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was the understanding I received from some Members on the other side of the aisle. I talked with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and he said he thought it was going to be postponed until after the election in Italy.

Mr. WILEY. I have no definite information on the subject.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would the Senator from Michigan mind passing this nomination over until the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] can return to the floor of the Senate and answer my question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall endeavor to ascertain the facts from the State Department. I have no personal knowledge as to when she will take office. I understand that that is entirely up to the President of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know that is true. In the latter part of last November I visited Italy and found that the relationship with our diplo-

mats which existed there was a very friendly one, and I do not want anything to happen that may do some injury to the good feeling which now exists there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator ask for postponement of the consideration of the nomination?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was on the floor a few minutes ago.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from South Carolina object to considering the nomination at this time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I realize that it is a matter for the President, but I did want to call the situation very forcefully to his attention, and the only way I could do so was to let it be known how I feel with reference to it.

So, Mr. President, if the nomination can be passed over temporarily, until the Senator from New Jersey can return to the floor, I think he can throw some light on the subject.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to be recognized for a few minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we might take up the supplemental appropriation bill in legislative session.

I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce be placed at the foot of the list of nominations on the Executive Calendar, and that we proceed with the other nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce will be placed at the foot of the list of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### PRICE SUPPORT FOR BUTTER AT 90 PERCENT OF PARITY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I feel that I should make a few remarks in support of Secretary Benson's announcement that he intends to support dairy products at 90 percent of parity for the next year, following the expiration of the present order, which will expire on April 1.

In order that we may have a complete understanding of the price-support program as it related to dairy products in the past several years, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that a surplus of butter exists all over the Nation; it is not confined to only 1 or 2 or 3 States. As an indication of that I call attention to the fact that in the calendar year 1950 the Commodity Credit Corporation received from the State of Alabama 152,619 pounds of butter.

Georgia delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation 176,753 pounds of butter.

Kentucky delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation 3,082,520 pounds of butter.

I shall not burden the Senate with reading all the figures, but I ask unanimous consent that the table showing the situation may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

#### Butter under price support for calendar year 1950

	Pounds
Alabama	152,619
Georgia	176,753
Kentucky	3,082,520
Mississippi	1,909,793
Tennessee	5,903,642
Illinois	8,271,158
Indiana	2,831,010
Iowa	1,243,470
Michigan	1,557,125
Ohio	5,095,962
Oklahoma	229,195
Texas	47,613
Kansas	203,729
Missouri	10,746,422
Nebraska	83,684
Minnesota	11,845,535
Wisconsin	55,879,066
New York	35,738
Idaho	105,581
Total	109,210,620

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the calendar year 1950, 19 States delivered butter to the Commodity Credit Corporation in the total amount of 109,210,620 pounds which went to the Corporation. In the year 1952 there were 12 States which disposed of some butter to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I shall not burden the Senate by reading the names of all those States, but I ask unanimous consent that a table entitled "Butter Under Price Support for the Calendar Year 1952" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### Butter under price support for calendar year 1952

	Pounds
Illinois	4,514,942
Iowa	1,520,448
Kentucky	137,500
Ohio	480,408
Oklahoma	282,567
Kansas	670,597
Missouri	2,689,198
Nebraska	914,060
Minnesota	3,161,492
North Dakota	813,483
Tennessee	171,736
Wisconsin	708,193
Total	16,064,627

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the months of January and February of 1953 70 million pounds of butter were purchased under the so-called price-support program. This is under a support of 90 percent, as announced by Mr. Brannan, the previous Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, there must be a support program for dairy products or perishable products if there is to be a support program on feed crops, such as corn, feed wheat, and cottonseed meal, a product of high protein, and which the dairy producer must purchase. Cotton itself is under a 90-percent support program. Another item is flaxseed, from which is derived flaxseed meal. All the high-protein feed which goes into the dairy ration used for the production of milk is under a support program.

I believe Secretary of Agriculture Benson was entirely justified in his announced support of 90 percent for dairy products for the year commencing April 1, 1953.

It was expected that reactions to Secretary Benson's announcement of the dairy support level would be varied. As might have been expected, metropolitan newspapers apparently have chosen to take the Secretary to task for deciding that supports for dairy products should be continued for a year at 90 percent of parity. I refer to an article written by Mr. Aubrey Graves, and published in the Washington Post of February 28, 1953. That article was not one which enlightened anybody. It caused a great amount of confusion. I was indeed happy when, as of this date, March 2, 1953, the Post printed an editorial on the same subject that was far more enlightening, and did the consumer, as well as the producer, much good, because it clarified a very highly technical and confused question.

However, attention should be called to the fact that the price-support level will be approximately 2 cents a pound less than it has been during the past year, and that the purchase of butter will be on the basing-point method, using the New York, Chicago, Seattle, and San Francisco terminal markets, with appropriate differentials at other points in the country. Butter has been purchased at a uniform price throughout the country, which in effect meant that the Commodity Credit Corporation paid the freight and certain other costs. This is not to be done in this calendar year.

The position of butterfat prices with relation to the feed costs of dairy farmers should also be noted.

The parity ratio for all farm commodities declined 1 point between January 15 and February 15, 1953, from 95 to 94 percent, while the ratio stood at 100 percent in February 1952. Stated in another way, prices received by farmers declined 9 percent from February 1952 to February 1953, while prices they paid declined much less; in fact, they declined only 2.8 percent.

Mr. President, this is a factor which we must recognize and reckon with. We cannot allow the income of the farmer to decline rapidly, while his operating costs remain on the high level which inflationary conditions in the economy of the Nation have brought about in the past 18 months.

Therefore, if there is to be a stable economy in the United States, it will be necessary to support farm prices and to keep them somewhere in line with the producer's expense and keep the agricultural economy in balance with the national economy; otherwise there will be chaos in the entire economy of the United States. Not only will the earnings of farmers be affected, but a decline in their income will be reflected throughout every category of the economy of the Nation and will ultimately reach consumers, as well as persons employed in factories and the white-collar group employed in offices.

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

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is not that situation analogous to what happened after World War I? At that time the prices of all farm products dropped, but everything which farmers bought remained high, or declined only one index point, with the exception of copper.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from North Dakota has asked a very pertinent question. I wish to read figures showing the percentage of total national income to persons living on farms over a period of years in order to show trends and how the income of farmers in relation to national economy is reflected.

Looking at a tabulation over a period of years, we find that of the total national income, the farmer received, in the calendar year 1912, 13.7 percent. In the calendar year 1917 he received 16.5 percent, and that was at a time when the United States economy was relatively high, not only for the farmer but also for the worker, whether he was a factory worker, a professional man, or a businessman.

In 1922 the percentage dropped to 8 percent. That was the beginning of a recession that affected not only the farmer but affected also the entire economy of the United States.

In 1927 the farmer's income in relation to the total national income was 8.2 percent. In 1932 it dropped to 5.5 percent of the national income. That was the beginning of the depression of the early 1930's.

In 1937 the percentage had risen to 8.8 percent, and in 1942 to 9.1 percent.

In 1947 it had risen to 9 percent, and in 1952 it had dropped to 6.4 percent.

In other words, the recession felt in agricultural areas of the Nation today is reflecting a recession that commenced in the calendar year 1951 and carried itself through 1952. We are now feeling the effects of that recession as of 1953; and unless we can support agricultural prices to maintain a sort of stable price level, there will be a recession which will have its reflex beyond the boundaries of the farm economy. It will reach into the cities and factory centers of the Nation.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield to the junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I want to commend the able Senator from Minnesota on an excellent speech in behalf of 90-percent supports for butterfat. In view of all the facts, I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture could have taken any other course. However, I do take exception to some of his excuses for the 90-percent supports. I do not think any excuses were necessary. For example, he ties his reasons for dairy supports closely to 90-percent supports for basic farm commodities. There is some relation, of course, but not nearly as much as he indicates. For example, there is no price support on pasture, which is a large part of the feed supply for cattle. There is no support on hay or on ensilage. Oat supports are 85 percent of parity. Wheat has been selling at 82 to

85 percent of parity, or from 30 to 40 cents a bushel below 90-percent support, for most of the time during the last 8 months. Even corn is selling far below 90-percent supports. So I think that part of his statement was not quite accurate.

Mr. THYE. May I ask to whom the Senator from North Dakota is referring when he says the statement is not quite accurate?

Mr. YOUNG. I refer to Secretary Benson, not to the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was very careful in developing these figures, and I was ready to defend my figures if necessary.

If agricultural prices are allowed to slide to too low a level, we can rest assured that such prices will ultimately be reflected in the entire national economy. That is as certain as that night follows day.

When we go back over the figures we see that in 1932 the farmers' share of the national income was 5.5 percent. That was the beginning of the depression of the 1930's. In the calendar year 1952 the farmers' share of the national income was only 6.4 percent. That is a danger signal, and we had better recognize it as Members of Congress. Therefore, we had better commend the Secretary of Agriculture for having announced 90 percent support on butter, rather than write articles such as the one to which I referred earlier, in which Mr. Aubrey Graves used such language as this:

Benson's failure to drop the support level came as a shock following his recent St. Paul speech.

It was that article which led me to do some searching into the facts and figures.

If we permit ourselves to be beclouded in our thinking with regard to the farm-support program, to the point where the Secretary of Agriculture is not supported when he takes a sound stand, some day we shall waken to find a national depression on our hands which will lead to a serious situation, and it will be most difficult to bring the Nation out of it. For that reason, today I am defending the Secretary of Agriculture because, as I stated earlier, butter surpluses come from every section of the United States—not only from Tennessee, but from the New England area. They are not confined to the midwestern section. There are times in the year when butter surpluses necessarily exist if we are to have a sufficient amount of fluid milk to meet the consumers' needs in the summer, when the milk supply is at a low volume and when the consumption is exceedingly high. I refer to the consumption of fluid milk as well as butter fat which goes into ice cream. If we are to have an ample supply of fluid milk for the months of August, September, and October, we shall have butter surpluses throughout the winter months and the early spring months of the year. Such a surplus exists now. Therefore, the Secretary of Agriculture could do nothing other than step in and buy the surplus butter which was being offered. As soon as we have gone through the month

of March, I am confident that we shall see a smaller amount of butter offered to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Once we get past the period involved in the announcement of 90 percent supports a year ago, which period expires on April 1 of this year, we shall find that the amount of butter offered to the Commodity Credit Corporation will be less, because the announced support price, at 90 percent represents a return for butter 2 cents less than the price for the previous calendar year, even though the Secretary announces supports at 90 percent, because the parity ratio will bring 2 cents a pound less for butter under the new executive order than under the Executive order of a year ago.

Prices for butterfat and cream averaged only 66.8 cents a pound in mid-February. This was 1½ cents less than the price a month earlier, and 16.1 cents less than the price a year earlier, or a decrease of 19.4 percent, compared with a decrease of only 6 percent in feed prices.

Secretary Benson followed the only logical course in extending support prices for dairy products at 90 percent of parity for another year. In my opinion, this is not inconsistent with his statement made at St. Paul.

Mr. President, for the RECORD, at this point I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks a two-page release issued by the office of the Secretary of Agriculture on February 27, 1953.

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

**SECRETARY BENSON ANNOUNCES 1953-54 DAIRY SUPPORT LEVEL**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT

OF AGRICULTURE,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, February 27, 1953

Dairy product prices will be supported at 90 percent of parity for another year beginning April 1, according to the announcement made today by Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson.

This decision follows the recommendation of the Dairy Advisory Group, congressional leaders, farm leaders, and others who have been consulted.

"A primary reason for continuing the maximum support allowed by the law," according to Secretary Benson, "was assurance from the dairy advisers that the industry would immediately start work on programs to reduce to a minimum governmental support purchases. The year will give the industry time to demonstrate to what degree it can solve its own problems.

"Here is one of the great agricultural industries," said Benson, "that has told us they want time to get programs into operation. We know the important dairy industry does not want to depend on Government price supports. The farm and dairy leadership now has the opportunity to demonstrate what teamwork will accomplish."

A representative work conference including farmers and leaders of their organizations, processors, distributors, retailers, and consumers will be called together at once. Each segment of the dairy industry will be asked to send representatives prepared to assume definite responsibility for a portion of the solution of the dairy problems. Secretary Benson said, for example, "Dairy farmers can shift more rapidly to fluid milk sales and away from butterfat.

"Milk companies can move more milk from butter-producing areas into regions needing fluid milk.

"Retail dairies, stores, and consumers can more actively promote the sale of milk and milk products.

"There are other adjustments which the industry can make to reduce the accumulation of surplus dairy products.

"The United States Department of Agriculture has offered to help and the assistance of the agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and extension services can be depended upon."

"Dairy farmers and dairy industry leadership has a major challenge," continued Secretary Benson. "We believe they will put the dairy business on a more solid basis—with a minimum dependence on price supports. They have asked for time—we have agreed. Now we will all pitch in to get the job done."

Such price support operations as are needed will be carried out through offers to purchase butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids.

Purchases of butter will be made on a "basing point" method, using the four terminal markets of New York, Chicago, Seattle, and San Francisco, with appropriate differentials at other points in the country. This will be a change from the present policy under which butter has been purchased at a uniform price throughout the country.

The drop in the parity formula will reduce the butter price support about 2 cents per pound.

Program details, which otherwise will be generally comparable with those of present operations, will be announced by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial which was published in today's issue of the Washington Post. It is an excellent editorial, which greatly clarifies the situation.

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

**DILEMMA IN DAIRY SUPPORTS**

Agriculture Secretary Benson is wise to plan a series of talks over the country to explain his views on farm-price supports. It is apparent that those views have been distorted by persons who see in any suggestion for change in the system of rigid high price supports an attempt to undermine American agriculture. What amounts almost to a campaign of fearmongering has arisen—fear, not of what has happened, but of what might happen. If Mr. Benson can get his essentially moderate position across to responsible farm audiences, we surmise that many of those fears will be quieted.

In this connection Mr. Benson's decision to continue dairy price supports at 90 percent of parity, while disappointing to consumers, ought to reassure farmers that policy changes will not be precipitate. Whether or not to lower dairy supports to 85 or 80 percent would have been a most difficult decision, and Mr. Benson would have invited criticism either way. In view of the huge governmental stocks of butter—89 million pounds—as well as of cheese, his own disposition must have been to drop the support level.

But a drop in the dairy support level, at the same time that supports on feed grains remain pegged by law at 90 percent through 1954, would have put a squeeze on dairy farmers. Incidentally, a major reason for the alarm over falling beef cattle prices is the fact that, whereas cattle prices are not supported, feed prices are pegged. Here is a classic example of the way in which rigid supports upset the economy. Faced with mandatory grain supports, Mr. Benson made a practical compromise. Dairymen are assured 90 percent support for another year, but they have clear warning to adjust them-

selves to a program requiring less governmental aid.

Mr. Benson spoke euphemistically, however, when he said that the high supports, if continued, will price butter right out of the market. Reports of butter consumption vis a vis that of margarine show that a wholesale change in eating habits has long since occurred. Millions of Americans, whatever their personal tastes, prefer to buy margarine at 30 cents instead of butter at 75.

Dairymen themselves, despite the pressure of their lobbyists, must recognize that there is something criminally wasteful in the governmental purchase of 2 million pounds of butter a day for storage, and perhaps eventual dumping. What is happening is a realignment of values on dairy products. The use of skim milk is on the upswing, and vegetable oils have supplanted higher priced butterfat for many uses. Possibly this means higher ultimate prices for fluid milk and lower prices for butterfat. Lower prices for butterfat might, in turn, restore some of its popularity. Mr. Benson needs to remind the dairy industry continually during the next year that the basic adjustment cannot take place until the price-support system is changed to facilitate production, not for the Government, but for the market.

Mr. THYE. I say further that we, as Members of Congress, must watch the trend, not only of our agricultural economy, but of our entire national economy. If we fail to do so, and if one segment is thrown out of balance with respect to others, it will be a matter of only a short time until there will be chaos, which will be drastically reflected in our entire national economy. I stand in full agreement with the announced support, at 90 percent, for dairy products for the next 12 months, commencing April 1, as contained in the order issued by the Secretary of Agriculture last week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments with regard to a certain nomination on the Executive Calendar. I will be unable to be present when it is taken up for discussion this afternoon.

In order that I may catch a train at 3 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from further attendance upon sessions of the Senate until I return from the trip which I am about to take.

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

Mr. MORSE. Let me say facetiously and good naturedly that the Republican speakers in support of Secretary Benson ought to get together. Their signals seem to be crossed. I think it would make rather humorous reading to read the speech of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] last week, and then read the comments of the Senator from Minnesota today, and try to follow the time clock of the Department of Agriculture. I think they ought to get together if they are really going to present a united front in the agriculture picture, because if I ever listened to two inconsistent speeches, I have heard them from these two distinguished leaders of the Republican Party.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

## NOMINATION OF JAMES H. DOUGLAS, JR., TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on the nomination of James H. Douglas, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, which nomination will be under consideration later this afternoon. At that time I shall not be present to register my vote against his nomination, so I wish to announce at this time that, if present, I would vote against it and to make certain comments as a result of my study of the record of the Armed Service Committee.

Mr. Douglas' nomination was favorably reported last Friday, and is on the calendar for today. He is a Chicago attorney. He has stock holdings which run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. A complete list is available from the Armed Services Committee. The committee requested that Douglas divest himself of 800 shares of Phillips Petroleum stock and 145 shares of Texas Gulf Producing. Douglas agreed to do so.

The transcript shows that Douglas has 400 shares of Seaboard Oil of Delaware. The record shows that members of the committee discussed this subject, and were not sure whether or not the company is a refining company. They did not seem to be able to reach an agreement on that point.

Not being a member of the committee, I must judge from what is in the record. As I gather from the record, some members of the committee felt that if this was a refining company Douglas should get rid of his shares in it. Mr. Douglas was not present at this hearing in order to clear up this matter. So far as the record shows, this discussion was left unresolved. So we still do not know. Even if we wish to accept as sound the criterion of the Armed Services Committee, which I think is a very fallacious criterion, namely, the distinction between a refining company and a producing company, as a basis for determining whether or not a nominee should be required to sell his shares, we cannot tell from the record the breed of his stocks.

Douglas is a cotrustee of several trusts, including that of his father's estate, in which the mother has a life interest. He and his brother will share equally upon her death. It was stated that this trust has diversified stockholdings, but no description was made beyond Douglas' statement that the trust does not hold aircraft or airline shares.

As a lawyer I know it is elementary that when one is trying to find the facts he does not stop with the witness' statement as to what the facts are. In my judgment, if one is carrying out his trust as a member of the committee, he ought to determine exactly what these stocks are. Simply to accept the statement that they are not aircraft or airline shares—which is all the record shows—certainly is not sufficient for me as a lawyer. I still think we ought to know what the facts are, based upon a listing of the shares. That should not be very difficult.

The appointee also has some interests and royalties in oil well enterprises which do not refine petroleum products, but sell to refineries. The discussion in the committee was to the effect that it has adopted the rule that Defense Department appointees should divest themselves of refining company stock, but not producing company stock. The rationale is that the latter would not deal with defense-procurement agencies. I think it is a remarkable rationale, but clearly unsound. In my opinion, there is a very direct relationship between the oil industry as such and the procurement of oil by the Defense Establishment. I believe the kind of interest Mr. Douglas has is one that should have been gone into more carefully than the transcript of the hearings shows was the case.

The record discloses that petroleum procurement for all the military services is handled by the Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency. There is an Air Force representative on the Agency, but he is not within the Office of the Under Secretary. However, he does not work in a vacuum. Nor would the proposed Under Secretary work in a vacuum. They all work together in the Department of the Air Force. To say that because the Under Secretary himself does not sit on the procurement agency, or that the officer who does sit on the procurement agency representing the Air Force does not work within the Office of the Under Secretary, is a great charge on the credulity of the Members of the Senate, if the conclusion the committee thinks we ought to draw is that therefore there could not possibly be any question of influence that would seep through the Air Force Department because of the position of the Under Secretary of the Air Force. They work shoulder to shoulder. They are parties in interest. One would expect that to be the fact in any kind of team work.

At the outset of the hearing Mr. Douglas stated that he would resign all his directorships, including that in the American Air Lines, if his nomination is confirmed. I compliment him on that great concession, but I wish the RECORD to show that if a yea-and-nay vote were held on the nomination—and I do not think one will be held—I would vote against confirmation. I would vote against it because I do not believe that the record shows that Mr. Douglas has been cleared of an affinity of interest any more than Wilson, Kyes, Talbott, or other nominees, whose nominations, in my opinion, for important positions in the Defense Establishment, should never have been confirmed, because they have interests which are in potential conflict with the public interest.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Douglas, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

## FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Val Peterson to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

The nomination was confirmed.

## ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all the nominations in the armed services listed on the Executive Calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army, National Guard, Air Force, and Navy are confirmed en bloc.

## SUNDAY APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations lying on the table, referred to at the bottom of the Executive Calendar, be considered at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I inquire what nominations are now being considered?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that nominations of 5,500 junior officers were reported to the Senate on Friday. On objection of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], they were laid over until today.

Mr. STENNIS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the sundry appointments in the Regular Army, sundry appointments and promotions in the Air Force, and sundry appointments in the Navy, which were reported favorably by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services on February 27, 1953, are confirmed en bloc.

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make clear to the Senate that my request on Friday that consideration of the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, be held over until today was not, by any means, motivated by doubt as to the personal integrity and ability of the lady from Connecticut.

Rather, it was the result of a recent visit to Italy where I found that Ambassador Bunker had performed a remarkable service for our country in a difficult political situation. I found that the attention of the Italian Government and people were focused upon our acts here in the United States. They were eagerly

awaiting any move we might make which would reflect our future attitude toward the Italian nation. For this reason, therefore, I felt that a more advised and deliberate approach should be taken to the nomination of a new Ambassador to assume the duties now being performed so ably by Ambassador Bunker.

Let me emphasize that I want the situation in Italy to remain as it is at the present time. I believe that to be the best position to take under all the circumstances. Particularly, we should not indicate that we are in any way interested in the election which is about to take place in Italy.

It was my thought that by avoiding a hasty approach to the nomination, we could best assure the maintenance of the good relations between our two countries and also avoid the charge that the replacement involved political implications in connection with the forthcoming Italian elections.

Mr. President, I shall now withhold any further objection to the nomination.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in behalf of the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, I should like to say that she appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe she demonstrated beyond any doubt that she understands the duties of Ambassador to Italy. She also very clearly distinguishes between the position of Ambassador to the Government of Italy and that of Ambassador to the Vatican State. She also demonstrated that she understands the principle of the separation between church and state in America.

I believe that she will serve in the position of Ambassador to Italy with credit to herself and to our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 44, which is the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering the second supplemental appropriation bill, so-called, which is the first appropriation bill of the 1953 session of Congress.

A great many persons in the United States and a great many Members of the Senate have had considerable to say about economy and about balancing the budget. The first appropriation bill of the 1953 session is now before the Senate, and this is the time for the Senate to proceed to effect economy.

I believe the Appropriations Committee has done a good job on the bill. Let me point out that the appropriation items submitted by the President and the Bureau of the Budget, and considered by the Senate committee, totaled \$2,327,521,114. The bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee to the Senate calls for appropriations in the amount of \$947,325,579, or a decrease of \$1,380,195,535 from the estimates and the budget requests.

The bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee differs in only minor respects from the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Items now included in the bill, as reported, which were not in the bill as passed by the House, are largely ones which were never submitted to the House of Representatives, but came in subsequent budget estimates. For instance, in that connection let me refer to an item of \$13 million for claims and judgments. There is nothing the Congress can do about claims, once they have been passed upon by the courts and once the courts have settled their amounts, we can only appropriate the amount.

Various other small items are contained in the bill; but the House of Representatives in considering the bill kept economy in mind, and I believe the Senate committee has held it to the same test. I hope we can proceed to act on the bill without any great delay.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Inasmuch as I have to attend a hearing in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the so-called tidelands-oil legislation, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD some remarks I have prepared in connection with the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY ON APPROPRIATION FOR COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS AND CONFUSED ECONOMIC POLICIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

I should like to make a few brief comments on the supplemental appropriation for the Council of Economic Advisers.

#### THREE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL SHOULD BE APPOINTED

First of all, I should like to point out that the \$60,000, provided for the Council of Economic Advisers by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, is unique in one respect: It is the only appropriation item for an agency which has no head.

While I support the committee's action in restoring the funds that had been eliminated by the other House, I believe it is essential that appointments be made promptly to fill the three positions on the Council of Economic Advisers as provided for under the Employment Act of 1946.

#### WIDESPREAD CONFUSION ON ECONOMIC POLICY

At the present moment, we see on all sides a growing confusion in the economic policies of the administration.

In the field of agriculture there seems to be a serious unawareness of the possible dangers confronting the American farmers and of the dangerous impact of declining farm prices on the rest of the economy.

In the field of fiscal policy, we are told, on the one hand, that many billions of dollars of wasteful expenditures can be eliminated and, on the other hand, that very few budget cuts can be expected.

We are told on one day that taxes can be reduced and on another day that they cannot be reduced.

On the one hand—presumably because inflationary pressures have abated—we see price controls abandoned and margin requirements on the stock market reduced.

On the other hand, we are told that higher interest rates are needed to stem inflation.

#### CONFUSION AND WASTE IN INTEREST RATES

We are told, on the one hand, that more of the public debt should be placed in long-term bonds, but, on the other hand, the Treasury Department replaces almost \$9 billion of 11½-month securities with securities maturing in only 12 months.

We are told that a primary purpose of the administration is to reduce costs. Yet in this recent refinancing operation—which is the biggest single action the new administration has taken in the field of economic policy—the Secretary of the Treasury has boosted the rate of interest from 1½ percent to 2¼ percent.

This increase of three-eighths of 1 percent means an increased cost to the Government—and increased profit to the bankers—of \$34 million a year, a figure verified by the Secretary of the Treasury. This sum alone is twice what would be needed to expand and improve our Nation's facilities for training an adequate supply of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

We are told that this costly increase in interest payments is forced upon us by the fact that the market rate has risen as a result of the automatic operation of the law of supply and demand. Yet the financial expert of the New York Times who reported upon the refinancing operation in the New York Times of February 15 said that one consideration in the higher interest rate was—and I quote—"the willingness of the Treasury to pay even more than the market rate."

#### NEED FOR COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

It was to deal with problems of this type that the Congress provided for the Council of Economic Advisers in the Employment Act of 1946.

The primary purpose of the Council of Economic Advisers is to develop a consistent and integrated economic policy which will promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The members of the Council of Economic Advisers, when appointed, will obviously not find their task an easy one.

Any Council of Economic Advisers, when appointed, will probably find itself faced with the necessity of recommending many changes and improvements in the present

economic policies of the present administration.

Because of the obvious need for such changes and improvements, I sincerely hope that the appointments will be made without further delay.

**SIXTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ADEQUATE FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR**

As for the specific sum of \$60,000 to carry the Council through the remainder of this fiscal year, I am highly gratified with the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee. This decision, if sustained, will reverse the action of the other House which, by deleting funds for the Council of Economic Advisers, would have defeated the intent of the Congress as expressed in the Employment Act of 1946.

The sum of \$60,000, I am informed, will be sufficient to allow this important agency to operate during the next few months. I assume this figure will be accepted by the Senate; I hope it will be agreed to by the conferees representing the other House.

**MR. FERGUSON.** Mr. President, the amount carried by the appropriation bill we are now considering is almost 60 percent below the total amount requested by the Budget Bureau originally. It is actually 59.3 percent below the estimates. Most of the estimates and requests for appropriations were submitted to the Congress by the previous administration. Congress, however, can take little credit for this tremendous reduction in the appropriations carried by this particular bill, for almost all the savings were voluntarily made by the new administration.

Time after time at the appropriations committee hearings we heard officials of the new administration say, "We can get along without that additional appropriation," or "We shall use the funds we already have." This spirit of economy on the part of the executive branch of the Government is something new to me, and I believe it is the spirit which should be shown by the administration.

I have compiled a brief table showing the reductions in appropriation requests which were voluntarily made by the new administration and also the reductions which were made after the House of Representatives or Senate Appropriations Committee brought the attention of the new administration to this subject. The two types of reduction made by the new administration amount to \$1,380,358,500. This total is greater than the amount shown on page 1 of the Senate committee's report as a reduction in the budget estimates, because some of the transfers requested by the new administration are not considered as appropriation estimates or requests. In previous years, however, such transfers were rare, since the emphasis always seemed to be on new and additional appropriations—in other words, on new and additional funds—not on transfers and the use of existing appropriations.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the table of appropriations reductions requested or agreed to by the new administration and also the table of reductions in appropriations requests which were made by the House of Representatives, were accepted by the new administration, and were not appealed to the Senate.

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

*Appropriations reductions requested or agreed to by the new administration*

**I. INSTANCES AND AMOUNTS OF REDUCTIONS WHERE REQUESTS WERE REDUCED BY NEW ADMINISTRATION BEFORE CONSIDERATION BY CONGRESS**

State Department salaries and expenses	\$360,000
Justice, fees of witness and support of prisoners	1,870,000
Justice, Immigration and Naturalization, salaries and expenses for new law	1,725,000
Commerce, Patent Office, printing expenses	5,000
Post Office, postal operations	28,000,000
Post Office, claims	300,000
Department of Labor, Employment Security, salaries and expenses	31,000
Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics	150,000
National Mediation Board, salaries and expenses	17,000
Agriculture, REA, for telephones	15,000,000
President's emergency fund	100,000
Civil Service Commission, for U. N. investigation	1,000,000
Veterans' Administration, medical and hospital services	3,074,000
VA, readjustment benefits	80,640,000
Defense Department, military pay	145,150,000
Total	276,422,000

<sup>1</sup>By transfer.

**II. REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS REQUESTS WHICH WERE MADE BY THE HOUSE, ACCEPTED BY NEW ADMINISTRATION, AND NOT APPEALED TO SENATE**

Judiciary, miscellaneous salary and expenses	\$36,000
State Department, United States-Mexico International Boundary Commission	1,000,000
Treasury, Bureau of Public Debt	1,550,000
Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, grants to States	1,190,000
Labor, unemployment compensation for veterans	5,000,000
FSA, Office of Education, salaries and expenses	30,000
FSA, Public Health Service, payment to Hawaii	56,000
VA, readjustment benefits	50,418,000
VA, servicemen's indemnities	500,000
VA, grants to Philippines	432,500
Defense, military pay	1,043,724,000
Total	1,103,936,500

<sup>1</sup>By transfer.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the heading "Chapter I—Legislative Branch," on page 1 after line 8, to insert:

**SENATE**

For payment to Rosemary T. McMahon, widow of Brian McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to. The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

**SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES**

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in

the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Florida, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 3 million but less than 5 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 12, to insert:

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of New Jersey, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 5 million but less than 10 million, the population of said State having exceeded 5 million inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

**Office of the Secretary:** Effective March 1, 1953, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 is made available for the compensation of one camera and sound engineer, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$4,080 per annum, and one shipping clerk, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$1,500 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 4, to insert:

**CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE**

**Joint Committee on Printing:** For an additional amount for salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates to be fixed by the committee, \$555.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 8, to insert:

**Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy:** For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, including the objects specified in section 401, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, second session, \$14,000; notwithstanding subsection (j) of section 401, amount to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 16, to insert:

**Vice President's automobile:** For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, \$980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 19, to insert:

**Inquiries and investigations:** For an additional amount for "Expenses of inquiries and investigations," \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 4, after line 6, to insert:

**SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES**

**Office of the Clerk:** For an additional amount for the "Office of the Clerk," \$3,835 to be available for the compensation of one editor and laboratory supervisor, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$4,020 per

annum, and one script writer and general secretary, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$2,500 per annum, Joint Recording Facility.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS

Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings" \$3,651, of which \$2,651 shall be for payment to Skinker & Garrett, contractor, for constructing brick arches under the main entrance portico steps of the Capitol Building to support the 1953 inaugural stands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 18, to insert:

Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnishings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, including personal and other services, \$1,600, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For an additional amount for "Senate Office Building," \$54,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Judiciary," on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PREPARATION OF RULES FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE

For expenses of the Supreme Court incident to proposed amendments or additions to the rules of civil procedure for the United States district courts pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2072, to be expended as the Chief Justice in his discretion may approve, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence at rates to be fixed by him not to exceed \$10 per day, \$11,500, to remain available until June 30, 1954.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Department of State—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico", on page 7, line 16, after the word "expended", to insert "of which \$1,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International information and educational activities", Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 19, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer from appropriations contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, not to exceed \$270,000 to the appropriation "Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice", 1953, and not to exceed \$600,000 to the appropriation "Support of United States prisoners, Federal Prison System," 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office—Salaries and Expenses", on page 8, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out \$100,000" and insert "\$130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Access Roads (Act of September 7, 1950)", on page 9, line 5, after "Act of September 7, 1950)", to strike out "for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended," and insert "to remain available until expended, \$18,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III", on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

POSTAL OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Postal operations", \$28,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 10, to insert:

CLAIMS

For an additional amount for "Claims", \$300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Department of Labor—Bureau of Employment Security", on page 10, after line 7, to insert:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Security Agency—Office of Education", on page 11, after line 18, to insert:

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The amount made available under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies, is increased from "\$750,000" to "\$875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 11, to insert:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses", National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 17, to insert:

ARBITRATION AND EMERGENCY BOARDS

For an additional amount for "Arbitration and emergency boards," \$10,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses," National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert:

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in the National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1953, exclusively for com-

pensation and expenses of referees is decreased from "\$216,000" to "\$199,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 6, to insert:

CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

RURAL ELECTRICAL ADMINISTRATION

Loan authorizations

The basic amount authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural electrification program is decreased from "\$50,000,000" to "\$35,000,000," and the basic amount authorized by said act to be borrowed for the rural telephone program is increased from "\$25,000,000" to "\$40,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 17, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "V" and insert "VI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 18, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VI" and insert "VII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President," on page 14, after line 19, to strike out:

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 15, to insert:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$60,000; and said appropriation shall remain available through June 30, 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergency fund for the President—national defense", on page 16, line 9, after the word "defense", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 3, to strike out:

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For an additional amount for "Grants to the Republic of the Philippines", \$1 million.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 13, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VII" and insert "VIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 3, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VIII" and insert "IX."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 21, to insert:

CHAPTER X

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document No. 18, 83d

Congress, \$13,230,038, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 18, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "IX" and insert "XI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions", on page 20, line 20, to change the section number from "901" to "1101."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 3, to change the section number from "902" to "1102."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to state to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire, that I have before me a letter from Mr. Bernard Weitzer, national legislative director of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. With the letter he has sent me a copy of a telegram, which I have since submitted to the Senator from New Hampshire. The telegram relates to appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. I am not sure whether the telegram was placed in the record of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that the telegram came in after the hearings were concluded.

Mr. HILL. I assume that the chairman of the committee will have no objection to having the telegram placed at this point in the RECORD; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. Then, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the telegram to which I have referred.

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

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,

Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, I respectfully urge you support full supplemental appropriation requested in Veterans' Administration approved by Budget Bureau \$15,886,000 for administration finance contact service vocational rehabilitation and education loan guarantee program and medical services plus \$10 million additional for medical services. Appropriations cuts in past years have already seriously eroded the VA medical services and staff leading to thousands of unusable hospital beds and causing deaths and dangerous hardships to veterans entitled by law to medical treatment. The appropriations suggested above are urgent now and correction in the 1954 budget will not undo the further ruination of the medical services and the contact service which present cuts will inflict. Contact service is the essential

means whereby the veteran is aided to get the benefits you have voted for him. The appeals made to you by some Senators on behalf of veterans in their States awaiting medical service can be duplicated in practically every State in the country where more than 21,000 eligible applicant veterans are waiting to get into hospitals and more than 289,000 applications are pending for outpatient dental treatment, more than 2½ times as many as there were last year. Will appreciate your entering this message in your committee hearings record.

BERNARD WEITZER,  
National Legislative Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have now been agreed to, and the bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, under authorization of the Appropriations Committee, and in conformity with a notice given in proper time for the submission of an amendment, I now send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, in line 18, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed on Federal property situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that our committee was unanimous in authorizing the Senator from New Hampshire to submit the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The amendment would add nothing to the total amount to be appropriated, but would facilitate greatly the attainment of the objective of giving some help to such areas, regardless of whether the children live in Virginia, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, or elsewhere. In any event, the purpose is to have them receive the aid Congress intended they should receive.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The amendment is based on the assumption—I may say, in connection with what the distinguished Senator from Virginia has said—that these are Federal funds, and if they are used for school purposes in areas where a great Federal project is in existence, the expenditure of the funds should not be limited by State lines. For example, let us say there is a large plant in Virginia or perhaps in Indiana—I remember one in Indiana—and let us assume that some of the persons working in the plant live in Kentucky—or vice versa. Under the law which has been in effect, they must live

within the State where the plant is located in order to obtain benefits. The State boundary is an imaginary line which should not be in effect where Federal funds are to be used. The test should be reasonable commuting distances to the plant, in order that all communities may be treated equally.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want to call attention to one matter only. This proviso applies not only to this fiscal year but to the succeeding fiscal year. The matter dealt with here will require the passage this year of another school act—an authorization act, as I remember. Consequently, Senators should closely watch to see that that act does not repeal this provision for the succeeding fiscal year. I only want to call attention to the fact that the Senate may later supersede what is being done here for the next fiscal year. I have no objection to including it in this bill, but it should be covered by permanent legislation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution to the discussion regarding this particular amendment. I should be glad to proceed to explain the amendment at some length, if desired, but I know that all members of the Appropriations Committee understand it. From my talks with most of the other Members of the Senate, I judge that they, too, understand it. It is a fair approach to correct an inequality which prevails at the present time.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that a good many States of the Union are affected by this provision?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. About 15 States are affected by it. I have in my hand a list of the States that will be affected. They are Maine, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, Maryland, Iowa, Illinois, Texas, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, South Dakota, and Nebraska. There may be others, but this is the number we have been advised are currently faced with the problem we seek to correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS  
CONSTRUCTION

Notwithstanding the prohibition against the purchase of land from appropriations for construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs, contained in the act of July 9, 1952, Public Law 470, 82d Congress, 2d session, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase from said appropriation not to exceed 1,500 acres of nonreservation lands in Arizona, and necessary rights-of-way and easements required for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, and approximately 5 acres

of allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., for use of the Wapato irrigation project.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment involves no increase in appropriations. Last year in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill there was appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$17,500,000 for construction of various Indian irrigation projects. There was included in the appropriation bill the customary language, that no part of the sum should be expended for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming, outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, and that no part of the appropriation should be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

When we made the appropriation we did not have that provision in mind. There was an allocation of \$300,000 for the improvement of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project in Arizona. But it cannot be used, because the improvement would result in flooding certain lands, principally desert lands which had been acquired. The same thing is true with respect to a pumping plant to be located on the Yakima Indian Reservation in the State of Washington. It is a small tract, but the title must be passed from the Indians to the United States, for the purpose of building the power-plant. This amendment merely makes it possible to do what the Congress intended should be done at the last session.

For the information of the conferees, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a complete statement regarding this matter, which appears at page 277 of the hearings.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

##### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Senator HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in the Interior Department appropriation bill last year, under "Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs," there is a provision:

"For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended; \$17,500,000 of which \$1,380,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted."

There are two provisos:

"Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations."

#### PICACHO RESERVOIR, ARIZ.

Now, this \$17,500,000 was left for allocation by the Secretary of the Interior and in the order of priority which he established. \$300,000 was allocated for improvement of what is known as the Picacho Reservoir, in connection with flood control and irrigation on the San Carlos project in Arizona.

It now appears that the \$300,000 cannot be expended for the acquisition of land which would be flooded by reason of the increase in the size of the reservoir. It also is true that in the State of Washington there is need to acquire a small tract of land inside of an Indian reservation.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED

What I desire to do, Mr. Chairman, is to offer a legislative amendment and have it printed in the record at this time which will modify legislative limitations that I have cited. I want to include in the record a statement as to just exactly what was expected to be done in each case, and the justification for the proposed amendment.

Chairman BRIDGES. You may include that in the record.

(The amendment referred to follows:)

"On page 8 after line 4 in H. R. 3053, as reported to the House, insert the following:

#### "BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS CONSTRUCTION

"Notwithstanding the prohibition against the purchase of land from appropriations for Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs, contained in the Act of July 9, 1952, Public Law 470, Eighty-second Congress, Second Session, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase from said appropriation not to exceed fifteen hundred acres of nonreservation lands in Arizona, and necessary rights-of-way and easements required for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, and approximately five acres of allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Indian Reservation, Washington, for use of the Wapato irrigation project."

#### "JUSTIFICATION

"The purchases proposed will be made out of funds appropriated by the said act for the Interior Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. Under the provisions of the act, however, the San Carlos irrigation project cannot use the funds to purchase the lands necessary for the enlargement of the reservoir because of specific limitations contained in the act. It is provided therein that no part of the funds appropriated for the construction of irrigation projects shall be used for the acquisition of lands within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, and that no part of the appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

"The lands needed for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir in Arizona, approximately 1,155 acres, are outside of any Indian reservation. The San Carlos irrigation project was constructed under the act of Congress approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 475). The Picacho Reservoir, originally constructed by the water users about 1892, is used to impound floodwaters of the Gila and San Pedro Rivers, and the surrounding areas west of the Picacho Mountains, for irrigation purposes. The reservoir provides storage regulation and water distribution service for the San Carlos project and protects a fertile farm area from possible damages resulting from flood runoff, which, during storm periods in the area, has, at times, exceeded the capacity of the reservoir. As a result of silt deposits, the reservoir capacity has decreased over the years from that of approximately 15,000 acre-feet to a present capacity of

about 3,000 acre-feet. The reservoir is extremely important to the operation of the project, the conservation of water, and the protection of the surrounding area from damage in the time of seasonal freshets and storms.

"All of the lands proposed for purchase are above the high-water line of the present reservoir. It is estimated that it will be necessary to purchase 1,154.5 acres at the following estimated costs:

864 acres desert land at \$50 per acre	\$43,200
290.5 acres cultivated land at \$300 per acre	87,150

Total, 1,154.5 acres 130,350

"The allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Reservation, Wash., are required for a pumping-plant site and operator's quarters for the Wapato irrigation project within the Yakima Indian Reservation. The purchase cost is estimated at \$500."

Senator HAYDEN. I next insert a statement made by Mr. C. A. Anderson, district engineer of the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"STATEMENT OF C. A. ANDERSON, DISTRICT ENGINEER, SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, COOLIDGE, ARIZ.

"The district I represent is a part of the San Carlos Federal irrigation project which comprises an area of 100,000 acres of irrigated land, located in central Arizona about midway between the cities of Phoenix and Tucson. One-half the area within the project is Indian land, property of the Pima Indians, who were engaged in agriculture there before the white man first came to explore the area some 300 years ago. The remaining half, or 50,000 acres, of the project is owned and operated by white farmers, and this area comprises the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District.

"The works of the project were constructed pursuant to the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 475). These works were placed into operation about the year 1931, and the area has enjoyed the economic benefit and growth resulting from the development since that time.

"A repayment contract between the Secretary and the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District was entered into in June 1931. Under its terms the program of operation and maintenance is defined as are the obligations of the district for the repayment of reimbursable construction costs on an annual basis.

"Because of the extensive Indian interest involved, the San Carlos project was constructed by the Indian Service and the Department, through the Office of Indian Affairs, still retains control and management of the principal project works.

#### "PICACHO RESERVOIR PROJECT

"Picacho Reservoir is a small storage reservoir located at the eastern edge of the project area and adjacent to the main canal. It serves two important purposes: (1) To capture and store unregulated floodwaters which would otherwise be lost for irrigation use; and (2) to regulate or make uniform the flow in a main canal which conducts water for some 40 miles, feeding project laterals along its course.

"The reservoir has been in operation for some 60 years. It was originally constructed and used by settlers in the valley before the project was built. It was then taken over by the Government as a part of the San Carlos project works. Silt-laden floodwaters impounded there from time to time have caused the storage space to gradually become smaller. At the present time the area is practically

level with the top of the confining embankment. As a consequence the floodwaters which form a part of the common project supply can no longer be impounded or regulated and must run to waste if storage space is not restored. Moreover, the loss of flood storage capacity presents an annual threat of flood damage to areas below the reservoir because, if no detention is provided, such floodwaters will unquestionably run over and past the former storage site and con-

tinue without control to cause damage to improved areas below."

Senator HAYDEN. In addition to Mr. Anderson's statement, I desire to have included in the record data that he has submitted, showing who owns the lands that are to be acquired, and the nature of the lands, whether cultivated or desert, together with certain data that he has prepared in connection with it.

(The material referred to follows:)

*San Carlos project—Summary of lands or rights-of-way required for reconstruction and enlargement of Picacho Reservoir*

[Section numbers referred to in the following tabulation are sections 25 and 36, township 6 south, range 8 east; sections 30 and 31, township 6 south, range 9 east; sections 1 and 2, township 7 south, range 8 east; and sections 6, township 7 south, range 9 east, all G. and S. R. B. and M., Arizona]

Sec. No.	Owner of record	Acres required			Patented or State (unpatented)
		Cultivated	Desert	Total	
25	Leonard Bellows, Waitsbury, Wash.	31.1	-----	31.1	Patented.
25	Fred Wuerz, Coolidge, Ariz.	67.4	-----	67.4	Do.
36	State of Arizona	27.0	46.6	73.6	State.
30	do	40.0	240.5	280.5	Do.
31	do	40.0	100.7	140.7	Do.
2	do	-----	80.0	80.0	Do.
31	Kitty Hayes, et al., Los Angeles, Calif.	140.5	140.5	140.5	Patented.
6	A. Avenenti Estate, Tucson, Ariz.	148.0	148.0	148.0	Do.
1	V. Whillock, Coolidge, Ariz.	70.5	79.6	150.1	Do.
1	C. Balcom, Coolidge, Ariz.	14.5	68.0	82.5	Do.
6	Earl Sheeley, La Marque, Tex.	-----	90.1	90.1	Do.
6	C. Balcom, Coolidge, Ariz.	-----	50.0	50.0	Do.
Totals (from preliminary surveys)		1,290.5	1,044.0	1,334.5	

<sup>1</sup> During 1952, following surveys, cultivated area was enlarged somewhat in SE 1/4 sec. 1. This appears to be about 50 acres additional. Hence total cultivated area is now estimated at total of 340.5 acres.

<sup>2</sup> Actual high-water line of new reservoir is estimated from surveys to cover new desert areas to the extent of approximately 864 acres. It may be necessary to purchase additional fractions to subdivision lines, amounting to about 180 acres. Therefore total estimated desert area is 1,044 (864 plus 180) acres.

NOTES ON TABULATION OF AREAS, PICACHO RESERVOIR

	Acres
Total patented land	759.7
Total unpatented land (State)	574.8
	1,334.5

Estimate of cost of acquiring lands (from Indian Service preliminary report):

864 acres desert land at \$50.	\$43,200
290.5 acres cultivated land at \$300.	87,150

Total estimate for purchase of right-of-way 130,350

It is believed that, if found necessary to purchase a total of 340.5 acres of cultivated land and 1,044 acres of desert land as indicated in the tabulation and explained by the notes above, such total areas can be obtained within the \$130,350 shown in the above estimate.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. As one who has worked long in this particular vineyard with the Senator from Arizona, I desire to add my word to his with respect to the amendment he has just offered. I think the amendment is in the public interest, and that the particular exception, or the two exceptions from the prohibition, should be made. It will be very helpful to the Indians in question, and it is absolutely necessary if the construction projects are to go forward.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this bill there was one item relating to clerk hire about which there was some question particularly from Senators of States with large populations. Some of the Senators from large States are paying money out of their own pockets for clerical hire in order to carry their official load. This condition should not prevail, and so far as I am concerned, I think the Senate should take steps to remedy it. However, the other day at the committee meetings, in marking up this bill, it was felt that the formula

used to attain the desired objective should be given more study. It was suggested that the sponsor or sponsors of such amendment confer with the chairman and members of the legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, to see whether they could agree on a formula for increased clerical staffs prior to the consideration of the next supplemental or regular appropriation bill. Such action will postpone the date of this relief, and it might impose a burden on Senators. I desired to offer that explanation. I see in the Senate Chamber the very able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who was one of the sponsors of this provision, and I shall defer to him if he cares to add anything to this explanation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I raised the question; indeed, as a matter of fact, it was raised in a number of conferences long before the matter was presented to the Appropriations Committee. Senators from States with large populations, particularly populations that are vocal and are given to writing letters, are in the unhappy position of having put upon them an undue burden. I am frank to confess that I am in that unhappy fix.

The formula by which we operate now is broken up into three categories: First, States with a population of less than

3,000,000 are allotted \$39,540 as a base. I confess I have never been able to fathom the intricacies of all the additions to the formula by which that amount is spelled out, because it must take into account nearly every legislative proposal touching the salaries of clerical assistants which at one time or another is enacted.

The next category covers States with populations of from 3 to 5 million; the third, States having populations of from 5 to 10 million; and then those having more than 10 million. I happen to come from a State that has a population of more than 9 million. The population of New Mexico is 1 million; that of New York is in excess of 14 million, or 4 million more than the top figure.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that I find myself in the very unhappy fix of being unable to compete with the House of Representatives when it comes to hiring clerical assistants; nor can I compete with the governmental agencies downtown. Sometimes when a very able person comes forward—a person who might well serve in my office—and I suggest what is the maximum salary I can pay, it is not acceptable, and I discover that I cannot compete with the agencies of the executive branch.

There is one other factor involved, which affects particularly those States that are most remote from the District of Columbia. I refer to the fact that there is no provision today for a transportation allowance for clerks. I think the Members from California would like to give employment to persons from their State, yet we all know that the transportation costs are heavy, indeed, and when the California Members cannot offer enough, it simply means they cannot compete with others who might engage the services of such persons.

Speaking as one whose State is in the category of large States, I simply say to the Senate that I need more help. I cannot go on forever working the life out of my staff. They start early and work until 6 or 7 o'clock at night. They work on Saturdays and Sundays. I bought portable typewriters for some of them so they could work at home, for which they receive no extra compensation. I have procured for them the number of electric typewriters the rule will allow. It becomes a tremendous chore to take care of the mail. It is not so heavy as it was, but in 1951, in a single day, more than 6,000 first-class letters reached my office. They must be answered. The people are entitled to a response from one who represents them in the Senate or in the House of Representatives.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the cost of transportation of an employee is so clearly a serious problem with which many of us are faced that I cannot help but comment on that particular phase of the Senator's statement. The cost of transportation by plane from the city of St. Paul, or the city of Minneapolis, to Washington is approximately \$122.02. We cannot recruit workers from such an

area without some kind of travel allowance, because they would expect to go back home at least once a year to see their parents and their friends. In the case of a far western State, such as California or Oregon, to which the fare is in excess of \$300, and no allowance is granted for travel expenses, it is impossible to recruit workers from such localities. Most of the time we have to take employees who offer themselves from the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Minnesota has placed his finger on the point. A Senator would like to favor people in his own State. They are familiar with the conditions in the State, whether it be in agriculture or in industry. They know other persons there, and it serves a very useful purpose in a Senator's office to have employees from his own State, if possible. I am in the unhappy position, because of the limitation on clerical allowances, plus the fact that there is no transportation allowance, of having to content myself with employing persons who are residents of Maryland and Virginia. They are fine people; but what kind of an explanation can we make to the voters back home? I am free to admit that a Member of the Congress does wear a political tab, and people want a little favor now and then, and they are rightly entitled to it by every tradition. I have great difficulty because of the straitjacket in which I am compelled to operate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Another grave problem of Senators who come from far-distant States is that from time to time they must return to their respective States and must take some members of their staffs with them in order to conduct their business properly. A year ago I was compelled to take two of the members of my staff and have them establish an office in St. Paul. There are no allowances with which to pay travel expenses of those persons who must return to the States in order to staff the office we establish during the time Congress is in recess.

There is another problem, Mr. President, which apparently no one seems to appreciate or understand, namely, that we must ask some of our staff members to give up their living quarters in the District of Columbia and move out to our own States for a period of 3 or 4 months, and then return to Washington when Congress reconvenes. It involves great expense, and much inconvenience, but conditions are such that it is very difficult to convince persons in the States that they should come to Washington to take positions in the offices of Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is quite correct.

The formula under which we operate is certainly not scientific. How can we justify a jump from a population of 3 million to 5 million persons, when the next category is over 10 million persons? We are penalized in that respect. I worked out a formula which I thought was infinitely better.

I may say, Mr. President, that I certainly do not like to encumber a supplemental appropriation bill, but I know

that if we had to wait until the 30th of June it would not become effective in time to be of any assistance. If we were to move up by successive stages, 1 million at a time, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, 4 to 5, then up to 9, and then to 10, and jump by a stated amount of \$3,000 in every category, that would give \$3,000 for every additional 1 million persons.

Some States may be able to get by with the amount of clerical help they have at the present time; but I find great difficulty. There is a city in Illinois with a population of more than 3½ million persons, but I can take only 1 person in the office for that large population. We are confronted with enough work to make it entirely worthwhile to have 2 or 3 and thus facilitate a great deal of the work at the Nation's Capital, and give more expeditious service. But that cannot be done under the formula which prevails.

I had hoped that my idea would commend itself to the favor and the grace of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I think the committee did look with favor on the objective which he sought. The committee did favor some action along the lines he has indicated. No definite recommendation was made, but it seemed to be the prevailing view that the legislative subcommittee could furnish a formula and then report its findings in connection with the next appropriation bill to come before the Senate.

The difficulty about acting on the floor at the moment is the haste with which we would have to act in perfecting the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I quite agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I know that one cannot discern at a glance all the things that are involved, so I am generally reluctant to advance an amendment under such circumstances. I wish to say to my distinguished chairman that I shall withhold the amendment in the hope that by the time the next supplemental or deficiency appropriation bill is considered, there will have been an opportunity to explore the question.

Mr. President, I am going to hand this proposal in the form of an amendment to my distinguished chairman, knowing full well that it will receive vigorous, careful scrutiny and attention.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator that we should give a great deal of study to this particular matter. Some Senators now on the floor may recall that the matter was before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That committee, too, did a great deal of investigating. At that time we found that when we jumped these brackets up to 3 million or a little more, in three categories, that was not enough. There ought to be more of a breakdown.

As an illustration, in my own State, the population is 2,200,000. Yet at the present time there are other States hav-

ing populations of about 250,000 whose Senators draw the same amount received by those of my State. It can readily be seen that that is not a correct allocation. There ought to be a committee giving this matter special attention and careful study. If that is not done, we will have a great many headaches in the future.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, and other Senators who may be interested, that, so far as I am concerned, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, insofar as I have it within my power to do so, I shall see to it that the legislative subcommittee makes a study of the question, and that the full committee acts on it, in connection with the next bill in which it can be appropriately included. I assume there will be another supplemental appropriation bill. The question should be considered by the legislative subcommittee, and something along the suggested lines might be included. I recognize the problem, and I hope we may have the cooperation of the committee and of the interested Senators in solving it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Has the Senator from Illinois concluded his colloquy on the subject he was discussing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, unless the Senator has a question on the point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; my question relates to another point.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, I should like to ask the chairman of the full committee a question with respect to the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, found on page 16, line 12. Approximately \$5 million more was asked than was allowed by the House. The Senate committee did not allow it, but referred the matter to the Director of the Budget for an opinion. May I ask the chairman if any reply has been received from the Director of the Budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that the matter was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, as the committee directed, but up to this moment there has been no reply from the Bureau. However, in my judgment, there will be another supplemental appropriation bill, and whether the budget reports favorably on the item or not, the committee will have an opportunity to pass on it when that bill is considered. So the matter can be considered a little later.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the matter was referred to the new Director of the Budget, in order to get an opinion from him, was it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 18 of the bill, line 14, under the items aggregating \$1,200,000,000, apparently to be appro-

priated to make up an increase for the military forces, I read the following language:

The foregoing amounts under this heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

I should like to ascertain from the distinguished chairman of the committee if the breakdown on page 22 of the report means that the action of the Senate in passing this bill today means reducing funds for the maintenance and operation of the Army by \$301 million; that we are taking away from the Air Force money for planes in the amount of \$295 million; that we are reducing the funds for the Marine Corps by \$40 million; the amount for ships and facilities of the Navy by \$83 million; the amount for ordnance and facilities by \$57 million; the amount for medical care for troops by \$5,700,000; together with funds for other matters listed.

In other words, I should like to understand whether the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] today that a saving of more than a billion dollars is shown means that we are to eliminate funds for the acquisition of ships, ordnance, and aircraft, and for medical care, amounts which will not be restored later by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is my understanding that the Department of Defense and its respective divisions have gone over the figures with the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, and also with some members of the committee, and the Department has given assurance that the reductions can be absorbed without the loss of effectiveness of the defense effort, or a reduction of any of the essential aspects of the defense program. In other words, it is the understanding of the committee that the funds will not be replaced, and that the reductions can be absorbed without detrimentally affecting the defense program.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senate committee having cut \$295 million from Air Force funds, some \$40 million from Marine Corps funds, and some \$57 million from ordnance, I am at a loss to understand how we would save money, if when the appropriation bill for the armed services comes before the Senate, the \$57 million for ordnance, and the amounts for airplanes and other items, will come back through another door when the time comes to appropriate.

Mr. BRIDGES. No, it is the understanding of the committee that these amounts will not come back through another door, but that they are actual savings. For example, as a result of going into production in the manufacture or purchase of certain ordnance equipment, and therefore getting lower costs, the Department of Defense is able to achieve its objective at an amount lower than was requested in the previous appropriation bill. Therefore, the surplus can be used for this purpose and not detract from the original objective. That is our understanding.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, what the distinguished chairman of the

Committee on Appropriations is saying is that this is a rescission, and not an actual saving of money?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. Let me read a statement with respect to that question by Mr. Lyle S. Garlock, one of the top officials of the Department of Defense:

With respect to the method of financing proposed by the House, the Department does not object to financing the bill from funds available, but we do want to point out that it is still too early in the year to determine which appropriations can stand these transfers without any substantial interference with the military operations.

So if this committee agrees with the House action, and it is understood we are to take the money from those appropriations which will not cause any interference with the military buildup, we will concur. It is possible, Senator, that we might have to use some procurement money that would have to be replaced in later years.

He leaves an out for the future.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think he leaves an out; I think he leaves the door wide open, if this matter is to be handed to the Senate and to the country as a billion dollar saving.

I listened intently to the Senator as he read from the report, and I understood the witness to say it was far too early to tell just what portion of these rescissions or transfers or manipulations would be savings which could come back in the form of requests for appropriations in other bills. I am not so familiar with military needs as is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; but when the armed services appropriation bill comes before the Senate, I should certainly be very much surprised if the Department of Defense did not ask for more money. I find in the report that it is proposed to transfer \$57 million for ordnance facilities. Moreover, I certainly doubt that there is \$40 million of fat in the Marine Corps appropriation. I doubt very seriously whether there is \$83 million for ships that we can automatically wipe out and not have to replace.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, because I know that he wants to be fair, and that he is looking for the facts, that in my judgment there might very well be that amount of fat that can be taken out. It can easily be taken out. The information conveyed to our committee was that on June 30, 1952, there was approximately \$7 billion in completely unobligated funds.

I am in favor of adequate national defense, and have always been. Back in the 1930's, when many Members of this body were in favor of cutting down defense appropriations and closing their eyes to what was going on, I fought for appropriations for national defense. I have always been in favor of adequate national defense. However, I think there is a great deal of waste and duplication which could be eliminated, and I think this is one way of doing it.

I cannot say to the Senator absolutely that with respect to these items the Defense Department may not try to slip some items in by the back door again. I would not be foolish enough to say that it will not try to do so. But to the best of my knowledge and belief these savings can be absorbed, and I believe that

the method proposed is the best way of policing the situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. The only thing that worries me is what the Senator has just read, to the effect that it is too early in the year to know. Now we are told that we are saving more than \$1 billion. As I read the bill we are not saving a thin dime. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. We are meeting \$1,200,000,000 worth of pay due servicemen under increased allowances and pay.

On the other hand, we are proposing to rescind or transfer some \$1,043,000. However, the chairman of the committee does not say, and I do not believe he can say, whether in this action we are taking away, for example, \$28 million of civilian relief in Korea, or taking away from the Army some \$301 million. Certainly, if money which has been appropriated for the Army is not used by the end of this fiscal year it will still be available for the Army. So we would not have to appropriate so much money in the next defense bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. That depends on the type of the appropriation; some authorizations lapse in 1 year, some remain available until expended. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that often in the past there has been a rush by the departments to obligate and spend money before the deadline of June 30. I do not say that that has been true in all cases, but I do say that there has been such a general tendency in the Federal Government. If the Congress of the United States, exercising its duties in the field of appropriations, can force a department to use money previously appropriated to carry out an act without detriment to the general program, I think it is sound procedure to do so. Large balances of unobligated funds available to an agency are not conducive to tight economical operations. I do not think the Senator has any cause for worry. I have never heard of damage resulting by reason of a department of the Government voluntarily giving up money.

Mr. MONRONEY. The breakdown, I take it, is that which is recommended by the Department of Defense for ordnance, aircraft, ships, and other things which are not needed, and for which the Department will not need to seek new appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. The Senator will note items for retired pay, and a number of items for military personnel. The opportunity for savings arises because during the fiscal year there were not the number of men in the services contemplated when the request for appropriations was made last session.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have heard a great deal about ordnance shortages. I should not like to see the Senate take action which would cut \$57 million from the item of ordnance, which apparently is in this list.

Mr. BRIDGES. Where does the Senator see the item of ordnance?

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 23 of the committee report. There is an item of \$57,288,000 listed under "Ordnance and facilities." I cannot tell whether it is for the Marine Corps or the Navy, or both. In other words, the rescissions

appear to me to come out of fighting funds, funds for military equipment, medical care, and things of that kind, which we have been led to believe are greatly needed, and represent a very important part of our national defense.

With a \$40 billion bill coming in later, I do not see how the Congress, and particularly the Senate, can tell whether or not such appropriation bill will carry the \$1 billion, which we save on March 2, and which we may find ourselves reappropriating in May, or whenever the bill comes to us.

Mr. BRIDGES. All I can say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is that the committee will do its best to see that these items are not reappropriated for through any back-door operation. We have approached the problem in a sincere effort to attain economy, bearing in mind that no Defense Department official will be absolutely positive. Defense Department officials say "probably," and Congress must make the decision. I think the Defense Department officials went as far as they could in the hearings without the official approval of their superiors. We have had various conferences since. Prior to that time we convinced ourselves that this was an equitable method.

I think we must approach this problem from the standpoint that we must provide adequate national defense; but let us not by any means call national defense a sacred cow and say "hands off," because there is evidence that there is a great deal of waste and duplication in the Defense Department.

I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that we shall do everything we can to see that the defense agencies do not call for reappropriations. I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that to the best of our knowledge and belief, based upon our ability to get the facts, elimination of these funds will not cripple the defense effort. That is all I can say.

Mr. MONRONEY. Can the Senator also assure me that the so-called reductions of \$1 billion do not represent reductions in personnel, payroll, and things like that? Are they mostly reductions in money previously appropriated for equipment, planes, ships, or ordnance, representing items which have not yet been expended by the Defense Department?

Mr. BRIDGES. Generally speaking, I believe that is true. They are funds not needed, or not required now, due to changed conditions. There may be some exceptions. But so far as we can tell, this is an equitable procedure. It does not mean cutting corners in any way. We do not expect to have to make appropriations later because of our action in transferring funds today.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, there was testimony by Mr. Lyle S. Garlock, Deputy Comptroller, Office of the Secretary of Defense, to the effect that at least \$600 million of this money was not to be used and, if transferred, did not have to be replaced. His explanation was that in many cases estimates were made about a year ago which were somewhat greater than were necessary. In allocating ap-

propriated money to various people, most of them had some left over, which makes up this sum. With respect to the \$600 million, I am sure the chairman can give assurance that it will not be necessary to replace that amount.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana himself asked the question, and received the positive answer that \$600 million absolutely would not be used.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The committee and witnesses then proceeded to discuss the remainder of the items. If there is any question whatever, it applies to the remainder of the items and not to the \$600 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 3053) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### THE BUDGET OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Congress will consider in the near future the budget for the District of Columbia. In that connection, it will have to deal with a perennial problem—one that confronts every new session of Congress. The problem is this: How much should Congress appropriate as the share of the Federal Government toward the annual operating expenses of the District of Columbia?

Let me say, at the outset, that I am not now a member of the District Committee. I had the privilege of serving on that committee for 8 years. But my assignment to three other committees now precludes my serving on the committee under the able leadership of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Nevertheless, during my tenure on the District of Columbia Committee I gained a deep concern for the problems of the District of Columbia. I have an abiding love for Washington—our National Capital. Always I shall stand ready to do whatever I can to preserve and develop it as the principal shrine of our people.

With this in mind I am compelled to bring to the attention of the Senate the serious financial condition of the District of Columbia. I have studied the matter carefully. I am convinced that Congress must take action if it is to maintain the financial stability of the municipal government. The demands for the services and facilities of the city

government are greater than ever. In recent years—as Senators know—the Federal Government has undergone a tremendous expansion in Washington. The cost of operating the city has spiraled due to inflation.

In 1917 the total cost of running the city of Washington was about \$16 million. In 1945 the total cost had increased to \$70 million. And for the fiscal year 1952 the costs climbed to \$120 million. Despite these increased demands for services, and rising costs, the Federal share of the city's operating expense has dwindled to only a fraction.

The record shows that the Federal payment has shrunk from 50 percent to 40 percent to 30 percent. At the present time it is less than 9 percent. This is the lowest Federal contribution toward the operating costs of the city of Washington in the history of our Nation.

The Federal payment is not a subsidy. It is not a grant-in-aid. Rather, it is a payment that the Federal Government owes to the municipal government for services performed during the year.

If we go into the history of the relations between the National Government and the city of Washington, we will find that the Federal payment has gone through four major phases.

During the first period, between 1790 and 1878, there was no fixed system for Federal payment. In some years there were lump sum payments and in other years there were no payments at all. But the average payment during this early period was about 25 percent of the city budget.

During the second period, from 1879 to 1921, the District of Columbia was on a 50-50 basis with the Federal Government. This fixed ratio payment, established in the Organic Act of 1878, lasted for more than 40 years.

The third period began in 1921 when Congress ignored the organic act and provided for a 40-60 basis of payment. The Federal Government paid 40 percent. The same plan was used in 1922. In 1923 the 40-60 ratio basis of payment was made permanent.

The final period in the history of the Federal payment began in 1925 when Congress adopted the present lump-sum payment system. The first lump-sum payment was for \$9 million, or about 30 percent of the city's expenses for that year. But during the period since 1925, and up to the present time, the Federal share has gone down from 30 percent to less than 9 percent.

Mr. President, throughout the years District officials and civic organizations have urged Congress to establish a definite policy of fair and regular Federal payments for the upkeep of our National Capital. But just as soon as Congress adopts a policy, as the record shows, it proceeds to ignore it and appropriates an arbitrary Federal share. This is often done without measuring the services it has obtained, or expects to obtain, from the District Government. The officials and residents of Washington cannot have any assurance, from year to year, as to what percentage of payment the Congress will allow toward the operating costs of the Nation's Capital.

Before I go into the necessity for a fixed policy, though, I think we ought to

look at some of the causes that underlie the District's financial condition.

The first problem is the real estate or land situation in the District of Columbia.

As Senators know, the District of Columbia is an area that is fixed. It cannot expand. It can never reach out and annex new territory. The total land area of Washington, excluding the streets, is about 30,688 acres. But less than 48 percent of the real estate in Washington is taxable. Think of it: The city of Washington is not allowed to tax 52 percent of the land and real estate within its borders.

Moreover, the District is losing more and more land and real estate every year which it could normally tax. But the Federal Government is expanding. And, every time the Federal Government buys property, the tax revenues previously received on such property is lost to the District. I have prepared a chart for the Record which illustrates how Federal purchases of real estate are rapidly decreasing District revenues. Quoting from that chart:

(a) The Cosmos Club property was bought by the Government in 1940. The annual revenue lost to the District of Columbia amounts to \$22,843. Since 1940 the District has lost in total revenues \$273,600 on that one piece of property alone.

(b) The Blair House was purchased by the Government in 1941. The tax revenue lost each year is well over \$8,000. This is roughly \$88,000 since its purchase.

(c) The Senate Office Building site—by the Senate Office Building—was purchased by the Government in 1949. The District's loss in revenue on that property is more than \$10,000 a year.

(d) The General Accounting Office site, purchased by the Government in 1941, causes a loss to the District of more than \$14,000 a year. Since its purchase, the District Government has lost \$154,000 in revenue.

These illustrations reflect the impact of Federal purchases of real estate on District revenues. These four items alone represent a loss of more than one-half million dollars. Such losses in revenues are permanent and cannot be replaced. In fact, it seems almost a policy of Congress to require and expect the residents of Washington to make up such losses in revenues by increased taxation.

In addition to property federally owned, there is the impact of privately owned, tax-exempt property. Foreign governments own large and valuable holdings here in Washington for embassy and legation purposes. All of them are exempt from the payment of real estate taxes. There are also many large national organizations which, over the years, have secured special acts of Congress exempting them from land and real estate taxes.

More important, the future program already approved by Congress indicates more and more tax exemptions in Washington.

How much do the Federal exemptions on land and real estate cost the District government in terms of revenue?

First. If taxed, Federal real property would produce, each year, \$19 million.

Second. If taxed, real estate owned by national organizations, foreign governments, and other private property now exempt from taxation, would produce almost \$3½ million.

Mr. President, no other city government in the United States is expected to operate and to take care of its financial needs under such crippling tax exemptions as those imposed by Congress on the District of Columbia.

While we are thinking in terms of real estate, we might also point to the ever-widening park areas in the city of Washington. The National Zoological Park is maintained and operated solely from District funds. Much of Rock Creek Park was acquired with District money; and although the title is in the United States, the job of policing and maintaining these parks is at District expense.

Turning to another major problem underlying the District's financial situation, we ought to look at a few of the services performed by the city for the Federal Government. I shall name just a few:

First. Fire Department services, washing and pumping out flooded Federal buildings, special details, and fire-fighting instruction.

Second. Water furnished Federal agencies—for which Congress pays less than the full cost.

Third. Installing curbs and gutters abutting Federal property, as well as building highways, sidewalks, and alleys.

Fourth. Handling and treating sewage from Federal property.

Fifth. Issuing motor vehicle license plates and special plates.

Sixth. Temporary home for ex-soldiers and ex-sailors.

Seventh. Cleaning streets abutting Federal property, and refuse disposal.

Eighth. Special police details for Federal purposes. And, speaking in terms of police services, let me advise the Senate that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in recently writing an open letter to law-enforcement officers all over the United States, said:

One factor which contributes to the property of the criminal elements is a police scale too low to maintain law-enforcement forces at full strength. Manpower was spread too thinly, and the criminal element moved in wherever a gap appeared.

The statement by the FBI Director is applicable to conditions in Washington. We do not pay enough to get the numbers of qualified police we need. The police force in Washington is greatly undermanned.

Mr. President, the final major problem underlying the District's growing financial crisis is constituted by the obligations of the municipal government in connection with Federal programs. For instance:

First. The improvement, maintenance, and policing of federally owned parks cost the District government over \$2 million dollars a year.

Second. Expenses of National Zoological Park cost \$615,000 a year.

Third. Land purchased and to be purchased and titled in the United States under the Capper-Cramton Act is set at \$16 million.

Fourth. The District's share of the Hospital Center to be built is \$17½ million.

Fifth. The District government's share of the new United States Court Building is about \$5 million.

Mr. President, these and many other items make up the services, expenses, and obligations of the city of Washington in its relations to our Federal Government. These demands upon the municipal government are the highest in history. Yet the Federal contribution is near the lowest in history. In my opinion, it means that the Federal Government is exercising little better than squatter's rights in the city of Washington.

Many people will ask, Why do not the people of Washington do more for themselves? Why do they not impose new taxes and higher taxes?

In answer to that question, let me say that while I served on the District Committee I found the residents of Washington always ready and willing to pay their full share for the upkeep and operations of the National Capital. The record speaks for itself.

In 1951 District residents paid an average of \$128.61 in city taxes. This was the highest per capita rate recorded in any big American city. The Census Bureau reports that the average person in America's largest cities paid only \$61 in municipal taxes last year. But the residents of Washington—our Capital City—paid twice that amount, and have paid it for several years.

District tax collections have jumped more than 210 percent in the last 10 years. We know now that the District of Columbia has tapped its last major reservoir of revenue. I am speaking of the sales tax. We know now that any further increases in taxes, especially in real estate rates, would cause more people and more businesses to move beyond the District borders. We know now that the taxpayers of Washington have all the burdens they can carry.

When we think of the mounting operating costs and the ever higher taxes on the people of Washington, and compare them with the low Federal payment year after year, we can reach only one conclusion: The failure of the Federal Government to make its fair payment has shifted the burden directly to the taxpayers of the District. To the extent that the residents of Washington foot the bill for services to the Federal Government, they are subsidizing the Federal Government. We cannot look on it any other way.

Mr. President, the District of Columbia government cannot properly handle its own financial affairs, and determine how it will support its services, unless it knows what its revenues will be. It cannot know what its revenues will be unless it has some assurance of what it is going to receive from the Federal Government. The best way to provide such assurance, in my opinion, is to establish a certain fixed ratio of expenses between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia.

The Nation, through its Congress, must assume for the future a fixed share of the burden of operating and maintaining

its National Capital. I think we should do this by adopting a fixed ratio of Federal payment of not less than 25 percent of the total expenses of the city of Washington, excluding special funds.

Such a proposal would, in my estimation, solve a number of important problems connected with District appropriations.

First. It would provide Congress with an adequate and permanent basis for determining annually what is a fair payment from the United States Government toward the expenses of the District government.

Second. It would simplify the problems here in Congress by making unnecessary the yearly controversy over the form and amount of Federal payment to the District.

Third. It would simplify the District budgeting problem by settling the role of the Federal Government in financing the District. The fixed ratio of 25 percent would make certain for District officials the extent and character of the Federal payment.

While I am not introducing legislation at this time, I believe that the District Committee should make a serious study of the feasibility of this proposal. I am convinced that this proposal for a 25 percent payment maintains the integrity of the fiscal relationship between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. It insures that District residents and taxpayers will pay sufficient revenues for normal local operating expenses, as do citizens in comparable cities. It provides, on the other hand, that costs in excess of those normally borne by residents of other large cities shall not be expected of District residents. Such excess costs shall be paid for by the Federal Government as a part of its normal operating expenses. This is only fair and equitable.

Mr. President, Washington is the jewel of American cities—the symbol of freedom for the people of all the world. I hope that this year Congress will begin a new era in our Federal and District relations.

I hope that it will be an era in which the Nation will again recognize its responsibility toward Washington and act to balance government rule with proper financial support.

Mr. President, as I stated, I have felt that, although I am not on the committee, yet I should make this statement. I fear that we neglect our duty to the city of Washington, and have been neglecting it in the past, in failing to appropriate sufficient amounts to pay for the services rendered by the city of Washington, D. C.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 4, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 2, 1953:

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Harry N. Routzohn, of Ohio, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2, 1953:

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

James H. Douglas, Jr., of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

#### FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Val Peterson, of Nebraska, to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

#### ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for appointment to the position indicated and for appointment as lieutenant generals in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Maj. Gen. Daniel Noe, XXXXX, United States Army, to be the Inspector General, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Alexander Russel Bolling, XXXXX, United States Army, to be commanding general, Third Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William Benjamin Kean, XXXXX, United States Army, to be commanding general, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Lyman Louis Lemnitzer, XXXXX, United States Army, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Research, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., XXXXX, United States Army, to be deputy commanding general, United States Army Forces, Far East, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Paul Wilkins Kendall, XXXXX, United States Army, to be corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Reuben Ellis Jenkins, XXXXX, United States Army, to be corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Isaac Davis White, XXXXX, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Withers Alexander Burress, XXXXX, United States Army, to be commanding general, First Army, and senior United States Army member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

#### To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Leslie Earl Simon, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Richard Clare Partridge, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Haydon Lemaire Boatner, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Halley Grey Maddox, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Samuel Tankersley Williams, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Wayne Carleton Smith, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Earle Standlee, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Cornelius Edward Ryan, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Francis William Farrell, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Gerald Joseph Higgins, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. John Francis Uncles, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Richard Warburton Stephens, XXXXX

Brig. Gen. Thomas Edward de Shazo, XXXXX

(NOTE.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

#### REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Col. Jacob Landes Hartman, XXXXX, Veterinary Corps, United States Army, for appointment as brigadier general, Veterinary Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

#### NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The officer named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States as a Reserve commissioned officer in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.) and sections 38 and 73 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

Brig. Gen. Paul Kistler MacDonald, XXXXXXX, to be brigadier general, Illinois National Guard, to date from July 15, 1952.

#### IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

#### To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Joseph Bacon Fraser, XXXXXXX

Maj. Gen. John Calhoun Henagan, XXXXX

Maj. Gen. Albert Edward Henderson, XXXXXXX

Maj. Gen. Paul Henry Jordan, XXXXXXX

Maj. Gen. Edward Delvin Sirois, XXXXXXX

#### To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Ernest Nicholas Bauman, XXXXXXX

Brig. Gen. George Justus Hearn, XXXXXXX

Brig. Gen. Jesse Scott Lindsay, XXXXXXX

Brig. Gen. Julius Andres Stark, XXXXXXX

Brig. Gen. Charles Frederick White, XXXXXXX

Brig. Gen. Otis Minot Whitney, XXXXXXX

The nominations of John F. Patton et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed this day, were received by the Senate on January 20, 1953, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John F. Patton, appearing on page 457, and ending with the name of Joe L. Youngker, which is shown on page 458.

The nominations of Italo W. Daniele et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 10, 1953, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Italo W. Daniele which is shown on page 1011 and ending with the name of Allan J. Francisco, which is shown on the same page.

#### REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Maj. Gen. David Myron Schlatter, XXXXX, lieutenant general, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Allied Air Forces, Southern Europe, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Bryant Le Maire Boatner, XXXXX, lieutenant general, Regular Air Force, to be

the inspector general, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, ~~XXXX~~ lieutenant general, Regular Air Force, to be commander in chief, Alaskan Command, with rank of lieutenant general.

**ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE**

The nominations of Wistar L. Graham et al., for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 20, 1953, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Wistar L. Graham, which appears on page 458, and ending with the name of Donald L. Zaworski, which is shown on page 462.

The nominations of Troy William Crawford et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 9, 1953, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Troy William Crawford, which appears on page 292, and ending with the name of Margaret Louise Rau, which is shown on page 295.

**IN THE NAVY  
APPOINTMENTS**

Vice Adm. Laurance T. DuBose, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Eastern Sea Frontier, and commander, Atlantic Reserve Fleet.

Vice Adm. William M. Callaghan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet.

Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

Rear Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years; and to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (personnel).

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral:

*To be rear admirals, line*

James H. Thach, Jr. William K. Mendenhall, Jr.  
Richard W. Ruble Harry D. Felt  
Stanhope C. Ring Charles F. Coe John M. Will  
Thomas B. Williamson Leslie A. Kniskern  
Aaron P. Stoops 3d

*Rear admirals, Medical Corps*

Frederick C. Greaves  
John Q. Owsley

*To be rear admiral, Supply Corps*

Joseph L. Herlihy

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification thereto as provided by law:

Edward B. Harp, Jr., Chaplain Corps.  
John R. Perry, Civil Engineer Corps.

The nominations of Rudolph J. Fabian et al., for permanent appointment in the Navy and the nominations of Spencer M. Adams et al., for promotion in the Navy, both groups of which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 20, 1953, and appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Rudolph J. Fabian, which is shown on page 636, and ending with the

last name of the second group, Nicholas Mandzak, which appears on page 642.

The nominations of William A. Alfano et al., which were also confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 6, 1953, and appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William A. Alfano, which is shown on page 934, and ending with the name of Samuel F. Leader, shown on page 936.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we rejoice that Thou art always willing and able to supply each new day with its needed blessings.

We pray that we may be numbered among those whose minds and hearts are rich in the supply of Thy divine spirit of truth and righteousness, of mercy and forgiveness.

Grant that in these days of world tragedy and tribulation we may have the grace to pray even for our enemies who, in their blindness, their hatred, and brutality are filling human life with so much suffering and sorrow.

Inspire us with the dynamic and victorious virtues of goodness and love. Show us how we may lift mankind into that higher spiritual unity where all antipathies and antagonisms are transcended by the spirit of brotherhood and good will.

Heal us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 26, 1953, was read and approved.

**UNITED STATES v. WEINBERG**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1953.  
The honorable the SPEAKER,  
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: In compliance with House Resolution No. 105, January 22, 1953, I have appeared before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the matter of *United States of America v. Joseph W. Weinberg*, Criminal No. 829-52.

I am attaching herewith, for the information and consideration of the House of Representatives, a copy of the official transcript of a statement made by the court in the above proceedings.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,  
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

**CAPITOL PARKING**

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to make a brief report to the Members on the results of the perplexing parking problem study by the special subcommittee of the Com-

mittee on House Administration. This subcommittee, of which I have had the honor to serve as chairman, includes the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. WILLIAM COLE, and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. CHARLES DEANE.

We have had numerous meetings and have enjoyed the fullest cooperation from Mr. Russel, Sergeant at Arms of the House; Mr. Lynn and his staff, Architect of the Capitol; Captain Broderick of the Capitol Police; officers of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department; and Mr. George Keneipp, Director of Vehicles and Traffic of the city of Washington. We have made a full report to the Committee on House Administration and it has been unanimously accepted.

The plans we propose do not include the building of any new parking facilities, although such facilities are needed now and their need will become increasingly greater as time goes on. The study and proposal of any such plans comes within the proper scope and jurisdiction of another committee of the House.

The approach to the problem by the subcommittee was entirely from the point of view of being of service to two general groups—the public who often drive thousands of miles to see their own United States Capitol and who many times have important problems to discuss with their Representatives and Senators, and the Members of Congress and limited numbers of their office staffs, committee staffs, and service employees, all of whom are vital to the actual work in the Capitol and congressional offices. In order to make the plan work, it is absolutely essential that the full cooperation of everyone involved is assured.

Within the next few days each Member will receive a letter directed to his personal attention. Please read it carefully, follow the instructions fully, and keep it on file for reference. Also in the very near future, the owners of authorized vehicles, other than those of Members, will receive a notice to appear for the Capitol Police to check the car authorization and affix the new and necessary "sticker." Please insist that each of your employees follow these instructions to the letter.

There has been complete cooperation with our colleagues in the Senate to reserve completely the plaza area on the east side of the Capitol.

A very limited number of spaces have been reserved on the plaza for the officers of the House and Senate whose cars must be parked in designated spaces. Another very limited number has been reserved for members of the working press. All remaining spaces are reserved for the exclusive use of the public and parking will be limited to not more than 2 hours enforced by the Capitol Police. This is designed to stop the all-day parking of unauthorized cars and to protect the rights of our Capitol visitors. Your full cooperation and help in this matter will assure success.

The regulations for parking of the automobiles owned by Members is fully explained in the letter each will receive. These regulations may seem very harsh

and restrictive, yet they have been promulgated for only one purpose—to serve the Members in their official duties. Briefly, each Member's car must have the official 83d Congress tag on it. The issuance and use of these tags is fully covered by law. The use of the tags of any prior Congress is unlawful. The use of the various State tags, which indicate the owner is a Member of Congress, will not be sufficient to park in a restricted area around the Capitol and congressional office buildings. No cars, other than those bearing the official tags of the 83d Congress, will be permitted to park in the areas reserved for Members. All these matters are fully covered in the letter each Member will receive.

Finally, I want to urge everyone to cooperate fully with the police officers. They are here to serve all of us and have been issued very strict instructions. Any effort by anyone of us to gain special favor or courtesy will only serve to break down the successful administration of this parking program. Whether it works or not is largely up to each of us.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to my distinguished friend and minority leader, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. May I ask the gentlemen whether or not in this setup there is going to be some parking space set aside for the general public who want to visit the Capitol or want to visit their Representatives here?

Mr. SCHENCK. Yes. I am happy to have the distinguished gentleman ask that question. We have reserved 144 spaces on the east side of the Capitol for use of the public. Those are the spaces to which I referred and they will be limited to 2 hours parking. This parking ban will be enforced by the Capitol police.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to my distinguished friend and majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman and those who have worked with him for the formulation of this program in respect to parking. It has been evident to many of us for a long time that something needed to be done. I trust that when the details of the plan are made available to us all of the Members of the House and all of our employees will study the plan and undertake to abide by it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What happens to the Members who are obliged to use taxicabs? Some of us have no automobiles in Washington.

Mr. SCHENCK. I answer my distinguished friend, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts by asking a question—do you not park your taxicabs in restricted areas?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it would be nice if we could because sometimes we keep a taxicab waiting in order to make a very important engagement with some department. I

think something ought to be arranged in that direction.

#### ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF WASHINGTON TERRITORY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1853—100 years ago this very day—the President of the United States, President Fillmore, signed a bill creating Washington Territory.

Today the Legislature of the State of Washington in the capital city of Olympia will observe with appropriate commemorative exercise this 100th anniversary.

I regret Mr. Speaker that I cannot be present at the ceremonies at Olympia and I am sure this disappointment is shared by my colleagues from Washington State.

However, it seems proper and fitting here and now that recognition be given in this House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to this auspicious day, and likewise to record our felicitations and good wishes to the people of the State of Washington on this 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Territory of Washington.

#### E. ALAN PHILLIPS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening here in Washington I had the great privilege of attending a meeting of the Science Talent Institute. Forty boys and girls selected from 14,260 high-school seniors have come here to compete for the Westinghouse science scholarships at the Twelfth Annual Science Talent Institute being held from February 26 through March 2. I was the guest of Mr. E. Alan Phillips, of Lincoln, Mass., a young constituent of mine. I was very proud that he was one of the 40. He is only 15 years old and the youngest member. He is a genius. He was doing algebra when he was 6 years old. He will graduate in June from Weston High School, Weston, then hopes to attend Massachusetts Institute of Technology to prepare for a career in mathematics. A member of the staff of his school publication, Alan also belongs to mathematics and photography groups and lists radio and astronomy among his hobbies. His science project, titled "The Compression of Liquids and Gases Under Gravitational and Centrifugal Forces," involved mathematical calculations much more complex than are normally expected of high-school students. Alan won a gold medal for the highest score in a State mathematics examination by the University of Massachusetts, and top honors in a similar ex-

amination conducted by Tufts College. He is the son of Dr. H. B. Phillips, retired professor of mathematics at MIT, and Mrs. Phillips.

Mr. Speaker, we need scientists desperately today and I hope many more of our youth will go into scientific fields of study and education. Through advancement in science they will accomplish even greater things than they have in the past. Through medical science they will save many lives and they will help to maintain peace in the world.

In the Appendix of the RECORD today you will find a brief résumé of Dr. W. E. Shoupp's speech at the meeting Saturday evening and a memo on the scientist-talent search. The Westinghouse Electric Corp. deserves a great many congratulations for their foundation research work.

#### FOREIGN OIL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 45 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow and Wednesday, at the conclusion of the legislative programs of those days and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House today for 90 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

#### A PAY INCREASE FOR EVERY WORKER IN AMERICA

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has the power to grant a pay increase to every workingman in America. It can be done, and it should be done without the need for a work stoppage, a strike, or a labor dispute. It can be done in either one of two ways: By passing H. R. 1, Congressman REED's tax reduction bill; or by raising the individual income tax exemption from \$600 to \$700.

Either of these tax reduction programs would give every worker in America more take-home pay to spend upon his family. A tax reduction at this time would also have the tendency to stop the vicious spiral that has been going on during the last decade—namely, first a

pay increase, then a tax increase; another pay increase, then another tax increase, ad infinitum. Every time the worker has succeeded in getting a pay increase to meet the increased cost of living, Uncle Sam has immediately stuck his long arm deeper into the working-man's pay envelope and extracted a larger share of what he found there.

Is it not about time, Mr. Speaker, to reverse this process? The Congress can start the reverse movement by passing H. R. 1, or by raising the \$600 individual income tax exemption to \$700. Every Member of Congress who during the campaign promised his people tax reduction, expenditure reduction, and a balanced budget should take the floor and place himself on record for action now. This year is the year to keep our campaign promises. Next year will be too late. It can be done if we have the will to do it and the courage to act now.

RUTH J. MOTT

MR. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to Ruth J. Mott, sister of Betty C. Ickes, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Betty C. Ickes.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

MR. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

MR. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege some days ago to address my colleagues of the House on the serious situation that has arisen in the apparently uncontrolled importation of residual fuel oil. That situation has been bad and it is growing worse. For instance, during the month just ended, in February, for the week ending February 7, the average daily importation for residual fuel oil was 425,000 barrels, for the week ending February 14 the average was 437,000 barrels. That is equivalent to better than 104,000 tons of soft coal on the basis that 1 ton of coal is equivalent to 4 and a fraction barrels of residual fuel oil. This situation was aggravated by the recent approval of a change in the reciprocal trade agreements with the Republic of Venezuela in South America by which the import duty on fuel oil was reduced from 21 cents a barrel to 6 1/4 cents a barrel. They have just discovered a

huge oil field in Lake Maracaibo in Venezuela in which the production is approximately a million barrels daily. The United States under the terms of that agreement must prepare to meet the situation of local markets being flooded with that cheap residual fuel oil from Venezuela. Under the favored nations clause in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that affects any other nation importing oil.

#### A PROMISE TO MY CONSTITUENTS

MR. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MR. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, please do not yell at me if the 83d Congress does not cut taxes, balance the budget. I will do my part.

My ears still ring because of the criticism of some commentators, columnists, and editors—1 or 2 in my own district—who jumped all over me when I voted in accord with a practically unanimous 13-year-old policy of the Republican Party and its leaders, which opposed a grant of legislative power to the Chief Executive.

Oh, sure I am accustomed to a lambasting by left-wing "experts," but some of this latest blast came from friends who should know better, but apparently thought a little "taking him down" would be helpful. Maybe so.

It never did seem important to me when eating a breakfast egg or a hen for supper, whether the hen or the egg came first—just something to argue about.

Nor, do I now think it important whether this Congress first balances the budget or first cuts taxes. But, one thing I do know: we promised the people that we would do both, and a Congressman had better keep those promises or have a mighty good alibi ready come November 1954.

November last, sick of the Korean war, disgusted with the mess in Washington, and, because of our promise to cut taxes, balance the budget, the people let Truman go and elected President Eisenhower and a Republican Congress. At least, we are getting some indications of a positive foreign policy. We are on our way to cleaning up the mess in Washington, but I see no indications that we are either to balance the budget or reduce the tax rate. Quite the contrary.

Though Truman was in power, the Republican-controlled 80th Congress reduced taxes and balanced the budget. It can be done again, but only if we cut expenditures, and that we can do by eliminating the waste and extravagance in the Executive and other departments, quit spending so many billions abroad, practice a little economy ourselves.

When someone jumps on me because of some fancied failure to follow the orders of someone without authority to issue the order just take a look at the record. I am only 1 of 435 in the House.

It is my purpose to vote not only to balance the budget, but to cut taxes because I believe, as do other Michigan Republican Congressmen, that a campaign promise is something more than political oratory.

If President Eisenhower gets a New Deal Congress of domestic and international spenders in 1955, it will not be because I have not gone along with the party's campaign promises, worked and voted to clean up the "mess" here at home and abroad.

Again, I suggest to my friends, "take a look at the record." And to my colleagues, "let us get the job started."

#### PREELECTION PROMISES TO REDUCE TAXES

MR. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MR. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, already the spendthrift crowd is planning emergencies to justify higher taxes, greater funds to spend. There is only one thing the Government spenders here and abroad fear and that is the reduction of the flow of revenue from the taxpayer's pocket into the coffer of the Treasury. Was a spendthrift ever known to stop squandering another's funds until the source was cut off? It is such tax victims, as the teacher to whom Mr. Pegler refers, who are bled white by the spendthrift crowd. These spendthrifts are the ones who have taken the purse strings from Congress; they are the ones who are opposed to any tax relief under H. R. 1. The drive is on now in full force to frighten the people with Russian saucers, submarines off our coasts, germ warfare, and atomic bombs. It is the hope of the Treasury raiders to make Republicans and Democrats alike ignore their solemn preelection promises to reduce taxes. H. R. 1 will bring tax relief to over 50,000,000 taxpayers, yet a few men stand ready to repudiate the promises made by which they now hold office.

Abraham Lincoln once said:

It was in the oath I took that I would, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I could not take the office without taking the oath. Nor was it my view that I might take an oath to get power, and break the oath in using the power.

Let me paraphrase the words of Abraham Lincoln. It was the preelection promise made by me to the voters that if elected I would reduce taxes. I felt I could not be elected without making the promise to the voters that if elected I would reduce personal income taxes. Nor was it my view that I might make this promise to get power, and then violate my promise to the voters when placed in power.

How many Members of Congress in either party would have been elected in the last election if each candidate had stood before the voters and said: "If you will elect me to Congress I pledge myself to vote against reducing your individual

income taxes, and I will shrink from cutting governmental expenses."

I believe with Professor James, "that every fine impulse, every lofty emotion that we allow to evaporate without action, is just another opportunity lost." The citizens of our Nation expect the Republican Congressmen to display honesty, intelligence, independence, and judgment in the conduct of legislative functions, as pledged to the people during the recent national election.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks the article of Westbrook Pegler which appeared in the New York Journal, February 27, 1953, as follows:

INCOME TAX AND A TEACHER'S PITIFUL EXPERIENCE WITH IT

(By Westbrook Pegler)

I present herewith a short and simple annual of a poor, weary, and somewhat broken-down Florida schoolteacher, to make a contrast with the disgraceful waste of tons of money wrung from the likes of her on the winter frivolities and subsidies of a corrupt government.

Listen:

"May I present a problem? It is entirely true. I still must find some way to raise money for my income taxes for this past year, and I still must keep on trying to find something to do in order to be able to live.

"I was born in Florida and have worked here most of my life. Beginning in June 1914, I taught 35 years in the Florida public schools. In 1949, I reached the age of 60 and, since I had been overloaded in the classrooms for years, I felt that I must retire before my health completely gave way. Indeed, I was unable to work for several months.

"My salary had run from \$45 a month for 7 or 8 months a year to \$2,500 yearly the last year that I taught. Now my pension under the Florida teachers' pension system is \$100 a month and is taxable.

"The 4-year bed illness of a sister, which ended in her death, left me heavily in debt. Therefore, when Internal Revenue notified me in December 1950 that I owed \$195 income tax, plus \$33.33 interest on my 1947 returns, due to errors in the returns, I was in no position to pay it. They had made no effort to tell me about it before. In other words, they had got around to notifying me 3 years late."

This is a familiar abuse of the citizen. Parasites of civil service loaf on the job, whistle jumping and stalling in the washrooms to the extent of millions of paid hours a year and tot up their rights and benefits at the expense of this wretched woman multiplied by millions.

By inattention and sloth they fall years behind in their work. Meanwhile, compound interest at 6 percent piles up against unsuspecting and morally innocent citizens who pay their salaries.

In the end, the little people, the weak and friendless millions for whom the Roosevelts and Truman and their evil cult expressed such mournful pity while they grabbed every dollar within their greedy reach, always are held to the literal figures rigged against them by expert professional tormenters.

For contrast, the record of the last 2 years of the Truman debauch disclosed hundreds of cases in which actual cheats and thieves were forgiven tax debts of millions on the corrupt proposition that it were better to collect a little money than to jail a rogue with a friend in the White House or a lawyer late of the Treasury staff.

Our schoolteacher's letter continues:

"I explained the circumstances and asked for time to pay it in installments. I was told that this was not Uncle Sam's way. I must send a check immediately for the full

amount. That was the first of several such letters.

"In June 1951 while I was still trying to raise the whole amount, the case was placed in the hands of the local (Lakeland) office. After being summoned and having appeared before the local officer for several lengthy sessions, he suggested that I go to the bank and borrow \$40, pay 25 cents for a certified check, and offer it in compromise.

"I did. Months later, I was notified that my offer was not accepted. I was then advised to add \$10 more and make a second offer of compromise. I did and waited several months more.

"On October 15, 1951, I went to work teaching in Georgia. My salary for the remainder of the school year ending in September 1952 was around \$1,500, before taxes. My expenses—board, etc.—were heavy and I was paying on other debts.

"In May 1952 just before school closed, and without notifying me that my \$50 offer had been rejected, the Georgia tax office seized \$245 of my summer salary, which was most of it.

"Now the old debt was paid but the Internal Revenue still had the \$50 I had sent in offer to compromise. Although I wrote them several times asking for it and stressing my real need, they did not get around to sending it until this January 1953. I endorsed it and handed it back to them in the tax office here (Lakeland) and they wanted me to have it cashed and buy another certified check which would have cost around 65 cents.

"But they did finally accept it. But they had kept it over a year, but gave me no interest, although they had charged me more than \$50 interest and penalties on the \$195 I owed them."

This cruel experience irresistibly reminds me of the braggart announcement of a character known as Leigh Dannenberg, a devotee and personal friend of Eleanor Roosevelt, for many years the publisher of a weekly scandal sheet at Bridgeport, Conn., that he was recently back after 4 months in New Delhi, India, where he set up a New Deal propaganda rag, at the invitation of the discredited Park Avenue political mountebank, Ambassador Chester Bowles.

The purpose was to teach the people of India the Dannenberg version of American ethics, morals, and decency.

This character himself said the budget for this squandering of the taxes of the unfortunate schoolteacher whose letter forms the burden of this essay was \$1,000,000 a year. The State Department said it was \$300,000.

Dannenberg may have been exaggerating and the State Department trimming, each for obvious reasons. Dannenberg got \$35 a day plus travel allowances, paid by the taxes and penalties of this tired old schoolma'am for his expert service in indoctrinating the Indians in the Dannenberg culture, also at her expense.

PREELECTION PROMISES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] have pointed out their Republican concern over the apparent indifference of the Republican Party to campaign promises and platform. This failure is a matter of concern to members of the Democratic Party also. The Republicans did make many promises during the campaign and since the campaign. They remind me more and more

of the hunting party that sent a few of its members out before dawn to set out the decoys. The main body, following at dawn, was so eager for the kill that it shot up all of the decoys before it could be stopped. One of the Republican decoys was a balanced budget. That one has been blasted. Another was reduction of military expenditures. The Secretary of Defense has set his sights on that. Mr. REED's tax reduction is under fire from the executive offices and from the majority leader. The Republican Chairman of the House District Committee has splintered one of the most recently placed decoys, additional commissioners for the District of Columbia. Two other decoys, extension of reciprocal trade, and extension of social security are under the guns of the Ways and Means Committee chairman.

The Republicans have had two chances for live game, one in the case of the Reorganization Authority, and another in the educational aid for impacted school districts.

In each case while the Republicans were shooting at the decoys, the Democratic members of the House had to assume responsibility and bring down the live game.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is also another promise that is very important for the national interest of this country, a stronger national defense. We have got to keep that in mind when we hear talk about reduced taxes, reduced budgets; how can that be brought about with a stronger national defense?

Mr. McCARTHY. They are practically shooting decoys out of each other's hands. It begins to look as though they will return from the hunt with their game bags full of chips, and their retrievers' mouths full of splinters.

PREELECTION PROMISES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, the Democratic National Committee withdrew requests for nationwide radio time to broadcast a speech delivered Saturday at Raleigh, N. C., by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and recent candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Evidently someone decided the Democratic National Committee could not afford to sponsor radio time. I do not know whether they could not afford it for financial or for ideological reasons.

There may be a clue to Democratic Chairman Mitchell's decision in the prepared text of the speech.

The Senator, it seems, was guilty of saying, among other things, that—

The American system has always recognized that unusual genius, capacity, and energy is entitled to its reward. Those who possess these traits will accumulate more than those who do not. In this belief is

found the strength and reasons for growth of our economic system.

Perhaps even greater heresy to the tender ears of the radicals who have captured control of the Democratic Party was this warning from the Senator:

There are those who would have us to drink of the fatal potion of national state socialism. We must resolutely reject their enticements.

Apparently even Mr. Mitchell and friends realized that the Senator could not possibly have been referring to Republicans with that remark.

It occurs to me that the Democratic National Committee deserves our sympathy in its present dilemma.

Certainly theirs is a sorry situation: the leftwingers they are willing to sponsor were discredited in the November election. On the other hand, they cannot afford to let a nationwide audience listen to a member of their own party who speaks out for sound American principles.

The Senator also said:

The Democratic Party cannot, and will not, be returned to power if this conspiracy to drive the South out of the party is continued. Those who promote this movement should realize that if any special group of extremists ever succeeds in driving out the old-line Democrats and fashioning the Democratic Party solely to their ideas, they would suffer the most disastrous defeat in American political history. They cannot name three States they would be assured of carrying for their presidential nominee, and the representation of this group in the Congress of the United States would be pathetic to behold.

It is apparent some are already trying to take the Senator and his people out of the party.

#### PREELECTION PROMISES

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, there was a very wise man from the State of the Speaker occupying the Presidency one time, and he was being kidded a great deal as being "Silent Cal" and not talking. He said: "I found out early in life you did not have to explain something you never had said." I trust the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], may take that to his bosom.

I want to say further to him and to his colleagues who believe as he does that they are going to have all they can do, the Republican National Committee and the leadership in the Republican Party, looking after their own business between now and 1954 and from 1954 to 1956, without giving any gratuitous advice to the Democratic Party.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARK (TERRITORY OF HAWAII)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1525) authorizing the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I make inquiry of the author of the bill or some member of the committee? I notice that this bill applies to a small piece of ground in the national park in the Territory of Hawaii. However, the Bureau of the Budget advises that in the event of enactment estimates for appropriations for the maintenance of this park should be held in abeyance until such time as conditions warrant consideration of additional expense for items of this character. In view of that statement on the part of the Bureau of the Budget, why should we pass such legislation at this time?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the first eight bills on the Consent Calendar come from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and were before the House last year. They appeared on the Consent Calendar and passed, but were not considered by the other body because of certain difficulties over there in organization. These bills were handled this year by the able subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'Ewart]. We again had hearings and these first eight bills came from his subcommittee to the full committee with a unanimous report. I ask the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'Ewart] if he will answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. D'Ewart. The question is, Why should this bill be enacted at this time?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is correct, in view of the statement of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. D'Ewart. The bill was brought before the committee at the request of a large group of people who were interested in such matters, including the Advisory Board of the National Parks, established by an Act of Congress, the National Parks Association, the County of Honolulu, and other groups. This monument is a refuge that has been there for a great many years. The exact way it was built is not known. It is thought that we should acquire this property at the present time and set it aside as a national park. It will not deteriorate, I agree, but the opportunity is present to acquire the property for future generations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I inquire of the gentleman if there is any likelihood, in the event that no appropriation will be available for a long period of years, that the situation would be changed at that time so that the law would not be adequate in the event we do enact this bill into law?

Mr. D'Ewart. In view of the fact that this is indorsed by such well-known agencies I think we can be sure that this is adequate to reserve the land that is needed for this national park.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in this par-

ticular committee report, and also in several of the others, the letter of transmittal from the Department is dated 1952 or in 1951. Consequently, it is obviously out of date. Several of these bills are, may I say rather inconsequential, they are not major legislative proposals. I think we should require hereafter up-to-date letters of transmittal in all of the committee reports before such legislation shall come to the floor and be favorably acted upon. I shall withdraw my reservation in this instance but certainly we cannot in this 1st session of the 83d Congress be acting on legislation with recommendations of prior years. I think that warning should be transmitted to all the committees.

Mr. D'Ewart. Mr. Speaker, I may say that what the gentleman has said in regard to reports is entirely true, but in these instances we have had a representative of the Bureau before our committee and he has indicated that the previous report is the opinion of the present regime. In view of the change of administration and the difficulties that they are having in the departments, it is impossible to get reports on these and other bills of similar nature that are before our committee. It may be some time before we can get these reports. However, each one of these bills was unanimously passed by our committee. It was debated and passed by the last Congress on the Consent Calendar, and we have cleared, as far as possible, with the Department. In view of that situation we thought it advisable to go ahead with bills of this type, get them out of the way, and get them over to the other House, rather than have them come up later in the session.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That when title to such lands located on the island of Hawaii, within the following-described area, as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his judgment and discretion as necessary and suitable for the purpose, shall have been vested in the United States, said lands shall be set apart as the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, for the benefit and inspiration of the people:*

#### PARCEL 1

Being all of R. P. 3306, L. C. Aw. 7219, Apana 2 to Kaliae, all of L. C. Aw. 9470 to Mukil, and portions of R. P. 7874, L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi (Ahupuaa of Honaunau), and R. P. 6852, L. C. Aw. 7712 Apana 1 to M. Kekuananoa (Ahupuaa of Keokea).

Beginning at a one and one-half-inch pipe in concrete monument called "Kalani," at the southeast corner of this parcel, the northeast corner of parcel 3, and on the common boundary of the lands of Keokea and Kiliae, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Seventy-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred and eighty feet along the land of Kiliae, L. C. Aw. 8521-B to G. D. Hueu and passing over a

rock called "Kuwaia," marked K+K at six hundred seventy-three and two-tenths feet to high-water mark; thence along high-water mark, along seacoast for the next three courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points at seacoast being:

2. One hundred and thirty-five degrees fifty-one minutes three thousand nine hundred seventy-six and one-tenth feet;

3. One hundred and fifty-two degrees twenty-five minutes one thousand and seventy-eight feet;

4. Two hundred and forty degrees fifty-five minutes one thousand two hundred four and four-tenths feet;

5. Three hundred and fifty-four degrees nine minutes two hundred twenty-four and one-tenth feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi, along stone wall and old trail;

6. Two hundred and sixty degrees fifty-four minutes one hundred seventy-five and nine-tenths feet across old trail along stone wall to a "+" on rock;

7. One hundred and fifty-eight degrees six minutes seventy-two feet along L. C. Aw. 7296 to Puhi, along stone wall;

8. Two hundred and sixty degrees thirty-six minutes ninety and seven-tenths feet along stone wall;

9. One hundred and ninety-four degrees ten minutes sixty-two and nine-tenths feet along stone wall along L. C. Aw. 7295 and 6979-B:2 to Keolewa;

10. One hundred and seventy-five degrees fifty-four minutes twenty-six and nine-tenths feet along stone wall;

11. Two hundred and fifteen degrees thirty-seven minutes forty-seven and four-tenths feet along stone wall along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi;

12. One hundred and seventy-two degrees twenty-eight minutes forty-eight and one-tenth feet along same;

13. Two hundred and twenty-six degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred twenty-eight and eight-tenths feet along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi to the south side of fifty-foot road;

14. Two hundred and sixty-four degrees fifty-one minutes one hundred fifteen and two-tenths feet along the south side of fifty-foot road;

15. Two hundred and fifty-two degrees thirteen minutes two hundred and two-tenths feet along same;

16. Two hundred and eighty-six degrees thirty minutes one hundred seventy and nine-tenths feet along same;

17. Two hundred and thirty-eight degrees twenty-five minutes ninety-two and eighteen-tenths feet along same;

18. Two hundred and twenty-three degrees one minutes one hundred fourteen and four-tenths feet along same;

19. Three hundred and thirty-eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds four thousand nine hundred eighty and three-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi and L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa and passing over a one and one-fourth-inch pipe in concrete monument at one thousand four hundred eighty-one and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, one hundred sixty-six and ninety one-hundredths acres.

#### PARCEL 2

Being portions of L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi, R. P. 7874 (Ahupuaa of Honaunau).

Beginning at a pipe in concrete at the northeast corner of this parcel, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being two thousand one hundred thirty-nine feet south and eleven thousand six hundred seventeen and nineteen-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred fifty-eight degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred sixty and

four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi;

2. Ninety-three degrees thirty minutes two hundred and sixty-nine feet along same, along stone wall, along lot 2 of the subdivision by B. P. Bishop estate;

3. Eighty-two degrees no minutes three hundred and eighteen feet along same to the east side of fifty-foot road; degrees twenty minutes two hundred ninety-one and five-tenths feet;

4. Two hundred and seventy degrees no minutes six hundred and twenty feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi to the point of beginning.

Area, three and seventy one-hundredths acres.

Together with an easement 6 feet wide for a pipeline right-of-way extending from the Government road to parcel 1, the south side of said right-of-way being described as follows:

Beginning at the east end of this right-of-way on the common boundary of the lands of Honaunau and Keokea, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being three thousand one hundred ninety and eight-tenths feet south and eleven thousand seventy-eight and eight-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Eighty degrees thirty-six minutes five seconds one hundred and seventeen feet along L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa, to the Triangulation Station "Ahupuaa" of the B. P. Bishop estate;

2. Eighty-two degrees twenty minutes seven thousand two hundred eighty-nine and one-tenth feet along same to a 1 1/4-inch pipe in concrete monument on two hundred eighty-nine and one-tenth feet along same to a 1 1/4-inch pipe in concrete monument on the east boundary of parcel 1 the coordinates of said point of the end of this six-foot right-of-way referred to Government Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being four thousand one hundred eighty-two and four-tenths feet south and three thousand seven hundred thirty-nine and four-tenths feet east.

Area, one and two one-hundredths acres.

#### PARCEL 3

Being portion of L. C. Aw. 8521-B to G. D. Hueu, being portion of the Ahupuaa of Kilae.

Beginning at a 1 1/2-inch pipe in concrete monument called Kalani at the northeast corner of this parcel, the southeast corner of parcel 1, on the common boundary of the lands of Keokea and Kilae, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred thirty-eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds five hundred ninety-five and four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 8521-B to G. D.

2. Ninety degrees no minutes one thousand ninety-nine and seven-tenths feet along same and along said eight thousand foot south coordinates line and across school grant 7 Apana 6 to high-water mark;

3. Thence along high-water mark, along sea, the direct azimuth and distance being: two hundred six degrees thirty-three minutes thirty seconds four hundred eighty-two and nine-tenths feet;

4. Two hundred fifty-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred eighty feet along L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa and passing over a rock called Kuwaia, marked K+K at six and eighteen-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, ten and twenty-five one-hundredths acres.

Sec. 2. Upon the vesting of title in the United States to such lands as may be desig-

nated by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary and suitable for historical park purposes in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of this act, the City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be established by order of the said Secretary, which shall be published in the Federal Register. Any other lands within the area described above shall become a part of the national historical park upon the vesting of title thereto in the United States and upon publication of an appropriate supplemental order by the said Secretary in the Federal Register.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure, by donation or purchase, with any funds that may be available for that purpose, lands and interests in lands which may be needed for the City of Refuge National Historical Park within the area described in section 1 hereof.

Sec. 4. In order to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in consolidating in Federal ownership lands within the area described above, and to facilitate acquisition of the lands needed for the national historical park, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii is also authorized to acquire lands for said park, at the expense of the Territory of Hawaii by exchange or otherwise, in accordance with procedure prescribed by the act of February 27, 1920 (41 Stat. 452).

Sec. 5. The City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 1-4), as amended and supplemented, and such additional authority compatible therewith as is contained in the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 461-467), with regard to preservation of historic sites and objects of national significance.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 21, insert:

"4. Thence along the east side of fifty-foot road, the direct azimuth and distance being: one hundred seventy-one."

Page 7, line 23, insert "Hueu to the eight thousand foot south coordinates line referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station Lae-O-Kanoni."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1527) to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to procure, in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest, the remaining non-Federal land and interests in land within the boundaries of Big Bend National Park.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOMATTOX COURTHOUSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1528) to authorize the addition of land to the Appomattox Courthouse National His-

torical Monument, Virginia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, in such manner as he shall consider to be in the public interest, any land or interests in land, within a distance of 1½ miles from the historic Appomattox Courthouse site, Virginia, which he shall consider to be suitable for addition to the Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Monument. The Secretary is authorized also to dispose of any surplus monument lands in such manner as he shall consider appropriate, or to exchange any monument lands for non-Federal lands of approximately equal value when, in his opinion, such action is in the interest of the United States. Properties acquired pursuant to this act shall become a part of the monument upon acquisition of title thereto by the United States. The total area of this national monument as it may be revised pursuant to this act shall be no greater than its present acreage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TO FACILITATE DEVELOPMENT OF BUILDING MATERIALS IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1529) to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purpose of aiding in the development of building materials essential to the growth of Alaska, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, for a period of 15 years from the date of approval of this Act, and under such conditions and for such consideration as he may prescribe to permit the removal of deposits of siliceous volcanic ash, commonly known as pumicite, from such areas as he may designate along the shores of Shelikof Strait in Katmai National Monument, Alaska.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "act", strike out "and under such conditions and for such consideration as he may prescribe" and insert "pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADDITION TO CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1530) to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note that the report on this bill states that there is approximately 1 acre involved in the

Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida, and that this 1 acre is to be purchased at an estimated cost of \$30,000. I appreciate Florida is a great State and has valuable ground, but I wonder if we should not have an explanation as to why 1 acre should cost \$30,000 for use in a national park.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], in whose district this monument is located, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDE FOR ADDITION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1532) to provide for the addition of certain Government lands to the Cape Hatteras national seashore recreational area project, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORBES], a member of the Consent Calendar Committee, who was called off the floor, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

#### RECORDATION OF SCRIP, LIEU SELECTION, AND SIMILAR RIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1813) to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any owner of, and any person claiming rights to, Valentine scrip, issued under the act of April 5, 1872 (17 Stat. 649); Sioux Half-Breed scrip, issued under the act of July 17, 1854 (10 Stat. 304); Supreme Court scrip, issued under the acts of June 22, 1860 (12 Stat. 85), March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 544), and June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 378); Surveyor-General scrip, issued under the act of June 2, 1858 (11 Stat. 294); a soldier's additional homestead right, granted by sections 2300 and 2307 of the Revised Statutes; a forest lieu selection right, assertable under the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1264); a lieu selection right conferred by the act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. 597); a bounty land warrant issued under the act of March 3, 1855 (10 Stat. 701); or any lieu selection or scrip right or bounty land warrant, or right in the nature of scrip issued under any act of Congress not enumerated herein (except the indemnity selection rights of any State, or of the Territory of Alaska), shall, within 3 years from the effective date of this act, present his holdings or claim for recordation by the Department of the Interior.

Sec. 2. In the case of a transfer after the effective date of this act, by assignment, inheritance, operation of law, or otherwise of a holding or claim of any right required by this act to be recorded, the holding or claim of right so acquired shall be presented to the Department of the Interior within 6 months after such transfer, for recordation by it; except that where such transfer occurs within the period of 3 years from the effective date of this act and the prior owner has not complied with provisions of this act, the owner or claimant by transfer shall have the

remainder of such period or a period of 6 months, whichever is the longer, within which to present his claims or holdings for recordation.

Sec. 3. There shall be endorsed on the evidence of the right or warrant each recordation thereof.

Sec. 4. Claims or holdings not presented for recordation as prescribed herein shall become null and void and all rights and interests thereunder shall terminate.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 3, strike out section 4 and insert:

"Sec. 4. Claims or holdings not presented for recordation, as prescribed herein, shall not thereafter be accepted by the Secretary of the Interior for recordation or as a basis for the acquisition of lands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPEAL CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO TIMBER AND STONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1816) to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following acts or portions of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, of the act of June 3, 1878 (20 Stat. 89), as amended (43 U. S. C., secs. 311, 312, and 313).

(b) Act of June 3, 1878 (20 Stat. 88), as amended (16 U. S. C., secs. 604, 605, and 606).

(c) Section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1095, 1099), as amended and supplemented (16 U. S. C., secs. 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 611a, 612, and 613), except the first sentence of said section 8, as amended (43 U. S. C., sec. 1166).

(d) Act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 1015), as amended (16 U. S. C., secs. 614 and 615).

Sec. 2. Rights and liabilities existing under the foregoing statutes on the date of the enactment of this act shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, my purpose being to ask my good friend from Pennsylvania, Judge GRAHAM, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, a few questions on a matter unrelated to this bill.

Last year we passed a bill the sum and substance of which was, as I recall, to enable those in the service during the present emergency to be quickly naturalized under conditions similar to those extended to World War II veterans. Is my recollection correct?

Mr. GRAHAM. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill was reported out of the Committee of the Judiciary and passed the House and went to the Senate. A few days before adjournment the Senate committee reported out the bill with amendments, and it passed the Senate, but went to conference too late for the conferees to have an opportunity to adjust the differences.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. My recollection is that the principal amendment in disagreement was that in the Senate bill there was a provision that those who were temporarily in the United States and who were in our armed services should not be given this opportunity.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without passing upon that question, because I think they should and I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania does, for I do not believe we should draw a distinction between those in the armed services, whether they are here on a permanent or on a temporary visa if they are in the service—it seems to me the question of their willingness to serve our country is the primary question involved—there is another bill now pending before my friend's subcommittee?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill is comprehensive?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to ask my friend this question, without pressing it, for I realize probably the gentleman is awaiting a report from the Department of Justice on it.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the Department of Defense is strongly in favor of the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. All our information is to that effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask my friend if he can give an idea as to the chances of early action on the bill. There is a tremendous amount of interest in it. I may say also that interest is increased because there are certain young men, and I am sure, young women, but young men particularly, who are now serving in the armed services and who, in case they serve in Korea and are captured and made prisoner, are likely to be in a very uncomfortable situation in that they are citizens of other countries whose governments are not members of the United Nations, such as Ireland. They also include displaced persons coming from countries behind the Iron Curtain. I know we have those of Irish blood who have volunteered to serve and are serving, and we have those who are displaced persons coming from countries now located behind the so-called Iron Curtain. They are two groups that are in a very uncomfortable situation, a very bad situation, unless this speedy means of naturalization is afforded them. Is my friend acquainted with that situation?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, I am.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, my observations in the nature of a question really cover the situation?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is an accurate statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask my friend what his views are on this bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. We plan to take it up as quickly as we can. At the moment the subcommittee I head is engaged in handling the tidelands matter, and we are pressing to get that through as soon as possible. It has been before the Congress a number of times. We are anxious to get it out of the subcommittee. One or two other bills are listed ahead of the

bill to which the gentleman refers. As quickly as we can reach it, we will take up the matter of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because I know there is a tremendous amount of interest in the legislation and I realize the failure to pass it quickly will bring inequities to many who are serving in our Armed Forces at the present time.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out to the gentleman that in addition to the many reasons why this bill should be passed we have in the armed services at the present time a number of men who are eligible for commission; that is, otherwise they would be eligible, they have all the qualifications, and our armed services feel that they are qualified in every particular, but because they are not citizens they cannot be granted commissions. I join with the gentleman in the thought that this bill should be passed quickly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for that additional observation, which is very pertinent. I was not aware of it, though I quickly see the significance of it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

#### AMENDING SECTION 3841, REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called 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.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. May I ask that some member of the committee explain just what this bill accomplishes?

Mr. Speaker, if no member is present who can explain what the bill does, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING ACT OF JULY 12, 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2466) to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch.

460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, has this bill been on the Consent Calendar long enough so that it may be properly considered at this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the bill has been on the calendar for the required time.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING SECTION 3841, REVISED STATUTES

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of clarification, was the objection raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in reference to an explanation of the bill, H. R. 3062?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to hear the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 10, 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, for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. Will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill in the first instance is to repeal the present law which requires postmasters throughout the United States to send to the Postmaster General all reports concerning the arrival and departure of the mail. The purpose of this bill is to eliminate the mere formal forwarding to the Postmaster General the time of arrival and departure of each mail that is brought to or taken from each post office. Instead of that, it is believed it would serve a much better purpose if the postmaster, instead of forwarding each arrival and departure, would send to the Postmaster General those that are late on arrival or those that are late on departure. Therefore, in bookkeeping alone it would save a great deal of money and eliminate much red tape.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no intention to follow this up by depriving any of the ports of entry of the continued service of steamship lines, is there?

Mr. BONIN. No, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is there any further explanation my friend wants to make to the House?

Mr. BONIN. In addition to that, there is another section here. In fact, there are two other sections. There is a revised classification which Public Law 204 of the 82d Congress provided. Therein, the classification of "clerk in charge" would actually not be necessary. He is working at the present time, but the classification is still maintained on the statute books. Therefore, this section is merely for the purposes of clarification and to be continued under the new legislation as passed in the 82d Congress. In the third section, this amendment is for the purpose of establishing post roads. At the present time, all post roads and highways, while kept up and maintained, are classified as post roads; but, you must still obtain approval of the Congress in order to establish them. It is merely a clarification of the law in repealing certain sections in consistence with other sections of the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the gentleman states that this will bring about not only economy but efficiency, without the impairment of any service?

Mr. BONIN. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I might say that a similar bill was passed by the House in the closing days of the last session. The bill did not reach the other body in time for action there. This bill was originally sent down by former Postmaster General Donaldson. Since it did not pass the other body, the present Postmaster General sent the same bill down this time. This is certainly a good bill which will bring about economy and repeal a lot of useless and obsolete laws that are on the statute books today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements that both gentlemen have made which I think it is good to have for the RECORD, and I might state that the explanation by the gentlemen satisfy me, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 3841 of the Revised Statutes (sec. 7, title 39, United States Code) is hereby amended by striking out the clause reading: "and he shall cause to be kept and returned to the Department, at short and regular intervals, registers, showing the exact times of the arrivals and departures of the mail.", and by inserting, in lieu thereof, a clause to read as follows: "and he shall cause to be kept and forwarded to the Department, or designated field offices, such reports as he may consider necessary."

Sec. 2. The act entitled "An act to re-classify postmasters and employees of the postal service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis," approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1045), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the paragraph reading:

"A clerk in charge is defined as a clerk in charge of a railway post office, terminal railway post office, or transfer office whether he performs service alone or has a crew of clerks under his supervision, or of a tour or a crew within a tour of a terminal railway post office or transfer office."

Sec. 3. Section 3975 of the Revised Statutes (sec. 493, title 39, U. S. C.) is hereby amended by striking out the semicolon and the following: "but where such service is performed over a route not established by law, he shall report the same to Congress at its meeting next thereafter, and such service shall cease at the end of the next session of Congress, unless such route is established a post route by Congress."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FREE POSTAGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN SPECIFIED AREAS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the bill (H. R. 2466) to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas, was called, Calendar No. 11, I asked that it be passed over without prejudice. I am now fully informed of the purpose of the bill and I now ask unanimous consent to return to its consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am acquainted with what the bill does, but I would like to ask the gentlewoman from New York for a brief explanation.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is merely a continuation of the present law which gives free mailing privileges to the troops in Korea or in any war area. But what is does further, and we feel it is a very important addition, is to extend the free-mailing privilege to hospitalized service people outside the continental United States. We are particularly anxious that this privilege should not be curtailed in any way. We have cleared it with the Department of Defense who have given it the fullest consideration and approval. We have also cleared it with the Bureau of the Budget, and they assure us that as the bill is written they would like to see it go through immediately so there will be no interruption or curtailment of this service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the present law this right of free mailing may be extended within the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is confined now to Korea and Europe.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes, or any declared war area, that is, declared by the President or by the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the bill contains a further provision extending it to hospitalized veterans, as the gentlewoman has said.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That is also provided.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the discretion to extend the privilege is left to the Presi-

dent of the United States, not the Postmaster General.

Mr. McCORMACK. I knew there was delegated authority contained in the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the first section of the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That any first-class letter mail matter admissible to the mails as ordinary mail matter which is sent by a member of the Armed Forces of the United States (1) while on active duty or in the active service of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and such other areas as the President of the United States may hereafter designate as combat zones or theaters of military operations; or (2) while hospitalized outside the continental limits of the United States when such hospitalization is a result of service in Korea and such other areas as the President of the United States may hereafter designate as combat zones or theaters of military operations; to any person in the United States, including the Territories and possessions thereof, shall be transmitted in the mails free of postage, subject to such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General may describe. When specified by the sender, letters weighing not to exceed one ounce shall be transmitted to destination by air mail, dependent upon air space availability therefor."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of said act, as amended, is further amended by deleting therefrom "until June 30, 1953", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1955."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the calendar.

#### THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement by Dr. R. G. De Voe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad of the opportunity to include with my remarks a statement which was furnished me by Dr. R. G. De Voe, manager of the Veterans' Administration hospital in the Bronx, New York City, entitled "The People Behind the Professional Staff." In this statement Dr. De Voe clearly points out that the operation of a hospital is so dependent on excellent teamwork between the various units therein that if one unit should be crippled in any way, it affects the operation of the entire hospital. It is readily appreciated from his statement that a reduction in the nonprofessional staff who service the operation of the hospital itself is bound to affect the professional staff engaged in the care of the patients.

I am convinced that Dr. De Voe and his staff at the veterans' hospital in the Bronx, New York City, are doing everything they can to cooperate in reducing expenses and have of their own accord

instituted savings where savings could be made without crippling the service. It becomes very necessary for the appropriate committees of Congress to inquire into the actual situation in great detail before authorizing a reduction in appropriations for hospital operation in the Veterans' Administration.

From my study of the situation I believe that something is wrong with the high echelon of the Veterans' Administration when it approves a reduction in the nonprofessional personnel with assurances that it will not affect the care of the patients. Both Congress and our veterans are entitled to better judgment on which they can rely. I hope my colleagues will read Dr. De Voe's excellent statement which follows:

THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF

For many years hospitals, both private and Government, have been accused of poor management because of their high costs, and more recently VA hospitals have been asked, "Why can't you cut down your staff of nonprofessional personnel without touching the doctors, nurses, dentists, and dietitians and still give the same service both from the standpoint of quantity and quality?" Hospital authorities have answered this question many times and in many ways, but here are a few points concerning VA hospitals which may help to further clear the question.

It is true that since 1945 operating costs of veterans' hospitals have increased considerably in terms of cost per patient-day. This, of course, is due in part to the general rise in costs of everything, but more important, it is the improvement in care of our patients over that in prewar VA. The VA hospital has also taken its place as one of the best hospitals in the community and has assumed its rightful responsibilities to the Nation insofar as training of personnel, professional and nonprofessional, and utilizing its vast resources of patients for research for the benefit of all mankind. This, of course, is expensive but worth while.

Many people not engaged in the day-by-day operation of hospitals are prone to look upon the hospital in the light of a hotel for sick people, or business-type institution. Nothing can be further from the truth. The hospital, to be a good one, must be a dynamic medical workshop with complex organization of services; a social institution serving the needs of sick people and keeping uppermost the fact that the needs of those sick people must come first before any attempts at profit-making or economy in the business sense of the word. The direct furnishing of care to patients by the people they see—doctors, nurses, dentists, and dietitians—is the most expensive phase of the hospital, but let us stop and think. These people could not render their services without a large group of people behind the scenes who provide the materials, supply the food, the records, the telephones, etc., which must be provided for. We agree wholeheartedly that the VA hospital, having a public trust in the expenditure of taxpayers' money, must be as efficient as possible and must be constantly searching for better and more economical means of operation. Here I do not think we have failed.

This hospital, through research and management improvement programs, has voluntarily cut its staff as our personnel have become more experienced, and newer and better ways of doing the hospital work have been found. As a matter of fact, in the last year we have processed 27 employee suggestions resulting in improved service and 84 work simplification studies resulting in economies in either personnel or supplies.

We have been asked, "Why can't you cut your nonprofessional staff. What do they have to do with patient care?" Let's go down the nonprofessional activities department

by department. One of our largest nonprofessional groups is our engineering department whose task is to maintain without failures a conglomeration of buildings (housing 1,500 patients) some of which were built in 1900 and some in 1940. Aside from keeping the buildings in repair, which is a job in itself where you have provided a half-million patient-days in a year and have taken care of 52,000 veterans as outpatients, our maintenance people have to see that the basic services—heat, steam, electricity, gas—are provided 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, year in and year out, without failures which could make the doctors' attempts futile. We have already cut this department down to the point where we honestly feel we are practicing false economy. This same department must be ready to run our ambulances, plow the snow, haul supplies and patients. Our laundry must continue to process 7,000,000 pieces of laundry every year in order to maintain hospital standards which I am sure no one wants to see drop. Our guard force must protect the property and provide fire-fighting services when necessary.

Our supply division is responsible for purchasing, warehousing, and issuing all the supplies and equipment used in a huge hospital of this type. In doing this, they must insure that the doctor will have everything he needs when he needs it and still not overstock and tie up the hospital's money. They must buy all the hospital's food at the best advantage, and this, too, must be available when needed. Warehousing in itself is a big business. The supply division must stock and maintain stock levels on over 2,000 items that are used on a recurring basis in the hospital. This stock replenishment system, as it is called, was copied from some of the largest industrial concerns in the country as a means of assuring continuous supply without overstocking. Our supply division consisting of 31 persons has been reduced by 4 persons during the past year alone as a result of improved methods brought about by constant management study.

In our hospital we also have a communications and records department whose main functions are the sorting and delivering of 140,000 pieces of mail per month, coming to us from outside; the maintenance of a messenger system at this hospital where we have no call system, the operation of our telephones, travel, and transportation activities, and one of our biggest headaches, the maintenance of records and files. Administrative records and files are a small problem, but the maintenance of a system of accurate filing of the tens of thousands of patients' records which must be maintained here for a period of 10 years is enormous. It should be pointed out that medical records in a Veterans' Administration hospital serve two purposes: First, as medical and/or research records, and secondly, as very important records concerning the case of a veteran in the adjudication of any claim he may have pending against the Government for compensation or pension. We have reduced this department through our own efforts by four people during 1952.

The registrar division, another nonprofessional service, is responsible for all the administrative aspects pertaining to the admission and disposition of patients and maintenance of their current records, as well as provision for taking care of patients' clothing; responsible for property and equipment on wards and the furnishing of a stenographic service for transcription and typing of patients' clinical records. This division was created to relieve our doctors, nurses, and other professional personnel from purely administrative duties.

Our finance office is responsible for the accurate accounting of all moneys expended at this hospital for any purpose and from any source. Other functions of this division are maintenance of a cost-accounting system

which enables us to gauge our performance in comparison with other hospitals, Government and otherwise; preparation of payrolls for all employees and distribution of pay checks; operation of patients' funds activities. This interesting activity is somewhat like a small bank in that all patients are encouraged to deposit any money they bring with them to the hospital which can be withdrawn by them at any time. In addition, we have incompetent patients' funds which must be administered by the manager and handled by the finance office. Personnel in this division were also reduced during 1952 by four.

The personnel department handles the hiring and discharging of employees and the operation of a personnel program at the hospital consisting of training and recruitment which we also do for other hospitals. The personnel department is also responsible for staff work in connection with incentives awards and suggestion programs, employee health activities, and advice to the manager regarding personnel administration.

Special services is responsible for recreation, chaplaincy service, library, both professional and patients' library. The activities of this department have been a matter of controversy from time to time, but it has been our experience that the program properly directed for long-term type neuropsychiatric and tuberculous patients is beneficial in aiding our medical staff insofar as dealing with more cooperative patients is concerned.

Housekeeping is a prodigious job in a hospital of this size and type. It goes without saying that every hospital must be immaculate at all times and at all hours. Our hospital, where it is not at all uncommon to have 1,500 visitors to patients at any time, and located in a large population center, presents special problems in housekeeping. If it were not for the afore-mentioned factors, our old buildings with their high ceilings, old-fashioned floors, would be a job in itself. This department, which we have mechanized to the maximum, is another one whose work is often taken for granted, but is constantly a thorn in the side of hospital management.

I have thus far discussed only the purely administrative activities which function as services to the professional and subprofessional staff. In our professional departments we have, of course, many complex activities handled by other than doctors, nurses, or dentists.

Our dietetic department for instance, is responsible for preparing approximately 7,000 meals a day and on time. Our patients and the public often see only the pretty dietitian or the nurse who serves the tray, but in our discussion, we must stop and think what happens and how many people are involved in getting that tray to the patient. We must realize that, after the supply people purchase the food, it must be transported, menus planned, food prepared for cooking, cooked, divided into portions, and transported to the patient to whom it is to be served. Afterwards, the remains of the food that has become garbage must be taken back and disposed of, and the dishes washed. Garbage from 7,000 meals is a formidable thing as is the dishwashing! To get back to preparation of food, most of our food is purchased in bulk. Our beef, for instance, is purchased in carcass lots. It would be prohibitive for us to purchase cuts as the average householder does, so in order for our food to be prepared for cooking, we must maintain a staff of butchers, kitchen helpers, etc. We must prepare vegetables, keep our kitchens and serving areas hospital clean to prevent infection on a 24-hour, 7 day a week basis.

We wonder whether the average lay person takes into consideration the assistance the doctor must have in modern medicine to make an accurate diagnosis and to decide upon courses of treatment. Here again, our

X-ray department, our huge and complex laboratories, all of which must be adequately manned if tragic errors are to be averted, are too often out of the public eye when it comes to judging the hospital. Yes, the character of hospital care has changed radically in the past decade. In an era of ever increasing technical advances in medicine, new testing techniques—electrocardiograph, electroencephalograph, special high-speed X-rays—have added greatly to the overhead cost. Antibiotics, the extensive use of intravenous fluids, including blood, plasma, more laboratory examinations, all of which mean more skilled personnel—these are examples of modern hospital techniques, requiring greater additional cost, but while they have increased the cost of running the hospital, they have lengthened the patient's life, reduced pain, and cut the time of his stay in the hospital. Concentrated treatment is costly, but it pays off economically as well as physically. Excluding our long-term or custodial cases, our patients spend much less time in the hospital than they would have if hospitalized for the same illness 10 years ago.

The points that we have brought out are not peculiar to a Veterans' Administration Hospital but are applicable to any large university-type teaching hospital, organized and operated to take the lead in the medical world toward the goal of not only rendering the highest type of medical treatment but also to discover new methods, train professional staff, and to conduct research in those problems still baffling physicians the world over. The Veterans' Administration has made a notable contribution, and it would indeed be tragic if false economy were to destroy these things now.

#### SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure to submit to you a summary report on the activities of the senior Senator from our great State of Michigan during the 82d Congress. Michigan's pride in Senator HOMER FERGUSON has been justified by his two terms of distinguished service to his country and to his State. He has been a dynamic influence in the work of two major Senate committees and his active participation in Senate debate has placed him among the hardest working and most able men in the Senate.

High on the list of outstanding legislative achievements during 1952 is an amendment to the Defense Production Act credited to the efforts of Senator FERGUSON. This amendment terminated the undesirable activities of the International Materials Conference, which had deprived American industries of much-needed raw materials for war production.

Elsewhere in labor and industrial fields our distinguished Senator urged allocation of Government contracts to distressed areas. Furthermore, he vigorously condemned President Truman's unconstitutional seizure of the steel industry. Concurring with the decision of the Supreme Court, Senator FERGUSON called upon the President to halt the steel strike through the use of existing legislation.

One of the chief champions of economy in the 82d and previous Congress, Senator FERGUSON was instrumental in achieving the greatest reduction in Federal expenditures in the Nation's history. On more than 50 occasions during Senate debate, Senator FERGUSON expressed his strong opposition to any increase in Government spending. The Senator is directly responsible for a savings of over \$10 million of the total reduction. He waged a victorious fight against waste and inefficiency in the Defense Department which saved millions in Federal expenditures.

As a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senator FERGUSON took part in the exhaustive investigations of Communist infiltration in IPR. Committee research resulted in the conclusion that the Institute of Pacific Relations was a vehicle used by the Communists to direct American far-eastern policies toward Communist objectives.

On the St. Lawrence seaway issue, Senator FERGUSON in 1952 spearheaded the fight on the side of those who favored the project. The high-water levels which last year caused so much damage to States bordering the Great Lakes, demanded much of Senator FERGUSON's attention. He sponsored legislation for control of the Great Lakes water level and in addition earmarked part of emergency flood relief appropriations for use in Michigan areas.

Senator FERGUSON was responsible for introducing into the 82d Congress bills to provide for servicemen's absenteé ballots where State laws do not make adequate provisions. A bill providing for compensation on the same basis for unemployed vets as for unemployed civilians was also introduced and guided into law by our senior Senator.

Senator FERGUSON has always found time in his busy schedule to assist the citizens of Michigan in their relations with the Federal Government and its agencies.

His attendance record, shared by only one other Member of the Senate, is edifying proof of our Senator's conscientious efforts throughout the year. He missed only one of 129 rollcall votes and one of 121 quorum calls for an attendance record of 99.6 percent.

My report does not do justice to the far-reaching accomplishments of Senator FERGUSON. However, on behalf of the people of Michigan I submit this tribute to Michigan's senior Senator, HOMER FERGUSON.

#### ACCELERATED AMORTIZATION FOR AMERICAN OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the United States has evolved a conscious, if sometimes uncoordinated, policy for redressing the grave economic imbalance between itself and the rest

of the free world. Among other things, this policy has included the encouragement of American private investment overseas, although no great progress has been made. With this in mind, I have introduced today a bill, H. R. 3600, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit accelerated amortization on certain facilities constructed, established or acquired in foreign countries by American investors.

One of the basic economic problems faced by our friends abroad is that of production and productivity. Most of these countries are unable to produce enough goods and services at competitive prices to exchange for the goods and services they must import to build stronger economies and support their own defense effort. Their position can be improved only by expanding production and increasing productivity through the investment of more capital, development of managerial skill and encouragement of labor cooperation with a greater share of the profits.

The greatest source today for both capital and technical knowledge is the United States. We all agree that American investment in the form of foreign-aid programs cannot provide a permanent solution. The answer must be increased investment abroad by American private enterprise. Such investment would make available to our allies in some measure the economic benefits of the production, distribution, and management techniques which have contributed so greatly to this country's imposing economic strength.

Since 1947 United States direct foreign investment has been running at something over one billion a year. And it has been very largely special purpose investment heavily concentrated in the Western Hemisphere. This amounts to less than four one-thousandths of national income as contrasted with the approximately one one-hundredth capital movement during the 1930's, almost three times the current rate.

There are many convincing reasons why American private capital is reluctant to seek opportunity abroad. My bill is designed to diminish the importance of two of these factors—the threat of war destruction and expropriation of assets through nationalization schemes. If direct investments could be amortized within a relatively short time, the risk of destruction or expropriation would no longer be prohibitive.

Accelerated amortization is the device which has done so much for domestic investment in defense production for World War II and the Korean war. As Mr. M. C. Conick, executive partner of Maine & Co., Pittsburgh, has pointed out, there is no reason why it cannot do the same thing for overseas investment consistent with our national policy. Amortization takes care of the risk that an investment may be written off on the one hand as useless, on the other as war-damaged or expropriated. It is reasonably estimated that this device could induce the export of American capital at a rate of three or four billion a year and more.

This system of overseas investment and re-investment was the very basis of Great Britain's creditor position in the

19th century, which saw an unprecedented expansion in the development of the world's resources. Both Britain and the rest of the world benefited. Under-developed countries expanded their production base and Britain's imports from and exports to them increased. The effect of United States investment in Canada in this century is another example. By importing American capital and skills, Canada has been able to develop its natural resources to such a degree that real national income doubled in one decade.

There are important differences, however, in the two situations. The American investor is discouraged, as his British counterpart of the last century was not, by discriminatory legislation and administrative practices of foreign governments, by double taxation, by unstable and inconvertible currencies, by the shortage of dollar exchange, and, as noted before, by the threat of expropriation and war damage. Investment cannot be justified if there is no assurance that the principal will remain intact and a reasonable return enjoyed. We cannot expect private enterprise to accept unfair risks in the name of national policy. The Government itself must provide the inducements if it desires an increase in overseas investment in the face of what our businessmen regard as an unfavorable investment climate. We expect friendly countries to help develop healthier conditions for the foreign investor, but this will be a slow and tedious process of negotiation and the need for greater investment is immediate.

This investment incentive offers the possibility for real missionary work for the free enterprise economic system. The bill specifically provides that investment programs which are a joint undertaking between American enterprise and investors of the foreign country concerned shall have priority in the issuance of amortization certificates. In this way each country should benefit not only from the capital import but also from experience with American technical skill. Wages are made a factor in awarding amortization certificates in order to prevent the exploitation of local wage standards and consequent cheap labor competition with American domestic industry.

If the people abroad have an opportunity to share in the American system of capital investment, they can take the lead in steps to revitalize their own economy. Corporate investment, symbolizing the individual citizen's share in the ownership of our great business enterprises, is the best possible assurance of broadening the base of a free economy in the non-Communist nations of the world. There is no better way of helping to bring about a better appreciation of the system that has made the United States the envy of the world than to offer the opportunity to citizens of other countries to share in profits of success of the free-enterprise-business development in their own country. The owners and the wage earners in a profitable industrial system are not likely to be easy victims of Communist propaganda.

The question of cost to the American taxpayer under this program is more

apparent than real. Taken on the short-term view, the cost would be the loss of the amount rebated to each company in the form of a tax credit for accelerated amortization of the investment abroad. Yet what is lost from Government revenue temporarily would soon be recovered and more by revenue accruing from the taxable earnings on the investment.

But to talk of dollar costs is to tragically ignore the profounder long-term implications of a mass movement of American capital overseas. It is a matter strictly of our self-interest. It has come as a painful discovery to a people who has so long practiced the philosophy of live-and-let-live, but Americans now recognize that the security and economic well-being of our allies is necessary to the security and well-being of themselves.

Here is a way to give the lie to the Marxist dogma that capitalist nations must wage aggressive wars to gain markets for their surplus production. Quite simply put, either the rest of the world rises to our level eventually, or we sink to theirs.

#### TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

**THE SPEAKER.** Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

**MR. LYLE.** Mr. Speaker, March 2 is an important date in the history of man's quest for freedom from despotism. It is Texas Independence Day.

Texans are doubly blessed with a heritage of freedom. They are doubly blessed with the honor of two great flags, the Lone Star flag of Texas, and the beautiful flag of our country, both of which today fly over the capitol of our State, and each of them exemplifies the glory of the red, the white, and the blue.

Our pride in being Texans detracts not at all from our devotion to the common goal of the joint enterprise of all of the States. The contribution of our State, its people, its resources, and its industry has in no small measure contributed to the greatness, the progress, and the stability of our country. We love our country no less because we love our State so much. We serve our country no less because of our devotion to the welfare of our State.

The development of Texas parallels the development of the United States, and its resources have consistently increased the sum total of our Nation's wealth.

Petroleum is a resource that is rightfully identified with the progress and development of our State and of the Nation. It is a resource upon which the future of our country may well depend. In this day of labels we are reminded that this is the atomic age. I am not at all certain whether this is a promise or a threat. Of this I am sure. In this atomic age, petroleum is the resource of survival, and surviving, we may be able to determine what, if anything, the atomic age brings except the threat of extinction.

I was greatly impressed by a recent article written by the very able Gen.

Carl Spaatz, United States Air Force, retired, as it appeared in the February 9 issue of *Newsweek*. General Spaatz wrote that—

The atomic age is upon us but oil remains the strategic material that will decide whether we are to have peace of sorts or another world war. At the moment the bulk of the world's oil resources is under our control and helps keep the peace. But if the oil resources of the Middle East, which lie temptingly close to the Russian sphere, were to come under Russian control, the oil balance would shift to the Soviet side and war in our time would become a virtual certainty.

Such a conclusion nominates our domestic crude supplies as our mightiest weapon of war.

Petroleum is the versatile resource that adapts itself alike to construction and destruction. In a complex economic society it would be foolish to single out a resource or an industry as the indispensable one. Realism demands, however, in the face of Russia's attitude that we think in terms of both peace and war. In times of peace, petroleum and natural gas account for more than half of our energy requirements. In war, petroleum accounts for approximately one-half of our overseas shipments.

A recent report published by the Defense Production Administration evaluates its importance in the following language:

The machines of peace and war run on petroleum. A program to expand American industry substantially and keep it operating at top capacity requires constantly increasing quantities for fuel, for lubricants, and for the many chemicals that are made from petroleum—everything from toluene for TNT to wax for packaging. Greater industrial activity and peak levels of employment demand more and more gasoline for airplanes, automobiles, trucks, tractors, and buses, and more diesel fuel for locomotives.

Oil is a resource so abundant and so common to Americans we are often unable to appreciate either the product or the daring and adventuresome spirit of the individuals and industry that have made it available, abundant, and useful at prices each of us can afford. It is important that we have more knowledge of both the resource and the industry.

I have some knowledge of the history and operation of the petroleum industry but no interest, direct or indirect, that shades an objective presentation to you of information you will want to have.

Like many successful enterprises, this industry is too often subjected to distorted and unreasonable attacks. Too often it is characterized in relation to some of the buffoons who may have been associated with it. Then again, it is attacked simply because it is big and successful. I assume that this will ever be so, for it seems to be part of our nature that we fear failure, but are afraid of success.

The petroleum industry has dared to succeed. It has dared to challenge the stubbornness of nature, to explore the mysteries of the earth, and to conquer the dangers of the unknown. It has dared to be successful in the face of the scornful, the doubters, and the timid. It is a fabulous and fascinating industry, favored by luck, but solidly built upon good business principles, a national con-

sciousness of responsibility, and respect for the laws of nature. It is a business in which failure, though so frequent as to be usual, is forgotten and wiped out by the rewarding benefits of success. It is tough, hard, and competitive.

The petroleum industry is a national industry and production of oil and gas is not limited to a few States. Actually, petroleum is being produced at this time in 27 States. Leasing and geological and geophysical work is currently being conducted in practically every State in the Union. Almost 14 percent or more of the total land area of the United States, more than 275,000,000 acres, is now under lease for oil and gas. In practical terms, such activity translates into millions of dollars, yes, hundreds of millions of dollars, being paid to hundreds of thousands of families and land-owners each year throughout the United States for such leases and royalty payments.

It employs well over a million people throughout the United States, and I think it may be conservatively said that other millions are indirectly employed by it in related industries. This industry has invested billions of dollars, that annually pay millions in dividends to hundreds of thousands of Americans throughout the 48 States. Since the end of World War II the industry has expanded \$7 billion in its development program.

This great industry was not and could not have been developed except in the favorable climate of a free government dedicated to the development of free enterprise. Its success has required the understanding of problems peculiar to such an enterprise, as well as tolerance, patience, and encouragement. The history of the oil industry does not reveal it to be either timid or cautious. Its success has required boldness, daring, and even recklessness at times. It has defied predictions of disaster, laughed at prophesies of failure and in the true American spirit of faith in self it has gone and continues to go forward and to pace the greatness, the development, and the productiveness of our Nation. All predictions to the contrary, the oil industry is today on the threshold of new technical and scientific advances and discoveries which will make its past performances appear amateurish. Though grown, it is in many respects in its infancy.

It is unfortunately true that the oil industry has been harassed by ignorance, by jealousies, and by many who just do not believe in free enterprise, particularly where it is applied to the development of natural resources. Too, it has had to face the opposition of those who either did not know or did not wish it to succeed, individuals both in and out of government. Many had no faith in the industry. Some wanted the Government to control it.

As far back as 1866, the United States Revenue Commission, apparently with little faith in the future of the oil industry, predicted that we would be able to develop synthetics to take its place. In the following 82 years there has been produced in this country more than 37 billion barrels of oil.

In 1885, the United States Geological Survey reported to the Nation that there

was little or no chance of the production of oil in the State of California. Fortunately, those engaged in the oil industry did not believe this, for since that time more than 8 billion barrels of oil have been produced in the great State of California.

Again, in 1891, the United States Geological Survey reported that there was little or no chance for production in the States of Kansas and Texas. How very wrong they were. More than 14 billion barrels of oil have been produced in these two States, with known reserves of additional billions.

In 1908, still undaunted, officials of the United States Geological Survey estimated that the future maximum supply of oil in the United States was 22½ billion barrels. Again, the oil industry refused to believe this and has since produced more than 35 billion barrels and has within its grasp proved reserves amounting to more than 30 billion barrels.

In 1914, the United States Bureau of Mines decided to enter into the picture of predictions and estimated that the future production of oil was approximately 6 billion barrels. The industry has since produced 6 times that much.

We have increased our production of oil more than four times since 1920, producing each year since that date in excess of our requirements, all of this in the face of a prediction that year by Geological Survey that we had reached the peak of production and that there was a great need for foreign oil and synthetics.

In 1939, an official of the Interior Department spoke up, saying that the United States oil supply would last only 13 years. New oil deposits discovered in the United States since that time far exceed the then known supplies.

In 1947, the State Department decided to have a hand at predictions and the then chief of the petroleum division of that department stated that sufficient oil could not be found in the United States. What happened? Well, in the following year 1948, and in the face of such a prediction, the oil industry discovered its largest volume of oil in the history of the industry, more than twice our annual consumption, or 4½ million barrels.

But not to be dismayed, in 1949, the Secretary of Interior predicted that the end of the United States oil supply was almost in sight. The industry's answer to such a prediction was that the United States can now increase its production by more than a million barrels of oil per day.

You can well see from past performances that the oil industry is not a timid one and apparently it either cannot read the press releases or it pays very little attention to predictions of doom and failure from those who know very little about its great potential.

In 1953, Mr. Russell Brown, an industry spokesman, well qualified, I think, to judge the potential of the industry, said in a speech in Houston, Tex.:

We have within the confines of the United States petroleum supplies equal to our full national requirements for the foreseeable future.

He continued to state:

Whatever extent to which this country is now or may become dependent on outside sources for petroleum supplies is a matter of Government policy.

In the matter of Government policy, you and I share a great responsibility. We must be responsible for policies and actions which will create the climate, a favorable climate, for the continued expansion, growth, development and operation, not only of this but other great American industries whose continued success is essential to the continued welfare, prosperity and happiness of our Nation.

Fabulous and fantastic as has been the development of the oil industry in the past, requirements of the present and future demand that it outdo its past performances. Circumstances over which the industry has no control demand performance of which it alone can control.

It is conservatively estimated, I think, that the defense program will this year boost our petroleum needs to 8,200,000 barrels a day. This is an increase of 20 percent over the 6,800,000 barrels per day which we used in 1950. Such an increase in production will, of course, require the drilling of a great deal more wells each year than we have ever drilled yearly in our history. Our refineries must be expanded so that additional millions of barrels of crude petroleum may be manufactured into gasoline, fuel oil, and other finished petroleum products.

Such increases will, of necessity, enlarge our transportation and distribution facilities. The Defense Production Administration has urged that the refining capacity be so expanded as to permit by the end of this year a refining capacity of 125,000,000,000 barrels annually. To handle this increase more pipelines, more tankers, more truck transports, more barges and more railroad facilities are required.

The domestic oil industry cannot expand simply because there is a need for its products; there must also be a market for its products. Too, its expansion will be limited to the expansion of other industries upon whom it must depend for materials. Such an expansion will require tremendous sums of money, money that is becoming more and more difficult to entice into the necessary gambles that are a part of the industry. Such an expansion will require more than 7,000,000 tons of steel and more than 7,000,000 pounds of aluminum. It will require 40,000,000 pounds of copper. It will require lumber, electrical supplies, transports, yes, it will require practically a portion of the entire product of America. It must have additional labor, electrical power, and most of all, it will require a favorable attitude on the part of the Government.

Unquestionably, billions of barrels of oil lie beneath the surface of this great country of ours. To be sure, it is an elusive and well-hidden resource, not only exceedingly difficult to locate but also most difficult to capture. I have observed the development of this industry for many years, yet I have never ceased to marvel at the difficulties that must be overcome to put a gallon of gas

into the automobile I drive. You will better understand the challenge if you can know the problem.

Certainly you who have not had the opportunity to familiarize yourselves with the oil industry will be interested to learn something about the cost of finding and producing oil. Today it costs, as an average, \$90,000 to drill a well for oil. Many of the deeper wells drilled today in unproven areas may cost over a million dollars. The machinery used to drill a well today, I am informed, costs from two hundred thousand to a million dollars per drilling unit. This, of course, would not be a great deal of money if we knew exactly where to drill each hole. But nature is tricky, particularly when it comes to hiding its resources, and, in spite of technical and scientific advances, 8 out of every 9 wells drilled today are dry holes, nonproductive, and do not return one penny of the tremendous amount of capital involved in such an undertaking. I am speaking now of what is known to the industry as wildcat wells, or wells drilled in areas under which there is no known production. This may also be true of marginal wells. This being the case, it is, of course, not difficult at all to see that if you have average luck it will cost more than a million dollars to find one oil well. I know of several cases where independent operators have drilled as many as 20 or 30 dry holes without finding one that was productive. If you are fortunate enough to be average, however, and to find 1 oil well in 9 after expending a million dollars or more, it may or may not be a good oil well. It may or may not be of sufficient productive capacity to return the money expended. Past experience has proven that the chances are 16 to 1 against discovering a very small field, a field so small that its production will provide the United States with its oil needs for 4 hours or less. And the odds go up, for they are 53 to 1—and these figures are based on experience—the chances are 53 to 1 of finding a small field which could supply our needs for 2½ days or less. It is even more difficult to find a medium-sized oil field the production of which could supply our needs in the United States for a week or less. The chances are 230 to 1 for finding such a field. It is the dream, I am sure, of every man or woman engaged in the oil industry to find or own a part of a large oil field, and they are being found, but the chances are 991 to 1 against such a discovery.

This will give you, dramatically, I think, a better conception, not only of the faith, courage, and daring that it takes to be a part of this industry, but it will also give you an understanding which you and I must have to encourage the continued expansion and development of a product that we must have.

It becomes increasingly difficult in the face of increasing costs, decreasing returns, tremendous odds, and the scarcity of profitable production to keep lending institutions and individual risk capital flowing freely into the industry's hands; but fortunately, the bold, almost foolhardy spirit which has sparked this industry continues to live in the hearts of individuals engaged in it, and any man who underestimates the potential of this

group or their capacity for continued development sells America short.

Gen. Ernest Thompson, a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas, the agency which administers the oil and gas laws of my State, is one of the ablest public officials in America and the man, I think, who knows as much if not more about the oil industry than any man in the world, has some things to say about the future of the industry which I know will be helpful to you. General Thompson suggests that we should drill 55,000 new wells each year to meet our requirements. In 1952, there were only 45,840 wells drilled. The general estimates that we will probably drill in excess of 46,000 this year. There are many factors which would account for failure to drill the required number of wells, not the least of which is the lack of drill stem pipe and casing. I spoke just the other day to one of the officials in the department that allocates pipe and tubing. He estimates that it is possible to fill about 80 percent of the requests received. Equipment has been difficult to get, I am told this almost daily by those engaged in the industry. Particularly this is so for the small independent operator. At the present time there are more than 500 drilling rigs idle. While this country is by no means running out of oil, it is quite certain that we cannot afford the idleness of 500 drilling rigs. Particularly is this true when we realize a jet engine uses approximately 3½ times the amount of petroleum products as a propeller-driven aircraft. Yes; and we cannot afford the idleness of 500 drilling rigs in the United States when we realize the covetous attitude of Russia toward oil in the Middle East.

In 1952, this country produced 2½ billion barrels of oil and natural gas liquids and at the same time increased our known oil reserves by approximately 2 billion barrels. This now gives us a reserve in excess of 34 billion barrels. Compare this to the 5 billion barrels in reserve at the end of World War I and it seems to be entirely adequate. However, in the face of estimates that by the end of 1975 we will need between 12 and 14 million barrels a day, twice that we are now producing, it becomes readily apparent that the oil industry still has a great task ahead of it.

There are, says General Thompson, probably more than 75 billion barrels of oil remaining in the ground in old oil-fields, waiting to be recaptured by new production methods. Unquestionably, this will be done.

This industry, since 1859, when the discovery well was drilled, has made great progress. The development of this Nation, its roads, its schools, its transportation facilities, its productive capacity, all are monuments to the oil industry that has dared to be great and successful in the face of many obstacles.

The Congress of the United States has reason to be proud that its good judgment, its faith in private ownership and free enterprise have cleared the road for the advancement and success of this industry. This has not at all times been an easy task for the Congress. Proponents of Federal control of resources, opponents of free enterprise and others

through just plain ignorance have subjected this body to much criticism. Some have left the impression that those engaged in the oil industry have robbed nature and their fellow citizens of a great resource and have somehow, through wrongful methods, become gaudily rich at the expense of the consumer. The facts, of course, prove this to be untrue. It is true that fortunes have been predicated upon the production of this great resource. Fortunately, that is no crime. Too, fortunes have been lost by many in the business. It is also true that the wealth that has been produced from this resource and the energy that has resulted from its product have benefited more millions, both directly and indirectly, than any other industry.

This industry has consistently been in the forefront in hourly wages paid. This statement may be easily verified by a look at statistics published by the Department of Labor. It has fought to keep its product within the financial means of all the people. Again, you may see by statistics published by the United States Department of Labor that while, on an average, all products have increased in price by 16 percent since the start of the Korean war, crude petroleum has increased only by eight-tenths of 1 percent.

Taxwise, this industry contributes billions yearly as its share of the cost of local, State, and Federal government.

For example, the petroleum tax bill, for 1950 was over \$3½ billion. Concern has been expressed as to the capacity of the petroleum industry to keep pace with the requirements of the future, the requirements of our country in this era of half peace and half war. A glimpse at the past clearly indicates the potential of this industry for the future. It can meet the demands. Current requirements of the Department of Defense and the industrial and domestic trade of the United States are being supplied. Simultaneously, our known reserves are increasing. The industry is capable of expanding production, reserves, refining capacity, and transportation facilities. It can do all of these things, our Government willing.

In 1951, the United States Geological Survey reported:

In the United States adequate production has been a direct function of economic incentive. Until the unpredictable date at which the incentive fails to provide the needed supplies there will be no convincing evidence that we have reached the limits of our ability to expand the potential ultimately recoverable reserves of petroleum.

It cannot meet its requirements and at the same time battle with bureaus and bureaucracy intent upon its control. The future of the oil industry in relation to the welfare of our country depends upon a national policy understood and agreed to by both industry and the Government and faithfully carried out by all concerned.

Much thought has been given to such a policy and in 1949 the National Petroleum Council, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, outlined the aims of such a policy. It stated:

First. It should result in a maximum contribution by the oil industry to an ex-

panding American economy and to a rising standard of living, including stable employment at fair wages within the industry.

Second. It should maintain conditions most likely to assure adequate supplies of petroleum in both peace and war.

Third. It should maintain conditions, within the free-enterprise system, most likely to assure adequate supplies of essential materials equitably available to all units in the industry in both peace and war.

Fourth. It should contribute to the expansion of trade and of industrial activity at home and abroad by encouraging American nationals in the development of both domestic and foreign oil resources.

Fifth. It should operate to strengthen our free institutions by demonstrating that the issues which periodically arise in an industrial democracy, involving the relations of Government and private industry, of State and individual, can be successfully resolved within our existing institutional framework.

To achieve the aims outlined by the NPC, it is of great importance that the Congress of the United States continue its understanding and its support of a tax policy that will encourage exploration and development of the untapped reservoirs of oil remaining within the borders of this country.

The percentage-depletion law, passed by Congress in 1926 and subsequently maintained, has been a major factor in the development of our oil supplies. This wise and understanding and necessary provision of the tax laws must be continued. The odds against profitable production are increasing daily. Wells are being drilled deeper and deeper and the costs are ever mounting. Each year the gamble becomes more pronounced. To encourage capital, badly needed capital, from lending institutions and individual investors, the oil industry must be assured of a tax structure that will permit exploration in unproven areas with the prospect of a profit commensurate with the risks involved.

Such a policy is wise and tenable because it is based upon the Nation's need for petroleum and not the industry's greed for profit.

Since 1932 the Congress has wisely encouraged the development of the domestic petroleum industry by discouraging the importation of foreign oil. Here again the decision was necessarily made and maintained on the basis of the welfare of our country. Excessive imports of petroleum products are a threat to the Nation's reserves and its capacity to produce in times of war. Our position of strength against our present enemies may well be in ratio to our capacity to explore and to produce within our own borders adequate oil and reserves.

The NPC has put it this way:

The Nation's economic welfare and security require a policy on petroleum imports which will encourage exploration and development efforts in the domestic industry and which will make available a maximum supply of domestic oil to meet the needs of this Nation.

The availability of petroleum from domestic fields produced under sound conservation practices, together with other pertinent fac-

tors, provides the means for determining if imports are necessary and the extent to which imports are desirable to supplement our oil supplies on a basis which will be sound in terms of the national economy and in terms of conservation.

The implementation of an import policy, therefore, should be flexible so that adjustments may readily be made from time to time.

Imports in excess of our economic needs, after taking into account domestic production in conformance with good conservation practices and within the limits of maximum efficient rates of production, will retard domestic exploration and development of new oil fields and the technological progress in all branches of the industry which is essential to the Nation's economic welfare and security.

The importation of foreign oil is a positive threat to the domestic industry. It is not difficult to conceive of a proper policy regarding imports. Only greed on the part of elements of the industry, or ignorance on the part of the Government, will keep us from a quick and successful meeting of the import issue.

A recent editorial in the Oil and Gas Journal very ably analyzed the requirements for success:

If defense is our main job and if oil is vital to defense and if a domestic reserve capacity is essential to the program, then all concerned should help achieve this objective.

One simple fact should be obvious: Somebody has to pay a lot of money to build up and carry reserve oil-producing capacity. Producers are willing to finance the program themselves if they can get enough funds from the sale of oil they do produce to carry their investment in unused facilities.

In addition to an adequate price per barrel, producers need assurance of a large enough market to give them the needed income. This means holding imports to some reasonable proportion of the domestic consumption, say about the same ratio as in recent years.

Other essentials of this program are a fair allocation of steel between domestic and foreign producers, assurance that foreign producers will share in the reserve program by keeping production below capacity and freedom from harassment and prosecution for doing what the defense planners ask.

This is a reasonable program and it doesn't require any worldwide cartel or international control machinery. It can be achieved by a clear understanding of objectives and methods, and genuine cooperation among all elements of the oil industry and the Federal Government.

Domestic production and adequate reserves are much more important than profits from foreign oil imports.

In the passage of the Natural Gas Act in 1938, the Congress specifically denied jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, an agency created by that act, over production and gathering of natural gas.

Here, again, the administrative agencies have attempted to interfere with congressional intent and have in many instances attempted to exercise controls over the production and gathering of natural gas, which has caused great confusion in this important phase of the oil and gas industry.

The petroleum industry is by no means a sacred cow and those who have played a part in its development are by no means exempt or excused, nor should they be, from the due processes of law, nor from accountability. No industry rightfully hopes to escape necessary su-

pervision and regulation. Wisely, the States have been delegated the right and power of such control and supervision. Particularly is this true in the field of conservation. Such a policy has resulted in our ability to produce adequate supplies. The continuance of such a policy is basic to future success.

Regulation by the Federal Government must be kept at a minimum for over-regulation would stifle it. It is an industry that thrives on freedom. It is an industry that nature regulates and one which competition controls. No trust or monopoly threatens the consumer.

This may well be the atomic age, but it is certain that until it has advanced considerably, petroleum is the one great resource upon which we must depend for progress and development in peace, and for survival and victory in war. The welfare of the industry has merged with the welfare of the Nation.

#### AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have included at the beginning of my remarks House Joint Resolution 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(House Joint Resolution 25 follows:)

*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. No treaty or executive agreement shall be made respecting the rights of citizens of the United States protected by this Constitution, or abridging or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

"SEC. 2. No treaty or executive agreement shall vest in any international organization or in any foreign power any of the legislative, executive, or judicial powers vested by this Constitution in the Congress, the President, and in the courts of the United States, respectively.

"SEC. 3. No treaty or executive agreement shall alter or abridge the laws of the United States or the Constitution or laws of the several States unless, and then only to the extent that, Congress shall so provide by act or joint resolution.

"SEC. 4. Executive agreements shall not be made in lieu of treaties.

"Executive agreements shall, if not sooner terminated, expire automatically 1 year after the end of the term of office for which the President making the agreement shall have been elected, but the Congress may, at the request of any President, extend for the duration of the term of such President the life of any such agreement made or extended during the next preceding Presidential term.

"The President shall publish all executive agreements except that those which in his judgment require secrecy shall be submitted to appropriate committees of the Congress in lieu of publication.

"SEC. 5. 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."

I

Mr. DOLIVER. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the impact of world affairs on the United States and the impact of the United States on world affairs in the present generation, new and intensified interest is evident in the treaty-making powers delineated in the Constitution of the United States. The entry of the United States into the United Nations organization, also focuses the attention of the American people on this problem. In the last 50 years, the force of events has pushed our country into a new and untried and unusual position with respect to our foreign policy. This requires, once again, that the American people look at the situation closely.

To begin with what are the provisions of the Constitution of the United States with respect to treaty making?

Before going further, let me set forth the existing provisions of the United States Constitution, pertaining to the making of treaties.

#### BASIC TREATY-MAKING PROVISIONS

##### Article II, section 2, clause 2:

He—

The President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers, and consuls.

##### Article I, section 10, clause 1:

No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

#### SUPREMACY CLAUSE

##### Article VI, clause 2:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

#### IMPLEMENTING POWERS OF CONGRESS

##### Article I, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have power \*\*\* to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

There are many who contend there is no necessity for an amendment of the nature I propose. Because they say it is beyond the realm of possibility, or even probability, that the Supreme Court would uphold a treaty provision which contravenes a constitutional prohibition. In support of this contention they say that the Supreme Court has stated in *Geoffroy v. Riggs* ((1890) 133 U. S. 258) and in *Asakura v. Seattle* ((1924) 265 U. S. 332) that a treaty cannot do that which the Constitution forbids.

But the issue is not so simple. I too doubt that our Supreme Court would uphold a treaty provision to override a constitutional prohibition. I feel, however, with thousands of other lawyers that while the treaty-making power might be used not to override a constitutional provision, it might be employed to circumscribe a constitutional right without running afoul of a constitutional prohibition.

The Supreme Court has rendered at least three opinions containing far-reaching implications in this respect. They are, first, *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* ((1936) 299 U. S. 315-318), which stated:

It will contribute to the elucidation of the question if we first consider the differences between the powers of the Federal Government in respect of foreign or external affairs and those in respect of domestic or internal affairs. That there are differences between them, and that these differences are fundamental, may not be doubted.

The two classes of powers are different, both in respect of their origin and their nature. The broad statement that the Federal Government can exercise no powers except those specifically enumerated in the Constitution and such implied powers as are necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, is categorically true only in respect of our internal affairs. In that field, the primary purpose of the Constitution was to carve from the general mass of legislative powers then possessed by the States such portions as it was thought desirable to vest in the Federal Government, leaving those not included in the enumeration still in the States. *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238, 294). That this doctrine applies only to powers which the States had, is self evident. And since the States severally never possessed international powers, such powers could not have been carved from the mass of State powers but obviously were transmitted to the United States from some other source. During the colonial period, those powers were possessed exclusively by and were entirely under the control of the Crown. By the Declaration of Independence, "the Representatives of the United States of America" declared the United (not the several) Colonies to be free and independent States, and as such to have "full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do."

As a result of the separation from Great Britain by the Colonies acting as a unit, the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown not to the Colonies severally, but to the Colonies in their collective and corporate capacity as the United States of America. Even before the declaration, the Colonies were a unit in foreign affairs, acting through a common agency—namely the Continental Congress, composed of delegates from the 13 Colonies. That agency exercised the powers of war and peace, raised an army, created a navy, and finally adopted the Declaration of Independence. Rulers come and go; governments end and forms of government change; but sovereignty survives. A political society cannot endure without a supreme will somewhere. Sovereignty is never held in suspense. When, therefore, the external sovereignty of Great Britain in respect of the Colonies ceased, it immediately passed to the Union. See *Penhallow v. Doane* (3 Dall. 54, 80-81). That fact was given practical application almost at once. The treaty of peace, made on September 23, 1783, was concluded between his Britannic Majesty and the "United States of America." (8 Stat. European Treaties 80.)

The Union existed before the Constitution, which was ordained and established among other things to form "a more perfect Union." Prior to that event, it is clear that the Union, declared by the Articles of Confederation to be "perpetual," was the sole possessor of external sovereignty and in the Union it remained without change save insofar as the Constitution in express terms qualified its exercise. The Framers' Convention was called and exerted its powers upon the irrefutable postulate that though the States were several their people in respect of foreign affairs were one. Compare *The Chinese Exclusion Case* (130 U. S. 581, 604, 606). In that convention, the entire absence of State power to deal with those affairs was thus forcefully stated by Rufus King:

"The States were not 'sovereigns' in the sense contended for by some. They did not possess the peculiar features of sovereignty—they could not make war, nor peace, nor alliances, nor treaties. Considering them as political beings, they were dumb, for they could not speak to any foreign sovereign whatever. They were deaf, for they could not hear any propositions from such sovereigns. They had not even the organs or faculties of defense or offense, for they could not of themselves raise troops, or equip vessels, for war." (5 Elliott's Debates 212.)

It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality. Neither the Constitution nor the laws passed in pursuance of it have any force in foreign territory unless in respect of our own citizens (see *American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co.*, (213 U. S. 347, 356)); and operations of the nation in such territory must be governed by treaties, international understandings and compacts, and the principles of international law. As a member of the family of nations, the right and power of the United States in that field are equal to the right and power of the other members of the international family. Otherwise, the United States is not completely sovereign. The power to acquire territory by discovery and occupation (*Jones v. United States* (137 U. S. 202, 212)), the power to expel undesirable aliens (*Fong Yue Ting v. United States* (149 U. S. 698, 705 et seq.)), the power to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense (*Altman & Co. v. United States* (224 U. S. 583, 600-601)); Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, 2d ed., p. 102 and note 1), none of which is expressly affirmed by the Constitution, nevertheless exist as inherently inseparable from the conception of nationality. This the court recognized, and in each of the cases cited found the warrant for its conclusions not in the provisions of the Constitution, but in the law of nations.

The third case is *United States v. Pink* ((1942) 315 U. S. 203, 232-233), which stated:

We recently stated in *Hines v. Davidowitz* (312 U. S. 52, 68), that the field which affects international relations is the one aspect of our Government that from the first has been most generally conceded imperatively to demand broad national authority; and that any State power which may exist is restricted to the narrowest of limits. There, we were dealing with the question as to whether a State statute regulating aliens survived a similar Federal statute. We held that it did not. Here, we are dealing with an exclusive

Federal function. If State laws and policies did not yield before the exercise of external powers of the United States, then our foreign policy might be thwarted. These are delicate matters. If State action could defeat or alter our foreign policy, serious consequences might ensue. The Nation as a whole would be held to answer if a State created difficulties with a foreign power. Compare *Chy Lung v. Freeman* (92 U. S. 279-280). Certainly, the conditions for enduring friendship between the nations, which the policy of recognition in this instance was designed to effectuate, are not likely to flourish where, contrary to national policy, a lingering atmosphere of hostility is created by State action.

The next case to which I call your attention is *United States v. Belmont* (1937) 301 U. S. 324, 331), which stated:

Plainly, the external powers of the United States are to be exercised without regard to State laws or policies. The supremacy of a treaty in this respect has been recognized from the beginning. Mr. Madison, in the Virginia convention, said that if a treaty does not supersede existing State laws, as far as they contravene its operation, the treaty would be ineffective. "To counteract it by the supremacy of the State laws would bring on the Union the just charge of national perfidy, and involve us in war." (3 Elliott's Debates 515.) And see *Ware v. Hylton* (3 Dall. 199, 236-237). And while this rule in respect of treaties is established by the express language of cl. 2, art. VI, of the Constitution, the same rule would result in the case of all international compacts and agreements from the very fact that complete power over international affairs is in the National Government and is not and cannot be subject to any curtailment or interference on the part of the several States. Compare *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, 316), *et seq.* In respect of all international negotiations and compacts, and in respect of our foreign relations generally, State lines disappear. As to such purposes the State of New York does not exist. Within the field of its powers, whatever the United States rightfully undertakes, it necessarily has warrant to consummate. And when judicial authority is invoked in aid of such consummation, State constitutions, State laws, and State policies are irrelevant to the inquiry and decision. It is inconceivable that any of them can be interposed as an obstacle to the effective operation of a Federal constitutional power. Compare *Missouri v. Holland* (252 U. S. 416); *Asakura v. Seattle* (265 U. S. 332, 341).

Charles Evans Hughes, former Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, in an address before the American Society of International Law on April 26, 1929, has stated:

If we take the Constitution to mean what it says, it gives in terms to the United States the power to make treaties. It is a power that has no explicit limitation attached to it, and so far there has been no disposition to find in anything relating to the external concerns of the Nation a limitation to be implied.

Now there is, however, a new line of activity which has not been very noticeable in this country, but which may be in the future, and this may give rise to new questions as to the extent of the treaty-making power. I have been careful in what I have said to refer to the external concerns of the Nation. I should not care to voice any opinion as to an implied limitation on the treaty-making power. The Supreme Court has expressed a doubt whether there could be any such. That is, the doubt has been expressed in one of its opinions. But if there is a limitation

to be implied, I should say it might be found in the nature of the treaty-making power.

What is the power to make a treaty? What is the object of the power? The normal scope of the power can be found in the appropriate object of the power. The power is to deal with foreign nations with regard to matters of international concern. It is not a power intended to be exercised, it may be assumed, with respect to matters that have no relation to international concerns.

So I come back to the suggestion I made at the start, that this is a sovereign nation; from my point of view, the Nation has the power to make any agreement whatever in a constitutional manner that relates to the conduct of our international relations, unless there can be found some express prohibition in the Constitution, and I am not aware of any which would in any way detract from the power as I have defined it in connection with our relations with other governments. But if we attempted to use the treaty-making power to deal with matters which did not pertain to our external relations but to control matters which normally and appropriately were within the local jurisdictions of the State, then I again say there might be ground for implying a limitation upon the treaty-making power that it is intended for the purpose of having treaties made relating to foreign affairs and not to make laws for the people of the United States in their internal concerns through the exercise of the asserted treaty-making power.

## II

The treaty-making provisions of our Constitution were written at a time and in a period of human history when international relations were much simpler than they are now. This is particularly true with reference to our new Nation, founded on a new continent, remote from the European world.

At the time of adoption of the Constitution, there were no means of rapid communication by telegraph, telephone, or radio. The journey across the Atlantic was slow and arduous, made by sailing vessel. There was much less reason for close and strict supervision of international affairs than is true today.

Because of the contemporary situation, a question immediately presents itself for discussion. Does the United States, through the United Nations, or some similar organization, or through a world federation, desire to relinquish its sovereignty as a nation—in whole or in part? To some legal scholars, it appears that such relinquishment could take place through the treaty-making powers outlined above, and take place practically without the knowledge or consent of the people of the United States, through the "back door."

Certainly, most Americans will agree if we are to relinquish a portion of our sovereignty, it should be through the franchise of the people as expressed in their elected representatives and not by a subterfuge apparently made possible by the provisions in the Constitution concerning treaty making.

This is not an unfounded fear. The State Department under President Truman's administration has stated in State Department Publication 3972, Foreign Affairs Policy Series 26, released September 1950, that "there is no longer any real distinction between 'domestic' and 'foreign' affairs."

I feel very strongly that our Constitution, adopted by the sovereign people of this great land of ours, has given the United States a government that has guaranteed human liberties and provided economic comforts and blessings found nowhere else in this world, and therefore should not be changed unless absolutely necessary.

In order that our liberties and blessings shall not be eroded away by a creeping tendency toward centralized world government, every American must be alerted to the dangers that lie in the treaty-making power. Our forefathers, fully aware that changes in the economic situations and the political philosophies of the world might require changes in this great document, provided, with foresight and wisdom, a mode of amendment in article V. This mode of change I propose to invoke. While the idea of raising the level of basic freedoms and rights for all peoples is highly commendable and concurred in by me, I do oppose any course of action through the exercise of the treaty-making power which might effectuate a substantial or even insignificant lowering of our liberties and blessings ostensibly in order to raise those of the peoples of the world. Actually, such a lifting of other peoples must come from within their own borders, and not at the expense of deterioration of our freedoms.

The International Covenant on Human Rights, as revised at the seventh session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, April-May 1951, contains many provisions which might affect certain of our basic rights by imposing obligations and restraints upon the relationships existing between our separate States and their citizens.

The medical profession especially may be confronted with its socialization under article 25, which reads:

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest standard of health obtainable. With a view to implementing and safeguarding this right each State party hereto undertakes to provide legislative measures to promote and protect health and, in particular:

- (i) to reduce infant mortality and provide for healthy development of the child;
- (ii) to improve nutrition, housing, sanitation, recreation, economic and working conditions, and other aspects of environmental hygiene;
- (iii) to control epidemic, endemic, and other diseases;
- (iv) to provide conditions which would assure the right of all to medical service and medical attention in the event of sickness.

Our country as a whole may be confronted with socialization under articles 19 through 24, which read:

### ARTICLE 19

The States parties to the present covenant—

1. Bearing in mind the link between the rights and liberties recognized and defined above, and the economic, social, and cultural rights proclaimed in the universal declaration of human rights;

2. Resolved to combat the scourges, such as famine, disease, poverty, the feeling of insecurity, and ignorance, which take toll of or degrade men, and prevent the free development of their personality;

3. Resolved to strive to insure that every human being shall obtain the food, clothing,

shelter, essential for his livelihood and well-being, and shall achieve an adequate standard of living and a continuous improvement of his living material and spiritual conditions;

4. Undertake to take steps, individually and through international cooperation, to the maximum of their available resources with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in this part of the present covenant.

#### ARTICLE 20

Work being the basis of all human endeavor, the States parties to the covenant recognize the right to work, that is to say, the fundamental right of everyone to the opportunity, if he so desires, to gain his living by work which he freely accepts.

#### ARTICLE 21

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to just and favorable conditions of work, including—

- (a) Safe and healthy working conditions;
- (b) Minimum remuneration which provides all workers:
  - (i) With fair wages and equal pay for equal work, and
  - (ii) A decent living for themselves and their families; and
  - (c) Reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

#### ARTICLE 22

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to social security.

#### ARTICLE 23

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to adequate housing.

#### ARTICLE 24

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living and the continuous improvement of living conditions.

The States and local subdivisions may find education transferred to the Federal Government under article 28 which reads:

#### ARTICLE 28

The States parties to the covenant recognize:

- 1. The right of everyone to education.
- 2. That education facilities shall be accessible to all in accordance with the principle of nondiscrimination enunciated in paragraph 1 of article 1 of this covenant.
- 3. That primary education shall be compulsory and available free to all.

4. That secondary education, in its different forms, including technical and professional secondary education shall be generally available and shall be made progressively free.

5. That higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit and shall be made progressively free.

6. That fundamental education for these persons who have not received or completed the whole period of their primary education shall be encouraged as far as possible.

7. That education shall encourage the full development of the human personality, the strengthening of respect for human rights, and fundamental freedoms and the suppression of all incitement to racial and other hatred. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial, ethnic, or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society.

8. The obligations of States to establish a system of free and compulsory primary education shall not be deemed incompatible with the liberty of parents to choose for their children schools other than those established by the State which conform to minimum standards laid down by the State.

9. In the exercise of any functions which the State assumes in the field of education, it shall have respect for the liberty of parents to insure the religious education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

The legal and all other professions may not be aware of the implications of article VIII, paragraph 2 of Senate Executive Report, 82d Congress, the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States and Israel which states:

- 2. Nationals of either party shall not be barred from practicing the professions within the territories of the other party merely by reason of their alienage; but they shall be permitted to engage in professional activities therein upon compliance with the requirements regarding qualifications, residence, and competence that are applicable to nationals of such other party.

Let us consider what this provision can do with respect to State requirements for admission to the bar and practice before local courts of the United States. A cursory examination of the publication of the West Publishing Co. entitled "Rules for Admission to the Bar (1951)" indicates that of 53 jurisdictions, 41 States, 2 Territories, 2 possessions, and the District of Columbia have requirements in one form or another relating to citizenship. Only a prolonged study would demonstrate how many more professions could be invaded through the invocation of this provision.

#### III

Fully recognizing the arguments that these possibilities may never develop, nevertheless, I feel there is an urgent need for a constitutional amendment to clarify the situation. I, therefore, have introduced House Joint Resolution 25 which, I believe, will resolve doubts covering these problems.

It was introduced the first day of the session of this Congress. That amendment makes provisions as follows:

##### Section 1 reads:

No treaty or Executive agreement shall be made respecting the rights of citizens of the United States protected by this Constitution, or abridging, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Its broad terms, not only prohibit treaties which conflict with constitutional rights, or treaties which conflict with enumerated constitutional rights, but they also prohibit treaties respecting the rights of the citizens protected by the Constitution or treaties which might abridge or prohibit the free exercise of such rights.

The amendment proposed by House Joint Resolution 25 also provides that any treaty which affects the internal economy and workings of the United States, shall not have the effect of superseding the Constitution of the United States and domestic laws, unless and until such a treaty has been implemented by congressional action.

My amendment, however, does not conflict with the well-established doctrine of the exclusiveness of control of foreign relations by the Federal Government as expressed in article IX of the Articles of Confederation: "The United States in Congress assembled, shall have the sole and exclusive right

and power of sending and receiving ambassadors—entering into treaties and alliances," nor as expressed in article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States, *supra*.

It merely prevents the exercise of the treaty-making power in such a manner as to abridge or to defeat those rights emanating from the Constitution of the United States that we Americans have considered for more than 165 years to be inherent, natural, and unchangeable.

Section 2 of my resolution reads:

No treaty or executive agreement shall vest in any international organization or in any foreign power any of the legislative, executive, or judicial powers vested by this Constitution in the Congress, the President, and in the courts of the United States, respectively.

It must seem unnecessary to most people to incorporate into the Constitution a provision of this nature. It must seem inconceivable to most people that there is danger of the President negotiating and the Senate ratifying a treaty which would delegate or transfer these powers to an international or foreign power. That the possibility is not too far-fetched is evident from the testimony before our congressional committees on certain proposals pending in the United Nations. For example, Alfred J. Schweiß, of Seattle, chairman of the American Bar Association committee having the Genocide Convention before it for study, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee that—

The ultimate objective of proponents of the Genocide Convention is to submit American citizens to trial by an international court on account of having, for example, inflicted mental harm on a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group.

For another example, George A. Finch, of Washington, member of the committee on peace and law through the United Nations of the American Bar Association and editor in chief of the American Journal of International Law, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee in January 1950 on intent to destroy and mental harm as follows:

Can it be successfully denied that segregation laws are susceptible of being denounced as causing mental harm to all members of a group against which such laws discriminate? Minority groups in this country are vigorously seeking to have such discrimination abolished by Federal legislation. Can there be any reasonable doubt that if Congress fails to enact the civil rights laws now being urged upon it and if this convention is ratified as submitted, members of the affected groups will be in a position to seek legal relief on the ground that this so-called Genocide Convention has superseded all obnoxious State legislation?

Section 3 of my resolution reads:

No treaty or executive agreement shall alter or abridge the laws of the United States or the Constitution or laws of the several States unless, and then only to the extent that, Congress shall so provide by act or joint resolution.

I did not include in this section that additional clause, found in many of the proposed constitutional amendments, which places an additional control on congressional implementing legislation by specifically limiting its exercise to the

constitutionally delegated powers of Congress.

Nowhere in the published debates of the Constitutional Convention do I find any proposal that the treaty-making power of the Federal Government shall be held within the delegated powers of Congress in the domestic field, nor do I find in these debates any suggestion that needed implementing legislation to a treaty should be limited to the orbit of specifically delegated powers. I assume, as it is evident from the debates of the Constitutional Convention that our forefathers assumed, that the Federal Government must possess in the international field as great a right to negotiate and carry out international agreements as is possessed by any other members of the family of nations.

This section would not override the rationale of the opinion in *Missouri v. Holland* ((1924) 252 U. S. 416), to the effect that the Congress may enact constitutional legislation on the basis of a treaty which would not be possible were it not for the treaty. I feel that to circumscribe the treaty-making power to the extent that it would interfere unnecessarily with the conduct of our foreign affairs is not proper. I believe that it should be possible to supersede State laws or municipal regulation by a treaty if the following actions pertaining to the treaty have been previously taken: First, negotiation by the President; second, ratification by the Senate; and, third, implementation by the Congress. My proposed amendment prevents treaty provisions from being self-executing in the domestic legislative field, that is, becoming effective as internal law contrary to State constitutional provisions and laws. Under my amendment a treaty will be an international agreement only and will not affect domestic internal laws unless and until Congress has passed implementing legislation. This places us in the same position as that now prevailing in most other countries of the world.

My amendment also limits the authority of the Executive with respect to executive agreements. It does not abolish executive agreements but provides that any executive agreement entered into by a President shall expire 1 year after he leaves office, subject to provision that it can be renewed by his successor in office.

Section 4 of my resolution reads:

Executive agreements shall not be made in lieu of treaties.

Executive agreements shall, if not sooner terminated, expire automatically 1 year after the end of the term of office for which the President making the agreement shall have been elected, but the Congress may, at the request of any President, extend for the duration of the term of such President the life of any such agreement made or extended during the next preceding President's term.

The President shall publish all executive agreements except that those which in his judgment require secrecy shall be submitted to appropriate committees of the Congress in lieu of publication.

The first paragraph of this section is predicated upon the need to arrest the recently developed practice of bypassing the Senate with the substitution of an executive agreement for a treaty. As indicative of this trend I quote the state-

ment of Mr. Vermont Hatch, New York City, member of the committee on peace and law through the United Nations of the American Bar Association, in the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 130, 82d Congress, 2d session, 1952:

The extent to which the scale between the executive agreements and treaties has shifted is mighty interesting. Mr. Borchard's article in 54 Yale Law Journal gives you an account year by year, and Mr. McClure in his book does, too. Mr. McClure points out that during the first 50 years of government under the Constitution the President is known to have entered into some 27 international acts without invoking the consent of the Senate, while 60 became law as treaties. In the second half-century there were 238 executive agreements and 215 treaties. Now it has gone the other way, and for the third similar period there were 917 executive agreements and only 524 treaties, so you can see exactly what has happened (p. 59).

Paragraph 2 of this section would limit, by a constitutional restriction, the effective operation of executive agreements by providing for automatic expiration 1 year after the elective term of the President who made the agreement. It serves notice on foreign nations that executive agreements, which in effect are personal undertakings of the President, will not be binding except for 1 year after his term.

Paragraph 3 of this section makes publication of executive agreements mandatory, except those requiring secrecy, in which instances they would be submitted to appropriate committees of the Congress.

#### IV

Knowing the extent of the treaty-making power and the limitations which may be imposed by treaties on the internal laws of the United States, I feel it is proper at this time to submit my proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States to the people of this Nation in whom sovereignty exists.

I do feel it very desirable that the questions raised by this amendment, which are the direct result of the current situation, should be carefully thought out and considered by the American people. This is not a passing phase of human history. The whole world is bound together as never before, and our citizens should focus their attention upon the problems raised by the shrinking world. For a good many generations ahead, there is no likely diminution of these problems. We must face this perplexing and difficult issue, and decide as a people what our course will be.

I have every confidence that Americans, if given the facts, will make the correct and righteous decision.

#### CAPT. HYMAN GEORGE RICKOVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate the question of confirmation of appointments for admiral which were made in accordance with the recommendations of recently

convened naval selection boards. The recommendations of one of the selection boards is of particular importance. If those recommended for rear admiral by a naval selection board which met on July 8, 1952, are approved, it will mark the end of the distinguished career of a fine naval officer, Capt. Hyman G. Rickover. Under the law, having served for 30 years and having been passed over by two selection boards, Rickover will be compelled to retire on June 30, 1953, at age 52. With his retirement will come the end, too, of a thrilling saga of a man's dedication and devotion to a dream—a dream of controlling the new force which had devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a dream of harnessing the atom for the United States Navy.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HELLER. I am glad to hear that the able and learned gentleman from Illinois is again addressing the House on the Captain Rickover case. May I at this time record my support of the gentleman's position and commend him for the fight he is making for fair play and justice for Captain Rickover. The good people of Illinois can well be proud of the services being rendered the Nation by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. The dream will not have been fulfilled when he retires, but as a result of his doggedness and determination we stand on the threshold of reality. Today we are building two nuclear-powered submarines, a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier and are contemplating a United States Navy completely atom powered within the next 10 or 15 years. It is to be deplored that Captain Rickover must be compelled to leave the Navy before his work is finished. It would have been infinitely better for the Navy, for the Nation, for all concerned, if he could have been promoted to rear admiral so that he could have completed his task before retiring.

In my speech to the Congress on February 12, I stated that I believed a flagrant injustice had been done to a deserving naval officer. I really believe he was wronged, but if that were all that was involved in the Rickover case, I would not again be taking the floor. But in my opinion, the Rickover case involves much more than that. In addition to the possibility of serious error having been committed by passing him over, there is raised also the question whether his retirement will jeopardize prompt completion of the atomic submarine project, and secondly whether the selection board processes of promotion should be reviewed by the Congress to provide greater assurance of fair treatment to officers facing promotion.

Just how vital to the United States is the atomic submarine project? Is it necessary that Captain Rickover stay on or can any replacement for him in accordance with usual Navy routine carry on the work as well as he has done?

Vice Adm. Charles A. Lockwood thinks the project is quite important. In an article written for the Saturday Evening Post for July 22, 1950, which is entitled

"We're Betting Our Shirts on the Atomic Submarine," he said:

Thank God, we do have the answer to the snorkel submarine, the boat which has transformed submersible concepts and designs, and upon which Russia is relying to build the greatest underwater fleet in the world and thus gain control of the seas.

The answer to the Kremlin threat is the atomic-powered submarine presented so dramatically to Congress by Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, when he sought the necessary appropriation for its construction. The present cost of a standard fleet-type submarine is \$10 million. At a cost of \$40 million, which will include the building of the initial atomic pile and the actual construction of the vessel, in 3 years the United States—we hope—will be the first nation to possess the atom submarine, and so lay the foundation for a fleet which will outrun, outfight, and outmaneuver the most advanced snorkel types that Russia is building behind the curtain or is likely to build. \* \* \* I repeat that we have the answer to the Russian snorkel in the atom submarine, and that we shall possess a weapon that might well decide the next war. It certainly will decide any naval war. \* \* \*

The measureless power that was unleashed to devastate Hiroshima and Nagasaki will be harnessed for propulsion purposes and will produce the first true submarine—a vessel of high speed, unlimited range, and operational ability, scorning the present snorkel for air intake, and using the more effective weapons constantly being perfected, the deadliest underwater killer ever conceived.

One gathers the impression that Admiral Lockwood is convinced that the atomic-submarine project is entitled to top priority among all the projects in the Navy, and rightly so. It is an undertaking vital to the safety and welfare of our Nation. The admiral continues:

The pity of it is that we didn't start earlier on the project, so that at the present point in history the Russian challenge would be less overpoweringly urgent. The Navy Department and several able scientists, part of our wartime group of naval assistants, had plans for just such a boat back in 1946, but failed to get the green light from the higher echelons. \* \* \*

Although the efforts of the Navy Department to strengthen our national defense by production of this invincible submarine were retarded for years, the Bureau of Ships, the National Research Council, and the Office of Naval Research were not idle. Plans for this newest power plant were developed, and intensive study was initiated in naval, industrial, and university laboratories to solve the difficult engineering problems presented by this radically new prime mover.

Thus, even though we are years late in realizing the original conception, the project has a good technical head start. For this, the Nation should be deeply grateful to the submariners, engineers, and scientists who never lost hope, but stood by their guns.

It is interesting to note that the name of Captain Rickover is not mentioned as having had any part in the conception and development of the atomic submarine. Admiral Lockwood gives credit to Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane and to Capt. A. G. Mumma as being the initiators of the project, but not to Rickover. One finds a similar omission in reading the article by Adm. Homer N. Wallin entitled "America's New Dreadful Weapon," which appeared in *Collier's* for December 20, 1952. Admiral Wallin gives no credit to any single individual, although

he must have remembered the citation with which Secretary of the Navy Kimball had bestowed a gold star on Captain Rickover in lieu of a second Legion of Merit a few months before the article was published, which read as follows:

Captain Rickover more than any other individual is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear sub program. He has held tenaciously to a single important goal through discouraging frustration and opposition. His efforts have led to the laying of the keel of the world's first nuclear-powered submarine well in advance of his original schedule.

Secretary Kimball added the statement:

Rickover has accomplished the most important piece of development in the history of the Navy.

One wonders whether the apparent oversight of the admirals in their articles was purposeful. In contrast to their viewpoint is the one appearing in the recently published book by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, entitled "The New Force," which the author describes as a history of atoms and people. On page 145 the author says:

At the time that the switch-over occurred in the power program, I was working for the Research and Development Board in the Pentagon and I took pains to explore the military priority for an atomic submarine. I discovered that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had assigned a priority to the nuclear propulsion of undersea craft but upon further inquiry this turned out to be a desirable military objective rather than an urgent military necessity. The Navy Department, at the time, was not sold upon the atomic submarine and its enthusiasm for the project was largely centered upon a single naval officer, Capt. H. G. Rickover. More than any one person, civilian or military, Captain Rickover was responsible for getting the Navy interested in A-power.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman, of course, knows I have served since its creation on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In June of last summer I had the privilege of being assigned by the late Senator Brien McMahon, chairman of that committee, to represent the Congress at the laying of the keel of the first atomic submarine, at Groton, Conn. I well recall the high tribute paid by the Secretary of the Navy and by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to the work and the effort on the part of Captain Rickover in connection with this project.

In line with what the gentleman has been stating in his remarks, may I read just one paragraph of the tribute the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Gordon Dean, paid to Captain Rickover at that time:

There are many people who have played a role in the events which have led to this ceremony, but if one were to be singled out for special notice, such an honor should go to Capt. H. G. Rickover, whose talents we share with the Bureau of Ships, and whose energy, drive, and technical competence have played such a large part in making this project possible.

Those words were in line with the statements of other speakers on that oc-

casion. Every one of them paid tribute to Captain Rickover as a man who babied, fostered, and brought this project along.

May I say that our own Committee on Atomic Energy put much of the drive behind the military to go forward with this project. The gentleman has stated that it was a sort of project the military endorsed, but did not put any expeditious effort behind. Our committee put much of the effort behind that project, and not until Captain Rickover came into the program were we getting the results that we as a committee desired.

I think the gentleman is doing a great service to the country in bringing the Captain Rickover case to the attention of the people of the country.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. May I say that I think the gentleman deserves great credit for the part he has played as a member not only of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy but of the Committee on Armed Services of the House in making sure that the military might of this Nation would be kept in the forefront of the nations of the world, that it would be modern, streamlined, and prepared for any eventuality. The gentleman is to be commended also for having recognized the talents of Captain Rickover and helped in his drive for the atomic submarine.

In the next chapter the author tells the story of Rickover's drive for the atomic submarine as follows:

The foregoing (material) should suffice to indicate some of the aspects of producing atomic power in a nuclear engine and to point out the unique problems associated with the latter. We are by now equipped with sufficient technical facts about atomic engines to proceed to discuss the propulsion unit which the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy Department are collaborating on and which promises to be the world's first mobile atomic powerplant.

In tracing back through the records, I find that the first clear-cut recognition of the possibility of using atomic power in submarines is contained in a report to President Roosevelt. Dated November 1, 1939, this report states: "If the chain reaction could be controlled so as to proceed gradually, it might conceivably be used as a continuous source of power in submarines, thus avoiding the use of large batteries for underwater power." Although this is the first published record I could find, I know from my work with the Navy that the Naval Research Laboratory had become interested in nuclear power in the spring of 1939 and had undertaken preliminary experiments in the field. Thereafter the Navy was almost completely frozen out of the atomic project so that there was nothing done and no interest was manifest in atomic propulsion until the end of the war.

One might have expected that after V-J Day the Navy would have moved into the atomic power field, for it is probably the world's largest consumer of premium fuels. Furthermore, it has constantly searched for new methods of propelling undersea craft, looking for fuels which would not consume precious oxygen. Moreover, the Navy is mindful of the need to do away with the dead weight of fuel storage which is such a limiting factor in marine design. And, of course, it is always on the lookout for new engines to drive ships through the seas at a faster clip. Despite all of these facts, the Navy in 1945 and for at least 3 years to follow seemed blind to the potentialities of atomic power.

There was one man in the Navy who did see the use for A-power. This was a slightly built but hard-bitten officer named Capt. Hyman G. Rickover. Not only did he see his final objective clearly but he proceeded resolutely toward getting A-power for submarines, possessed of all the zeal and energy of a religious convert. I remember first running across Captain Rickover just after the end of the war when he visited our Chicago laboratory. At that time I had not come into contact with many naval officers but I realized immediately that Rickover was something of a phenomenon. He did not hesitate to speak his mind or to criticize anything—the latter characteristic was scarcely one which later endeared him to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Captain Rickover realized that the post-war era found the Navy in a very confused state of mind and that there was no interest in atomic propulsion. So, very adroitly, he did not immediately attempt to sell the big brass on this new venture; rather he gathered around himself a group of young lieutenants and proceeded to make them sweat it out at Oak Ridge, learning all the wrinkles in this new technology. There were two things which he knew were needed to pry open the door for the Navy; one was technical knowledge about atomic energy and the other was personal acquaintance with atomic scientists. It is not fair to say that Rickover and his cohorts infiltrated into the atomic energy project, for this implies both stealth and a kid-glove approach; it is more appropriate to say that the Navy secured a beachhead in the atomic field.

During the establishment of the beachhead the Atomic Energy Commission took over control of all atomic work. The perilously small naval task force clung to its position, anticipating trouble but none developed. With his landing force secure, Captain Rickover launched the second phase of his campaign. He badgered the Navy to enlist the support of the big guns in Washington, these being the admirals on Constitution Avenue. Before the naval position could be enlarged he realized that strong demands had to be made upon the AEC. In other words the Navy had to apply the pressure to the new agency in order to speed up work on naval reactors. About this time I had moved from Chicago to Washington and was working in the Pentagon as scientific adviser to the War Department and in the course of time I met Captain Rickover frequently.

One meeting I shall never forget. I dropped by Rickover's office across the street from the AEC headquarters. Greeting me with a wry smile the Captain shoved a manila folder across his desk at me. I glanced at the title on the cover, "Quarterly Progress Report on Atomic Propulsion," and flipped it open. Inside there was a single blank piece of paper. "We didn't do a damned thing," he said and added some choice comments about the way in which the project was going. The latter didn't surprise me but I was intrigued with the zero-word report which Rickover had prepared for his superior, Vice Admiral Mills, then chief of the Bureau of Ships. This was but one of the ways in which he persuaded Admiral Mills to do something about getting an atomic submarine for the Navy.

There was another meeting that is equally vivid to me. This one was a much larger and more formal affair—the annual meeting of the Symposium on Undersea Warfare, held in the auditorium of the Interior Department. There were hundreds of officers and civilians present and on the stage were Admiral Mills and an AEC commissioner, Admiral Strauss, who was presiding. Reading a prepared speech, Admiral Mills fired broadside after broadside at the Atomic Energy Commission for its failure to develop atomic power, especially for the Navy. At one point in his speech the towering admiral turned to Admiral Strauss and interpolated: "Mind

you, the Navy isn't griping, but we do want atomic power." Admiral Strauss must have wandered back to his AEC office in a daze for he had had no advance warning of the attack.

The Navy had used its big guns for the first time and before the reverberations had ceased it was clear that the second phase of Rickover's campaign was accomplished. Any kid gloves which the captain may have possessed were put aside in favor of a bare-knuckles approach to nuclear propulsion. Even those who held no love for Captain Rickover, and these included many officers, had to admit that he had secured his beachhead and had also succeeded in swinging top strategy around to support a major offensive.

Up to the spring of 1948 Captain Rickover had been practically the only driving force for nuclear propulsion. What he had accomplished in 3 years of dogged persistence he had done almost singlehanded. After Admiral Mills' slam-bang speech the situation changed. The Committee on Undersea Warfare gave support to the atomic propulsion program and the Joint Chiefs of Staff officially endorsed the military objective in developing the new type submarine. Real pressure was now brought to bear upon the AEC. Lacking a real program of its own and being unable to cope with the pressure, the atomic agency formulated the reactor program which was described in the previous chapter.

These facts as I have stated them constitute to the best of my knowledge the real history of how the reactor program in the United States was shaped and how the Navy made its entry into the A-power field. Somewhere within the AEC headquarters there is probably an official history of these same developments and they probably disagree sharply with my account. Too often official histories are tidy and logical accounts of events which are neither logical nor complementary. The facts as I have presented them are those of an eyewitness, not an historian.

This is the story as told by an eyewitness, one who should know what happened. When one considers, too, the statement by Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, Director of Reactor Research for the Atomic Energy Commission:

It is an understatement when I say that more than any other single individual in the entire nuclear submarine program, Captain Rickover is responsible for the present rapid development of the project.

When one remembers the words of the late Senator Brien McMahon, who was chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

In all seriousness, I think the whole country as well as the Navy owes a debt to Rickover—I think he is proving that the impossible in the atomic field cannot only be done but done quickly and by economic means.

When one recalls the tribute paid by Gordon Dean, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, at the ceremony at which the keel for the first atomic-powered submarine was laid on June 14, 1952, when he said:

There are many men who have played a role in events which have led to this ceremony but if one were to be singled out for special notice, such an honor should go to Capt. H. G. Rickover whose talents we share with the Bureau of Ships and whose energy, drive and technical competence have played such a large part in making this project possible.

When one is reminded of what Secretary Kimball told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on September 22, 1951, that—

This Westinghouse bunch is a very capable organization with this very intricate manufacturing thing for this titanium they have to make, and they got this machinery in 12 months; and I said how did they get it in; and they said, "Rickover made us get it in."

When one considers all of these encomiums from people who were intimately associated with the A-sub project, one wonders even more at the admirals' oversight in not having given some acknowledgment to Rickover's accomplishments. One wonders, too, about the nine admirals who sat on the selection board which passed over Rickover for the second time. They knew that their action would compel his retirement from the Navy long before his work on the first naval atomic vessel project was completed.

Why was Rickover persona non grata to the admirals, especially since according to the Bureau of Naval Personnel he had not received an unsatisfactory or unfavorable-fitness report?

Perhaps it is because Rickover is an individualist and the Navy has no use for individualists. The Navy demands organizational achievements and not individual achievements. In the course of the design, development and construction of any naval vessel, the project may have as many as a dozen different directors at various officer echelons. In the past, as many as two or three Chiefs of the Bureau of Ships have been connected with one project. The Navy officer-rotational program is such that after about 3 years in a job a man moves on. Another steps in to fill his shoes, inheriting both the strengths and the frailties of his predecessor. Time goes on. Eventually out of the system comes a finished product. The system gets the credit for the achievement—not the people, for none of them have really been around long enough to make a lasting impression on the developments.

Perhaps this is what motivated the selection board's action, for we can only speculate. Although Rickover had been in his particular assignment for an unusually long time, the selection board may have been convinced that the amazing results that were obtained in so short a period of time came out of the system; that there were people who were put in the job and that the system, independent of the man, produced the results. If this were the case, all that could be said was that Rickover was lucky to be assigned to the spot, and that his mere presence in the job was not and is not sufficient reason or justification to make him an admiral.

But actually that is not what occurred. The facts show that the success story of the atomic project is one almost entirely of individual achievement—the vision and devotion of a single man. The glowing tributes which Rickover has received attest this, and if further verification is desired, it can be obtained from the people who know—the people working in the program. I thought I should talk to some of them and I did. I learned a great deal about Captain Rickover—not everything perhaps, but enough to convince me that he is a most unusual person, operating in a most unusual way, who has achieved fabulous results.

I learned that Rickover undertook almost on his own to achieve atomic propulsion for the Navy; that almost on his own he undertook and set out to get the research, the development and manufacturing facilities, the trained personnel, the appropriations, and interest it needed. In order to place himself in a position to carry on operations effectively, he obtained dual responsibilities in both the AEC and the Navy. He could then represent both organizations, eliminating liaison problems and the accompanying red tape. Not only did he obtain this for himself, but for his entire organization. This unique setup, which he personally masterminded and implemented, is an administrative gem which has saved time and money. It was a major instrument in the effectiveness of his future operations.

This done, Rickover's next step involved people. He knew what the Navy sometimes fails to recognize—that all great things come out of people, not systems. There had to be good people, who were well trained; people who could think clearly, have mature judgment, accept responsibility. His own personnel he carefully screened for these characteristics. He personally urged the companies with which he did business to spend more time on personnel; to hire better people; to continually delve down into their organizations to find younger people who could accept more responsibility; to recognize and allow engineers to operate with fuller authority and consequently more effectiveness. Companies with which he does business will readily admit that it was Rickover's urging and persistence that forced them to equip themselves to do a faster, better, more competent job. He sets a tremendous example of hard work himself—12 to 14 hours a day, 6 or 7 days a week. He asks no loyalty to himself. He demands devotion only to the job.

Rickover is a fanatic on training. He was the major influence in getting the Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology set up. He arranged for a course in nuclear engineering to be set up at MIT to train officers. He sent people away to school for special training over the objections of subordinates who were already strained for personnel. These same objectors now admit that without this training people within their organization could not carry on the job today.

The on-the-job training is continual and incessant. Rickover sets extremely high standards and then trains his people to meet them. His training has paid off. Today, due to his efforts, there are now hundreds who have received training in this work. Typical of Rickover's vision and foresight was the early training of the crew for the first submarine. Long before the design of the engine was completed he made arrangements for the Navy to assign a small group of officers and enlisted men to the project to insure that fully qualified people would be available for the ship.

The depth, the entire scope of the program came out of Rickover. As recently as 1947, atomic science and engineering were mysteries to the industry of this country. Such work was carried on in the national laboratories—Ar-

gonne, Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and so forth—in an atmosphere designed to match universities. There existed a belief in both the laboratories and industry that these matters were too esoteric for industry, that the problems of secrecy were too complex for the industrial organization, that the profit motive necessary to lure industry was lacking.

But Rickover believed that nuclear power could not be realized without the help of industry; that the newborn discipline of atomic energy could not be engineered by the scientists who had devised it; that it had to be simplified and streamlined to the point that engineers could understand it and make it work.

He had to sell industry on investing their most talented and most promising people in this new and apparently profitless field. He had to sell scientists on turning over the responsibility for their delicately nurtured brain child to the crude, rough hands of industry. These things he believed and these things he accomplished.

It was Rickover who established the design philosophy for the power plant and then initiated the action to see that it was carried out. It was he who decided the plant would not be built as a laboratory model to prove a principle, but built to go into a ship. It would not be spread out as a test facility but would be built as an engine which could go to war—rugged, reliable, and shock proof, designed to go in a submarine and meet submarine requirements. So the program was established to build the land-based engine into a section of a submarine hull. Rickover insisted that the shipboard problems had to be faced in the present, not the future. This was the hard way but the short way. This was the gamble but it paid off. This was all done over the objections of many leading engineers and scientists in the business. They now all admit that the prospects of a nuclear-powered submarine in 1954 would not even be realized if Rickover had not laid out the way.

Not only did Rickover set the scope, but he set the time scale as well. He wanted a submarine in 1954. The engineers and physicists told him it could not be done. He would not listen. They pointed out all the design, development, research, and manufacturing problems. He would not listen. Laboratories, test facilities—all of these were nonexistent. Rickover said he would get these for them and he did. They soon found out that he was not fooling. He was all business. So they proceeded to do the things they said could not be done and they did it within the time scale he set up. His pushing and unreasonableness were soon felt by every welder, laboratory technician, and engineer. This man could be pleased but never satisfied.

Training, scope of program, time scale—these are functions that could come out of any administration. But people in the program say this was only a small part of Rickover's operations. He traveled frequently, often times spending every day in his office and every night in some plant away from Washington. He was not content with reading reports, or receiving glowing accounts of progress from company officials. He

went out into the plants, watched equipment on test, picked out design soft spots and continually brought his naval engineering experience to bear on equipment designs. Where he saw danger in depending on one source of supply, he pushed parallel efforts. He was never satisfied with satisfactory performance. He was always seeking excellence. He would personally check to satisfy himself that the equipment could be maintained by sailors and did not require doctors of philosophy to nurse it. The design and performance standards were Rickover's. His influence was felt right down to the drawing boards where people were working on pumps, boilers, control equipment, and other items too numerous to mention.

When the development of industrial zirconium bogged down, he stepped in and personally took charge. He named himself "Mr. Zirconium" and personally directed the whole zirconium program for over a year. As a result of Rickover's pushing and guidance, zirconium has gone through the same evolution in 3 years that aluminum went through in 50 years. His methods have compressed 20 years of engineering into 5.

Rickover has left his imprint on every engineer scientist and technician in the atomic sub program. Every component has felt the weight of his philosophy and experience.

Are his methods the usual Navy way of doing things? Unquestionably not. Does this mean that his methods are inferior to the usual Navy way? Unquestionably not. What it does mean apparently, is that he cannot continue to do what he has done and stay in the good graces of the Navy.

This is the story in part of Rickover's accomplishments. The job is not complete and will not be finished in June. What will happen to the project when Rickover leaves?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Some days ago I read a press release about the case of Captain Rickover. In that story I believe it gave his age as 52. Are we to understand that when the Selection Board has passed a man over a second time that they will not again consider his case for promotion, and he might just as well resign and for that reason he is resigning?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. The retirement age is 62, is it?

Mr. YATES. No. Under the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, it is provided that when an officer is in a promotion zone and is passed over by two succeeding Selection Boards for promotion, that is, he is not selected by the Board for promotion and he has a certain number of years of service—in Rickover's case, being a captain, the number is 30 years—having been passed over twice, with the appropriate number of years in service, the officer is compelled to retire when his term of service is up. I consider the practice to be most wasteful of valuable manpower, and I certainly think that the law should be changed. There is another case I remember very well of a

man who was in the Air Force, and who retired at the age of 47. It was Lieutenant General Quesada, who until his retirement, was the head of the bomber command of the Air Force. I do not know whether the laws pertaining to the Air Force are similar to those of the Navy or whether his retirement was mandatory. I do know that in the case of the Navy, Rickover's retirement is mandatory. He can retire and the Navy can call him back, provided he wants to come back. I discuss later in my address, however, that this will not serve to expedite completion of the atomic vessel project.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for the information and commend him on his efforts in behalf of the captain.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1953, Secretary of the Navy Kimball held a press conference at which the following exchange of questions and answers took place:

The PRESS. You feel the Navy has enough men of Rickover's caliber so they can afford to retire them—

Secretary KIMBALL. You never have enough men of enough caliber, but we have got a lot of very capable people in our technical branches. I think the strength of the Navy—really, the great strength of the Navy—is our special-duty officers. We have them to a greater extent than either of the other services.

The PRESS. You have a man that can take over in Rickover's job, then?

Secretary KIMBALL. Yes.

The PRESS. Who is he?

Secretary KIMBALL. I could name you two or three, but I wouldn't care to start a name-calling thing. I am hoping they will keep Captain Rickover on that job because he has done a fine job on it.

The PRESS. You wanted him promoted to admiral; is that it?

Secretary KIMBALL. Surely, but I was not willing to insist that the board do it.

The Secretary said that he could name two or three people who could take Rickover's place, but it is significant that he wound up by saying that he hoped Captain Rickover would be kept on the job because he has done such a fine job.

Nobody knows what will happen when Rickover leaves. There will be a replacement; there always is. But who it will be is unknown at this time. That is why I believe it is so desperately important that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate find out before it acts on confirmation of those recommended for admirals who will be placed in command of the atomic-vessel project. There is no naval officer in the project itself who could replace Rickover. In the normal course of events the Navy will bring an officer in from another activity who knows nothing about the project, because rotation of duty is the Navy way, even among EDO officers, and the project must inevitably suffer.

The Navy will put another captain on the project, although one would think that with the whole fleet moving onto an atom-powered basis in 10 or 15 years, the activity is important enough to be subject to the command of an admiral. The Air Force project which seeks the application of nuclear power to aircraft is under the command of a general.

While it may not "go to hell in a hand-basket" as one reporter stated would

happen, we cannot overlook the statement of the Atomic Energy Commission which appeared in the Washington Post on February 18, 1953, that—

If Rickover is forced to resign from the Navy on retirement schedules, these things probably will happen: (a) Morale of the AEC Naval Reactors Branch will be affected; (b) some of Rickover's staff will leave; and, (c) there will be a time lag that usually occurs when there is a change in a key post.

The extent to which these factors occur will determine the promptness and success of completion of the A-sub project. These would not have been sources for concern had Rickover been recommended for promotion.

Amazingly enough, the admirals who decided that Rickover should not be promoted to flag rank status, have recognized how important his services are to the atomic submarine project. They are trying to pull him back into the Navy through the back door. On February 13, 1953, an article appeared in the New York Times which stated that the Navy is "both asking and urging" Capt. Hyman G. Rickover to stay on his job of directing the building of the world's first atomic-powered submarine. Rear Admiral Wallin of the Bureau of Ships, who should know more than anyone else of the importance of Rickover's work, is quoted as saying that the Navy was "asking and urging the scientist to stay on the job. If he agrees," the article goes on, "he presumably would go through the formality of retirement and then be recalled to active duty."

Mr. Speaker, if this matter were not so serious, it would be laughable. To my mind this offer is the usual smoke screen laid down by the admirals as they beat a hasty retreat from an obvious and colossal blunder. In one breath they say that Rickover does not merit promotion and we can get along very well without his services. In the next breath, they say that his talents are so vital to the success of the atomic project that we urge him to retire and come back on active duty.

Let us examine that proposition for a moment. Can Rickover do as good a job as a retired naval captain recalled to active duty as he has done up to now? Can he have any influence, let alone personal pride with his superior officers who until recently were his junior in rank? Will he have the same prestige with junior officers in the Navy or with industry when they know that he has been passed over twice? Will the atomic project receive a greater setback by having a passed-over captain at its head or a new commanding officer who is merely a figurehead? Certainly, a captain who has been retired and recalled does not have the same power to influence decisions as one who still retains the possibility of becoming an admiral.

In his press conference of January 15, Secretary Kimball was asked the question:

With your knowledge of the Navy, what is your opinion of how well a twice passed-over captain can operate in the Navy? How much respect and command do you think they can—

At this point Secretary Kimball broke in with his reply:

In the case of Rickover—in the case of any of them that are passed over twice—we

know a lot of people in there who have been passed over twice that are extremely capable people, extremely capable people. I know a dozen of them that I am very fond of and have a very high respect for their technical ability and I have tried and gotten many of them placed in industry.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a significant answer. In effect, Secretary Kimball acknowledges that a passed-over captain does not have the prestige necessary to remain on active duty in the Navy for a job such as running the atomic vessel project. The Secretary infers that moving into private industry is much better. So that when the suggestion is made, Mr. Speaker, that Rickover should return to continue to head up the project as a passed-over captain, much as I respect and admire the captain, I would be hesitant to recommend that he do so, not only for his own personal prestige and profit, but for the benefit of the program, as well.

Mr. Speaker, one very important point has been overlooked in this whole case because primary emphasis has been placed on the military uses of atomic power. We must realize that the Navy's atomic program today represents the only real effort in the Nation to engineer practical atomic power systems. It is the only basis there is of the country's infant atomic industry. Rickover's group has actually two power plants completely designed and construction is now well advanced. These plants are of entirely different types, both from a nuclear standpoint and from a power plant standpoint. Another large power plant, this one capable of propelling an aircraft carrier—or of powering a city, if you will—is now being designed. This represents a third and completely different approach to the use of atomic power. Thus, in a few years, while other reactor programs are still in the early stages of development, there will be operating in different parts of the country, three entirely different land based atomic engines. These plants will be run by engineers and not theoretical scientists. Their components have been produced by industrial concerns—not by atomic laboratories. Operations and maintenance procedures will be based on Navy and industrial practice, for these are not mere laboratory rigs. That is why the Atomic Energy Commission is so vitally interested in the Navy's power plants as central station prototypes. That is why when civilian atomic power comes, it will be a by-product of the Navy's work.

Mr. Speaker, on February 12, I stated to the Congress that we are in a new age—an atomic age and that we should establish atomic age standards, by giving recognition for promotions in the Navy to those officers who are scientists as well as those who are fighting men. I suggested then, Mr. Speaker, that an element of common sense and fairness should be brought to engineering duty officer selection processes and I proposed:

First. That the members of engineering duty officer selection boards which are convened to pass upon the promotion or retention of officers in flag rank shall consist of three line officers, three engineering duty officers, and three

civilians who are selected by the President from among the outstanding scientists and engineers in the country.

Second. The chairman of such a board shall be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy designated for the purpose by the Secretary of the Navy.

Third. There shall be a stenographic record made of the entire proceedings of the board, copies of which shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States, and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. In the event that there is disagreement by members of the selection board, such disagreement, with reasons therefor, may be noted and attached to the stenographic report by the minority members.

Fourth. The Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, or the President shall have the right to reject the action of the selection board in whole or in part and to reconvene the board. In the event that there shall be disagreement among the members of the selection board, the Secretaries of the Navy or Defense and the President may substitute the name of an officer not selected by the majority, but approved by at least one member of the board. If either of the Secretaries does so, he shall make an appropriate notation on the report, with his reasons, in forwarding the report to the President for final appointment.

Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a bill incorporating those suggestions.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, is limited to the promotion of officers of flag rank. I have not yet given sufficient study to the possibility of its application to officers in lower ranks, although I believe that congressional review of their situation is warranted. I have recently received a letter from a lieutenant commander, who for obvious reasons refused to sign his name, reading as follows:

DEAR SIR: In connection with your investigation of the passover of Captain Rickover I would like to point out this apparent unequal treatment is now the rule well below the rank of captain.

The action of the selection board last October, for instance, in passing over 10 out of 18 eligible AEDO lieutenant commanders for promotion to commander is a case in point. This is much below the ratio of accepted unrestricted officers in the promotion zone. It is a known fact that some of these AEDO officers have excellent records while some of the unrestricted officers recommended for promotion have at least questionable records.

Many of these "engineering duty" officers who answered the Navy's frantic call for scientific and specialized personnel at the close of the last war now find themselves in the position of not being able to advance in the Navy and not being able to get out and return to their civilian jobs since no resignations from the Regular Navy are being accepted. These officers face a possibility of being kept on active duty up to 18 years in the same rank before the law will permit retirement or release. This is certainly a different picture than was painted for them in 1947-48 when they were induced to accept Regular commissions.

It is my belief that any action taken by Congress to force the promotion of qualified captains but which does not also extend down to the lower ranks will only serve to work further hardship on the lower ranks by serving to limit the number of officers who

are allowed to become qualified captains even more severely than at present.

The letter graphically shows a discouragement and deterioration of morale among AEDO officers and EDO officers that is most disturbing and disheartening. These branches of the service used to attract the flower of Naval Academy classes. Today those standing highest in their class seek service in other branches, because the opportunities for promotion are so limited. The length of tenure required in each grade and the attrition in the selection process itself bear abnormally hard upon the naval engineering officers. In 1940 Comdr. H. N. Wallin, of the Construction Corps, who incidentally is now Chief of the Bureau of Ships, and an admiral, wrote a paper in opposition to the proposed merger between the personnel of the Construction Corps and the Bureau of Engineering. It appears in the Army and Navy Register for April 27, 1940, and I believe it is worth quoting in full:

Commander Wallin submitted some ideas on technical and personnel assignments. He said:

"In any discussion of personnel legislation it is essential that we do not lose sight of the tremendous importance of the quality of our technical personnel who are charged with the responsibility of designing and producing the best ships and equipment possible. The importance of this follows from the fact that no matter how efficient or spirited our operating personnel may be, when the real test comes, the fate of the battle will usually depend upon the ability of our ships to fight, and to continue in the fighting in spite of severe blows.

"In other words, material is certainly of no less importance than the personnel who man the ships. Deficiencies in material may well prove fatal to the Navy and to the national defense of the country. This is axiomatic; it is a fact generally recognized and accepted, but material is a prosaic, inanimate thing, and there is a natural tendency to take it for granted and to assume that it will always be adequate for the purpose intended. Most persons not engaged in the actual work of ship construction, and even those operating the ships, seldom have an adequate appreciation of the vast amount of technical talent which must constantly be applied to the design and construction of our ships. Thus, if we are to have the best ships, we must have the best technical personnel—men who are educated and trained in their specialty and encouraged to devote their full talents to the task of striking the best balance possible in the conflicting requirements and complexities of war vessels.

"In order to get the best technical personnel for the work, three things are necessary—first, there must be a real desire on the part of the young officers to apply for assignment for post-graduate instruction and training in the specialty; second, the laws which govern the careers of officers in the specialty must be such as to offer an attractive career; and third, administration must give such recognition to the specialty as to offer encouragement and contentment, a feeling of security, such that the officer specialists can devote themselves wholeheartedly and conscientiously to their task. With respect to the first consideration, it is obvious that young officers will not apply for assignment to technical work unless their prospective career as a full-time specialist outweighs the prospects which exist in the line for the better type of officers, on the average say in the upper one-fourth or one-fifth of the Naval Academy classes. Naturally, there is an urge on the part of most officers to stay in the line in order to command ships and to attain the various flag-rank commands afloat

and ashore. The best type of officer will not give up his opportunity in the line without the promise of an attractive career as an officer specialist. Unless the career as a specialist appears attractive, it is needless to expect satisfactory recruitment. As a matter of fact, the applications for transfer to the construction corps have recently reached a lower standard than heretofore, no doubt because of the unsatisfactory and unsettled promotion situation with the corps; further, I understand that applications for transfer to the specialty of aeronautical engineering duty only have been considered below the expected standard. The laws which govern a group of officer specialists and the general administration of the group determine, of course, whether the specialty offers an attractive or unattractive career. There is no unanimity of opinion as to just what legislation or administrative action is necessary to guarantee the best results, but it is a strong feeling on the part of many officers of the construction corps, and possibly in other technical branches, that existing conditions are not conducive to technical excellence in these specialties. Many officers in the construction corps do not feel that H. R. 9450 will in the long run improve the present unsatisfactory situation but seem to feel that the best solution might be found in the present corps system by suitable remedial modification in existing law and in administration."

The reasons sustaining Commander Wallin's argument at that time are as valid today as they were then. The EDO and the AEDO, the scientific branches of the Navy, are not nearly as attractive as the line, and will continue to suffer.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is making a very strong speech. It is obvious the gentleman has given a lot of thought and time to the subject he is discussing and I have been listening with a great deal of interest to what he has to say. In reference to the specialty officers, may I say that I agree with what the gentleman has said. I have been discussing the matter with some officers in the service and the feeling generally is that the combat officer gets the break in so many rules and regulations that seem to balance in favor of the combat officer as against the specialty officer. The technical officer has a reason for being there. He is extremely important. I think he should be treated with fairness in the regulations which the Department promulgates. One regulation of which there was considerable complaint is the matter of awarding housing to the technical officer. The feeling is that there is an unfair arrangement there, especially in the Army. I make this observation because I think it fits into what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I pointed out earlier in my address that whereas the AEDO and the EDO branches of the Navy used to attract the best of the Annapolis graduating classes, they are no longer doing this because there is a feeling among the graduates that they can get further in the Navy, they can achieve higher rank, they can achieve better status as line officers.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. A similar situation prevails in reference to the

Military Academy. At one time the high-ranking graduates sought the Engineers. Now there is not that unanimity of opinion that we had at that time. Many of them are seeking other branches of the service.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. While the law itself may be at fault, this is not the entire reason. Certainly those administering the law on naval selection boards have contributed to the difficult situation through unreasonable and unrealistic performance. When the Officer Personnel Act was passed in 1947, recognition was intended to be given to outstanding officers by providing for their accelerated promotion. John L. Sullivan, Acting Secretary of the Navy, wrote a letter on March 18, 1947, to Hon. Walter G. Andrews, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, in which he stated:

H. R. 2537 combines a number of unique features calculated to allow accelerated promotion in the case of outstanding officers without the necessity of all those who are passed by their juniors being considered as having failed of selection for promotion, as is the case under existing law. This would be accomplished by the establishment of promotion zones, or the block of officers in each grade who if not promoted would be considered as having failed of selection to the next higher grade. As is now provided, an officer would not be involuntarily separated from the active list unless twice failing of selection in succeeding years. No officer would be considered to have failed of selection unless he was in the promotion zone and was not selected for advancement.

Yet, in spite of this provision of the law, which would permit naval selection boards to dip below the promotion zones for up to 5 percent of their selections, an action which would give hope and encouragement to all officers in the eligible area, an action which would make them believe that they would have a chance for advanced promotion, naval selection boards have not done so. In the EDO branch, all promotions since 1947 have been from officers in the promotion zone, none from the zone below. I should qualify that. If any have been taken at all from below the zone they have been from eligibles on the point of entering the promotion zone. There has never been an allocation of the 5 percent across the entire eligible zone as there should be.

This has been the case as well in the selection of officers from the promotion zone. There have not always been across-the-zone selections as there should be. Selection boards have on occasion selected a disproportionate number of officers from a particular class, rather than making their selections from the several classes within the promotion zone. As a result, the inequity continues until the retirement of those selected out of the particular class. This, too, causes an unfortunate result, inasmuch as the retirements all occur at the same time, rather than being graduated over several years and giving the Navy the benefit of a continuity of experience from its older men.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know all the answers, but I do know that it is essential that the Congress face this problem now. Today there is no protection under the law and regulations for officers

who are eligible and have not been promoted. Nobody checks the actions of the selection boards. Nobody knows or apparently cares whether the selection boards have acted wisely. The Rickover case is only one example of flagrant errors that must have happened in many other instances, but nobody knows about it or takes the trouble to investigate. Unless remedial steps are taken, the same procedure will continue on and on. Today only the selection boards review all the officers eligible for promotion. Once they make their selections, there is no hope for those who are passed over. They are discarded and nobody knows anything about them. The President and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate review short biographical sketches only of the officers picked for promotion, and no information is made available respecting the men who have been passed over. Therefore there is no way that either the President or the Senate can compare the officers selected with those who have not been chosen. We have no way of knowing whether the selection boards have promoted the most capable men. It is argued that the members of the selection board know these men and are in the best position to judge whether they should be promoted. I do not believe this is enough. There is too much secrecy surrounding the promotion process. There is an appalling lack of information. I think that not only for the benefit of those who make the service their life career, but for the sake of the country as a whole, there must be some check or balance established to verify that the selection boards have done the best job possible. Perhaps this lies with the Secretary, perhaps it lies with the President—but there must be some check established.

In the 76th Congress the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs was holding hearings on S. 4026 dealing with the reorganization of the Navy Department and the transfer of the Construction Corps to the line. On page 86 the following interchange took place:

Senator DAVIS. Is it possible in the Navy for a man that is incompetent to be labeled as a fitted officer?

Admiral NIMITZ. I hope not.

Senator DAVIS. I am not asking you about what you hope, but I am asking you if that is possible to be done. I am asking you if a man who is incompetent and unable to do his work can be labeled as fitted? That is what I want to know. I do not want any hope about it, I want to get an answer of "yes" or "no" to it.

Admiral NIMITZ. As an individual I cannot answer that. Only the nine officers on the selection board can answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. A man may be competent for 20 years and take to drink and the selection board know he has been drinking, but he has had 20 years and instead of kicking him out without any retirement pay at all, the selection board find him fitted. Is that not right?

Admiral NIMITZ. That is possible; yes. I do not know what goes on in the minds of the nine officers who are designated as a board of selection. They have the officer's record and decide whether he is best fitted, fitted, or not fitted. When they say he is fitted, I cannot ask them why they hold him fitted. Their sessions are closed and they are not required to explain their action. Six out of those nine members determine whether he is fitted, best fitted, or whether he is not fitted.

Senator DAVIS. Then the human element can enter into it with these men that are on the board?

Admiral NIMITZ. Of course, the human element enters into everything that men do.

Senator DAVIS. Certainly. I think we should know if a man is competent or if he is fitted, and we ought not to put men that are incompetent on as fitted officers.

Admiral NIMITZ. I agree with you 100 percent. Every officer on these selection boards takes a solemn oath, having in mind the best interests of the service, that he will do his duty on the selection board as prescribed by law, and I have no reason to believe that they have not done their duty.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any question but that the officers on the selection boards try to do their duty. It is possible, under the system, for service politics to be played and for personal friendships to be favored, but I do not make this charge. I will accept the fact that the officers engaging in the selection process respect the oaths they have taken and conscientiously do their best to pick the top people. But mistakes do happen. The Rickover case is one instance; there may have been many more. In all fairness to the men in the service, in fairness to the Navy, and to the country, the Congress must establish some means of review to assure equality of consideration not only for the officers picked by the selection boards but for the others with whom they competed for promotion as well. We must find some way, too, of giving recognition to the merit of an outstanding individualist in the face of the Navy's demand for conformity and uniformity. We cannot, we must not continue to indulge in the luxury of wasting men whom we cannot replace.

Mr. Speaker, because I consider the Navy's atom project so vital to the defense and welfare of this Nation, because I consider the promotion to rear admiral of Capt. Hyman G. Rickover as being essential to the prompt and successful completion of the program, I hope the Armed Services Committee of the Senate will find some way to achieve that promotion. I know that some will say that he is the casualty of the attrition inherent in the selection-board process. I am not willing to accept that statement.

To my mind the A-sub projects are of such importance that I would want to know that the admirals who passed over Rickover had in mind a specific replacement for him possessing his demonstrated nuclear talents and capabilities. I do not believe that any and all EDO captains can do the job as well. Unless and until it is shown that such a replacement exists, I would consider the action of the selection board as an abuse of discretion and a blunder which should be corrected and not condoned. The judgment of admirals is not infallible merely because they are admirals.

It is most heartening to know that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate proposes to go into the Rickover case, for the confirmation process is not intended to be a mere formality. It is the only check set out in the law for review of appointments by the Executive, the only means we have to correct the infliction of possible wrongs in the promotion procedure. Captain Rickover, other

officers who have been improperly passed over, have no redress against abuse unless the Senate reviews their cases.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate what I have stated before—that if our military establishment is not to stagnate, we must heed the advice of the great scientist, Dr. Vannevar Bush, as stated in his book *Modern Arms and Free Men*:

We now need an adequate organization within the National Military Establishment for deliberate military planning in all aspects of modern war, not merely the strictly military part of a generation ago. When the President and Congress have set it up and started it in operation, they should review it constantly, they should review its methods and its personnel, and they must review its decisions, for upon them enormous appropriations will depend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to append to my remarks an article appearing in Look magazine for this month entitled "The Strange Case of the Man Behind the Atomic Sub."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

**THE STRANGE CASE OF THE MAN BEHIND THE ATOMIC SUB—THE CITATION SAID HE HAD ACCOMPLISHED THE MOST IMPORTANT PIECE OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE NAVY'S HISTORY, BUT THE NAVY DECLINED TO PROMOTE HIM**

(By Ronald Schiller)

Sometime soon in a shipyard near Groton, Conn., the first atomic-powered submarine, *Nautilus*, will slide down the ways and open a new era in the world's history.

"This vessel," said President Truman at the laying of her keel last June, "is the forerunner of atomic-powered merchant ships and airplanes, of atomic power plants producing electricity for factories, farms and homes. \* \* \* The day that the propellers of this new submarine first bite into the water \* \* \* will be the most momentous day in \* \* \* atomic science since that first flash \* \* \* in the desert 7 years ago."

Everybody knew that atomic energy would be harnessed by industry some day, but the job was so immensely complex that most scientists put its realization 50 years into the future. The miracle of *Nautilus* is that, from first plans to completion, she will have been built in about 5 years.

Chief credit for this achievement belongs to a silver-haired Navy captain named Hyman George Rickover, who first dreamed it up, then carried it through against heavy odds. Without his leadership, the atom sub would still be a dream. Captain Rickover's reward for this service to the Nation is to have been passed over twice for promotion. This means that he must retire from the Navy next June, with his work half done, at the age of 53.

The atom submarine developed in Rickover's mind after the first atomic bombs fell on Japan. In 1946, the year after the Hiroshima bomb, he got himself assigned to a course of atom study with the Manhattan project at Oak Ridge. Four of the Navy's bright young officers also were assigned to the course. When they had completed their studies, they went on a tour of all the atomic research installations and came back convinced that an atom-powered craft was feasible. They prepared detailed plans for getting the work started and submitted the plans to the Navy. The report was shelved and Rickover's little group was disbanded.

But "Rick" is a battler who doesn't quit when he knows he's right. After months of getting nowhere, Rickover, together with Adm. Earle Mills, then chief of the Bureau of Ships, persuaded Adm. Chester Nimitz,

chief of naval operations, to write a letter stating that "the atomic submarine is militarily desirable." It had the effect of an order to get going.

In Washington, this kind of tactics is strongly disapproved. But Rick didn't care. "That letter was my hunting license," he said. "Without it, *Nautilus* would have been just another of the dozens of worthwhile Navy projects that die of old age trying to get through channels."

#### RICKOVER'S RECORD

Once he had his license, Rickover got the Atomic Energy Commission—the only agency empowered to build atomic reactors, or furnaces—to say that an atomic-powered engine was feasible. Then he got himself assigned to duty with the AEC and that freed him from a lot of interagency red tape and Navy restrictions. His working habits were just as heretical: Rank means nothing in his outfit; ability alone determines where a man fits. And he has protected his officers from being transferred every three years, as is the Navy custom, so that he would not lose their atomic experience.

"It takes 2 years," Rick said, "to break a youngster of the bad habits he has learned elsewhere in the Navy; to teach him to tackle problems directly instead of by the rules, to get him to stick his neck out and accept responsibility. In battle, the habit of obedience is essential, but it won't work in the technical sphere, not in this atomic age."

In vital matters, the captain has gone over the heads of his superiors, after informing them that he intended to do so. With people who obstruct the program either willfully or foolishly, he is merciless. People have learned not to tangle with him. "I'm too obnoxious," he says.

It took 3 years of research and pressure to wear down the last opposition to the atom sub. In 1949 Congress appropriation \$40 million and work was started on the ship that nobody could describe and that many people thought could never be built. When the firm which had been asked to build the sub asked what the job would involve, Rickover answered truthfully: "I have no idea." And when a scientist on Rick's staff heard that Rick had set 5 years for the job, he exploded: "The little dope. He'll never live to see this thing finished."

There was no precedent for the job. Not one component could be ordered from a catalog; each one had first to be imagined, then designed, then turned over to a manufacturer, whose reaction usually was that it couldn't be done. The steam plant alone, said one of America's foremost ship designers, "would ordinarily have taken the Navy 5 years to develop." When the Secretary of the Navy asked how so many radically new jobs had been completed in so short a time, Westinghouse executives told him, "Rickover made us do it."

No man in the Navy was better qualified by training, experience and temperament to undertake this job. The son of an immigrant Jewish tailor in Chicago, Rickover was graduated from the Naval Academy in 1922, then went to Columbia for a degree in electrical engineering. He acquired a reputation as a "loner" who could get things done. Ships on which he served in engineering won the red "E" for excellent performance. As head of the Electrical Section of the Bureau of Ships during the war, he earned the Legion of Merit. "The money he saved the Government," said a General Electric vice president, "ran into hundreds of millions."

Rick received another commendation as industrial manager of the Okinawa repair base and a third from the Army for services at Oak Ridge. The job he did as inspector general of the 19th Fleet after the war was so outstanding that its commander recommended him for flag rank. It was a fine record, but it cost him immense loss in personal popularity.

When a mess developed at the Navy's largest supply depot, in Mechanicsburg, Pa., during the war, "Rick" was asked to clean it up. "It was a job," he said, "that could be done only by a S. O. B., so they called me in."

The captain does himself an injustice. When he's not battling, he is a quiet man of considerable charm and humor. Those who work closely with him say he is sensitive and sympathetic.

When the atom-sub project was begun, "Rick's" first problem was to find competent personnel. In 1947, engineers with nuclear experience were scarce. He was successful in obtaining the services of the four young officers who had served with him at Oak Ridge. Among them was Comdr. Louis Roddis, who had stood number one in his class at the Naval Academy and who had made one of the highest records at the school. Rickover charmed the chemists, physicists, metallurgists, engineers, and production men he needed away from industry, college laboratories and other Navy bureaus, largely by firing their imaginations. One engineer quit a \$15,000 a job in industry to work with "Rick" for \$7,500. Another said recently, "I was warned to stay away from 'Rick.' People told me he'd work me to death. But after I listened to him, I knew it would be one hell of a fast ride to somewhere."

Everybody who gets a job with "Rick" is put through a grilling in which he snarls idiotic questions at them: If you saw a Wave who was sloppily dressed, what would you tell her? How would you pick the most intelligent person in a roomful of people just by looking at them? "Rick" says he doesn't care what the answers are. "I want to find out whether a man can think straight about a problem he has never considered before, because that's what he's going to have to do every day of his life here. And whether he'll stand up to me when he's convinced I'm wrong. Too much depends on his decisions to have it otherwise."

#### RACING AGAINST TIME

Some people come out of this third degree shaking. But those who survive make a remarkable team of nuclear-power specialists, and their devotion to Rick is almost fanatic. Their great enemy is time. "The more you sweat in peace the less you bleed in war," Rick quotes. He is pretty sure that the Russians are working on atom-propelled ships and that this is a race we can't afford to lose. He has a knack for getting the last ounce out of his men, but he knows that you can't order a scientist to give you the answer to a brand-new problem by a certain date. All you can do is to get him so enthusiastic that he will surpass himself.

But nobody on the staff works harder than its chief. At the end of a normal working day, he often grabs a plane and transfers his operations to a laboratory, plant, or proving ground in some other city. Once he went 16 days without sleeping twice in the same place. He has called conferences at all hours of the night; he has called heads of corporations out of bed at 2 a. m. to find out why a promised delivery had not been made. None of the people who told me about such incidents had any resentment toward Rick. They admire a man who will go to such lengths to get a job done.

"You prove to him," one engineer said, "that a job can't be done, and he practically calls you a liar. He won't listen to reason and he keeps needling you until you walk away from him in a rage. You know the job can't be done, and then you do it anyway just to spite him."

There was a big metals firm that wanted a year to put a processing plant into operation. Rick gave them 10 weeks and made them stick to it. Another firm wanted 14 months to create a vital component for *Nautilus*. Rick called a night meeting of the company's engineers and got them to deliver the part in 10 months.

The thing engineers admire most about Rickover is his ability to save years by telescoping projects. In the normal way, the atom submarine would have started with the building of an atomic reactor, just to see if it would work. Then, when the experts shook the bugs out of the reactor, they'd redesign it to Navy specifications and try it out on a surface vessel. If that worked, they'd compress it and install it in a submarine, which was the ultimate goal. Each step would have taken years.

Rick was having none of that. He insisted that the reactor go directly into the sub. While the primary research was still going on in the laboratories, he had Westinghouse start building the actual engine. Long before the engine was completed, he was building a full-size submarine out near Arco, Idaho. Before the Arco job was finished, the keel for *Nautilus* was being laid at Groton, Conn. Rick had saved 5 to 15 years. "He stuck his neck out a mile," said an executive of one of the companies involved. "It took more ability and sheer courage than I've ever seen in 37 years in industry or the Navy."

And while the reactor for *Nautilus* was being built by Westinghouse, Rickover started construction of a second atomic engine, the submarine intermediate reactor, at General Electric. *Nautilus* will use water to transmit atomic heat to the steam engine; the new one uses liquid metal and operates on an entirely different principle. Last year, while those two projects were going, Rick undertook to build a third reactor for installation in an aircraft carrier and began a fourth, still secret project.

#### THE DEADLIEST WEAPON

When the first atom sub is in the water, she will be one of the deadliest weapons ever devised. She will travel under water immensely faster than any previous submarine, and will have practically unlimited range. Given enough food and water, she could stay submerged for phenomenally long periods of time, coming up, as the Navy gag runs, "just long enough for the crew to reenlist." She will be able to cross oceans without revealing herself and launch guided missiles with atomic warheads and supersonic speed against targets far inland. She will be able to track down and kill enemy submarines.

This weapon you can call Rickover's contribution. It scarcely occurred to anyone that his achievement would not be recognized. Yet the selection board that met in July 1951 to consider the promotion of captains to rear admirals passed him over. On July 7, 1952, the day before a second selection board met, Secretary of the Navy Dan Kimball took Rickover into his office and gave him a gold star to add to his Legion of Merit, with a citation that read:

"Captain Rickover more than any other individual is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear ship program. He has held tenaciously to a single important goal despite discouraging frustration and opposition, and has consistently advanced the submarine thermal reactor well beyond all expectations \*\*\* a contribution of inestimable value to the Nation's security. \*\*\* He has accomplished the most important piece of development in the history of the Navy."

At that same time, Gordon Dean, chairman of the AEC, sent the selection board a letter stating that Rickover's "energy, drive, and technical competence" had made the project possible. Dr. Lawrence Hafstad, Rickover's AEC boss and supervisor of all atomic reactor work in the country, sent a similar letter.

#### PROMOTION REFUSED

The nine admirals of the board rejected Rickover again, but they raised to flag rank 30 other captains whose services, however meritorious, cannot compare with Rick's.

Admirals with whom I discussed this curious business explained that promotion in the

Navy is not given as a reward but to the best fitted, and that perhaps the board felt that Rickover's experience was too specialized for flag rank. Which would seem to mean that the captain's chances for promotion would have been better had he spent his time on routine jobs of diverse nature, as is the usual practice, instead of giving himself completely to one matter of immeasurable importance.

"What it adds up to," said one admiral, "is that he just didn't get enough votes in the board." Another officer working for Rickover said, "I've been warned three times by friends in the service that my continued association with Rickover would jeopardize my career."

Gordon Dean, AEC Chairman, said, "I think I know every topflight atomic engineer in the country and I don't know one, Navy or civilian, who could do the job Rickover is doing." Every knowledgeable person to whom I spoke is convinced that the program he started will be slowed down by years if Rickover is compelled to retire now.

He could continue after June 30 on a year-to-year basis, never to be considered for promotion and subject to retirement at any time at the will of the Navy. He would have little authority in naval matters; his position would be practically untenable. It is possible, however, that he still might get his promotion should the President, as Commander in Chief, set aside the Selection Board's action and promote him anyway. Theodore Roosevelt did that for Adm. William Sims.

About the only person concerned who hasn't opened his mouth is Rickover himself. He has just stepped up the tempo of his work to get as much done as possible in the time left. Lots of people have offered him good jobs at more pay than the Navy gives him.

Hyman George Rickover can afford to retire, but can the country afford to lose him?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to append to my remarks the article appearing in the Washington Post of this morning entitled "Senate Checking Failure to Promote Naval Atom-Sub Expert."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

#### SENATE CHECKING FAILURE TO PROMOTE NAVAL ATOM-SUB EXPERT

(By John G. Norris)

A Senate investigation which could bring about changes in the method of selecting officers for high military rank is scheduled to open this week.

It stems from the controversy over the Navy's failure to promote its top atomic propulsion expert, Capt. Hyman G. Rickover, to the rank of rear admiral. Having been passed over twice by a Navy selection board, the 52-year-old officer must retire this June while the important job on which he has been engaged is as yet incomplete.

Rickover is widely credited with being chiefly responsible for the extraordinary rapid development of the Navy's atomic-powered submarine—a revolutionary craft due for completion next year. His drive, unorthodox methods and disregard for Navy protocol in pushing the development of atomic power for ships are said to have hastened this great step forward in naval shipbuilding by years.

#### TOES STEPPED ON

Charges have been made in Congress and the press that Rickover stepped on important toes in his drive toward his goal and that he is being shelved for bucking the system and incurring the dislike of tradition-minded superiors.

His congressional champions—notably Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, Democrat,

of Illinois, a wartime naval officer—also charge that Rickover's retirement this June will delay the development of the Navy's two atomic submarines and an aircraft carrier. The Atomic Energy Commission, under which Rickover's nuclear propulsion staff has been working, concedes that some of his key civilian scientists will leave and the morale of the unit will be affected if he is forced out.

The Navy has not yet answered its critics. Top admirals are expected to appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee this week for questioning about the charges.

It seems clear, however, that a major issue which the Senators must weigh is one that has come up many times before in American military history—the fate of the man with a cause.

#### SPECIALIZATION RISKY

Traditionally, young officers have been taught that the way to an admiral's cockpit hat is to diversify your career. Don't become a zealot, they are told. Don't overspecialize and get so hepped on putting over something you believe in that your record isn't well rounded. Above all, don't get so intent on putting over your ideas that you go outside of regular channels, over the heads of superiors who can't see the importance of what you're doing.

This advice undoubtedly is sound. Officers who gain a reputation for handling a variety of jobs well seem to go farther than those known largely as expert in one field. That's true even among officers who, like Rickover, are specialists and not required to qualify for command of warships. One of the explanations given in naval circles for his failure to be selected is that he is overspecialized in his field of engineering.

Navy men say diversification rates higher than accomplishment in a specialty—no matter how important—in the Navy, because admiral's billets largely require broad command or administration ability. As for zealots—those who go to extremes to push new ideas—they are bound to get into trouble in the traditionally conservative military forces.

#### IN GOOD COMPANY

Yet it is just such unconventional champions of change who have brought about major progress in American arms—usually at the expense of their own careers. Rickover, it would appear, is in good company.

One notable example was Alfred T. Mahan, now in naval history. He retired as a captain in 1897 after pushing with little effect the cause of higher education in strategy and tactics for naval officers. It was only after his writings on the place of seapower in world affairs won recognition abroad and President Theodore Roosevelt's backing that the "practical old salts" at the helm of the Navy put his ideas into effect. He was promoted to admiral on the retired list in 1906.

Adm. William S. Sims was another whose efforts to put over necessary changes got him into trouble. His insistence that naval gunnery practices were faulty nearly caused his court-martial as a commander. President Roosevelt backed him against the admirals, however, and the vital reforms were made. Sims was one of the few who got out of line and won out. He retired as a four-star admiral.

The fight for recognition of aviation also brought its martyrs. General Billy Mitchell was the best known, but there were others who battled the conservative powers-that-be and paid for it. Adm. John H. Towers, leader of naval aviation's struggle over the battleship admirals, kept his fight largely "within the family" and eventually reached high rank. But his infighting resulted in his being passed over once for promotion and kept him from his chief ambition—a top sea command in World War II.

There were similar casualties in other battles for change. The long battle for high-pressure steam propulsion and other technical reforms had their unsung martyrs. Capt. E. M. Zacharias crusaded for his ideas in the field of naval intelligence and psychological warfare and was retired. His promotion to rear admiral on the retired list was the result of a general law advancing officers with wartime combat decorations. Some of those who have got out of line fighting the status quo undoubtedly have been wrong and their superiors right. The question of how far opposition can be permitted without becoming insubordination always is a problem.

#### PRAISE OF RICKOVER

Of Rickover's ability, even brilliance, there seems no question. His feat in getting the atomic sub, *Nautilus*, so far advanced in less time than was considered possible has won the highest praise. The plaudits come from Chairman Gordon Dean and other top officials of the AEC, from industry—which he made step up schedules and cut corners—from some admirals and from Dan A. Kimball, former Secretary of the Navy.

Kimball is on record as saying that Rickover's was "the most important piece of development in the history of the Navy."

From indications, Navy chiefs are not expected to question Rickover's accomplishments and ability. But they are expected to argue that promotion is not so much a reward for past service as an estimate of an officer's qualification for still greater responsibility in higher-ranking posts.

And further, that the 2 boards of 9 rear admirals which considered his advancement had to pass on his record against those of many other engineering specialists with whom he was in competition. The last board considered Rickover and 27 other engineering capains to fill 2 vacancies in flag rank for officers of their category. They picked Capt. Peter Haas, Jr., commander of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, and Capt. Armand M. Morgan, assigned to the Mare Island, Calif., shipyard.

#### NO REASONS GIVEN

No one has said why the board felt Haas and Morgan were better fitted for promotion than Rickover and others. The proceedings are secret as are the votes taken by the members.

Some members of the Senate committee want to call members of the board and ask their reasons.

They may well inquire as to why Secretary Kimball—who is on record as saying he wanted Rickover promoted—did not do something about it. For there are numerous instances in the past where Navy Secretaries and the White House have brought weight to bear for the promotion of officers.

Navy admirals try to keep the control of promotions within the uniform selection boards as the fairest system.

But the Secretary does direct the Board on what to do—how many officers to pick, how far down the list to go, etc. Secretaries can and have, also directed the Boards to select officers with certain specified qualifications, which in fact means they have to name a particular man.

They also can, and have, reconvened Boards and handed back promotion lists because the Board chose someone the Secretary believed should not have been promoted or failed to pick someone he felt was neglected. Various Presidents also have taken similar action. Both the Navy and Defense Secretaries sign and forward such lists to the President, as a matter of practice, although this is not required by law. When the President approves, the list is supposed to be final. Promotions, of course, are not complete, until confirmed by the Senate.

Secretaries James Forrestal and Francis Matthews insisted on playing such a part in the promotion system. President Truman intervened on one occasion.

Assuming that Congress should conclude an injustice has been done, what happens then?

#### PRESIDENT COULD ACT

President Eisenhower could simply nominate Rickover for promotion, and if the Senate agreed, he would be a rear admiral. Promotion laws do not provide for this, but there are ample precedents for such action.

Or Navy Secretary Robert Anderson could convene a new selection Board before June 30 and Rickover could be recommended for advancement, either by free choice of the new Board or by virtual directive from the Secretary.

Congress itself, contend service lawyers, cannot promote him by a special act or other action, without violating the President's appointive powers under the Constitution. There are many precedents for legislative promotions on the retired list, but not to active posts.

However, the Senate, should it decide to do so, can exert pressure on the Navy to advance anyone by refusing to confirm others for like rank. The committee already has held up approval of 30 officers selected for flag rank by the Board which passed over Rickover.

Whatever happens, Congress is expected to take a long, new look at the promotion system, to determine, for one thing, if changes are needed to protect outstanding experts in this age of specialization.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

#### THE SPIRIT OF TEXAS

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House that today is a day dear to the hearts of all Texans. It is Texas Independence Day. Today commemorates the day when the spirit of Texas prevailed over the conquering hordes of the tyrant and the independence of Texas was proclaimed. All of us here are familiar with the great natural resources of our fine State of Texas—the oil, the cattle, the wheat, the cotton and the timber, but it seems to me that an even greater thing is the spirit of Texas which was kindled at the Alamo and fanned into a roaring flame by Sam Houston at San Jacinto, a spirit that bows to no tyrant, a spirit that holds that every man is entitled to freedom of body and soul. It seems that on this day which commemorates the anniversary of the independence of Texas, all of us here could do well to rededicate ourselves to the spirit of Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I commend the gentleman from Texas on his timely and most pertinent speech. I think it is well that he has come before the Congress on this day to call attention to the great service rendered to the people of

Texas by the great patriots who met the foe and repulsed him. I think this day should also bring to our minds most clearly that we in America, and, of course, in Texas too are today beset by a foe far more sinister than Santa Anna, a foe who is working within our country's borders and a foe that is much more difficult to fight. I think as long as the spirit of the patriots who won independence for Texas prevails we need have no fear of communism in this country. I pledge to the country the continued efforts of all Texans fired by the spirit of our great patriots to continue our fight against communism.

Mr. IKARD. I hope the future days, and I know they will, provide for us and our leadership the intellect of an Austin, the courage of a Bowie, and the leadership of a Houston.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUNTER.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances and to include two articles.

Mr. Bow in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAMPLER and to include an editorial appearing in the February 26 edition of the Smith County News.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN and to include an address by Hon. George F. Kennan, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$200.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. BEAMER in two instances and to include extraneous articles.

Mr. D'EWART in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLE of New York in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD and to include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRETTELLA and to include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include a speech made on February 28 by Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, at Raleigh, N. C.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include an editorial from the Boston Post.

Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in four instances and to include in one an editorial from the Federation News entitled "The La Follette Error."

Mr. BARTLETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include an editorial appearing in the current issue of the American Legion magazine.

Mr. SULLIVAN and to include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. BAILEY and to include two letters.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. HELLER) and to include matter relative to his remarks.

Mr. RHODES in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. SAYLOR) and to include an editorial.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include an editorial from the Denver Post.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include a speech by Mr. George E. Springfellow.

Mr. PATTERSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include a copy of a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture with attached charts on the subject of importation of meat into the United States.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. YATES) and to include a newspaper article.

#### SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 3 weeks, on account of illness.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly at (2 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 3, 1953 at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

496. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 96); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

497. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Housing Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

498. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal National Mortgage Association for the fiscal year

ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

499. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting reports of expenditures made in excess of apportionments approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1953 by the Federal Housing Administration, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

500. A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to the development of a program for disposal to private industry of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended, and Executive Order 9942 of April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

501. A letter from the Secretary, American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting a report of its activities during the year ending December 31, 1952; to the Committee on House Administration.

502. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1952; to the Committee on House Administration.

503. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

504. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1951, Publicly Owned"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

505. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

506. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 152. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and \$350 funeral expenses to Ruth J. Mott, sister of Betty C. Ickes, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 91). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 3575. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State Government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States;

to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3576. A bill to facilitate the adjustment of cotton production and marketing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3577. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3578. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 3579. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 3580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that the tax on the transportation of property shall not apply in the case of certain property exported from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3581. A bill to further the policy enunciated in the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 927), to facilitate public participation in the preservation of sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest by providing for a National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3582. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3583. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 3584. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3585. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3586. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3587. A bill to reclassify the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3588. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 3589. A bill to amend section 1701 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of any opera conducted under municipal auspices or by a nonprofit civic or community membership association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3590. A bill to amend section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the

case of admissions to a planetarium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3591. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from \$600 to \$700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3592. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3593. A bill to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 3594. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3595. A bill relating to the compensation of certain laundry employees at United States naval hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3596. A bill to provide a cost-of-living pay increase for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3597. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the lower Cumberland Dam and Reservoir on the Cumberland River in Kentucky and Tennessee, for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 3598. A bill to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3599. A bill to repeal certain laws authorizing the Postmaster General, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to revise parcel-post rates, size limits, zones, and other conditions of mailability; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit accelerated amortization with respect to certain facilities constructed or acquired in foreign countries which will help make available to foreign investors and labor the economic benefits of American production, distribution, and management techniques; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3601. A bill to increase the amount of disability pension payable to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3602. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3603. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of

government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3604. A bill to protect the public health and welfare by restoring authority for factory inspections under the Federal Food, Drug, Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 3605. A bill to provide for two additional district judges for the southern district of California and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3606. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3607. A bill to provide for the design, development, and construction of prototype aircraft suitable to the needs of local-service airlines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 3608. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program and increase the amount of earnings permitted thereunder without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H. R. 3609. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain land in Acadia National Park to the towns of Dedham and Otis, and to the city of Ellsworth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 3610. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3611. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3612. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3613. A bill authorizing an appropriation to aid the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in establishing an experimental farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3614. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to complete the survey of the Pecatonica flood area, and to appropriate \$25,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3615. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to improve the procedure for the selection for promotion of certain naval officers designated for engineering duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall purchase beef and butter on the open market for distribution to needy persons in other countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Res. 160. Resolution authorizing payment of official telephone service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 161. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to favor passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES: Memorial of the House of Representatives, State of Washington, resolving that the lake being formed by the impounding of waters behind McNary Dam on the Columbia River, be given the name "Lake Wallula" to commemorate this historic place which will be inundated; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE: Memorial of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois requesting that the Congress of the United States enact legislation at the earliest possible date which would confirm and recognize in the State of Illinois and its political subdivisions, its and their ownership and full rights in all lands beneath navigable waters within its boundaries, subject only to necessary Federal regulations in connection with international relationships, navigation, and defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: Memorial of the Arizona State Legislature relating to national cemeteries, and requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature requesting the formulation of a plan for cooperation in the development of ground water supplies on Indian reservations in central and southern Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature relating to Indians and requesting the elimination of existing Federal laws which discriminate against Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to Indians and requesting the elimination of existing Federal laws which discriminate against Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to a request to deed the title to all of the area of Fort Logan except that area now used as a national cemetery, to the State of Colorado together with all appurtenances thereto; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the approval of legislation authorizing the domestic producers of gold to sell their product in the markets of the world; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting that there be given serious consideration to the question of eliminating the Federal gasoline tax and leaving that area of taxation entirely to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President

and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of legislation protecting the consumers of fresh vegetables as to the grades and origin, and that a fine be imposed upon any wholesale or retail dealer repacking under inferior grades or failing to properly advertise the origin of fresh vegetables; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the increase of appropriations for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States and the allocation of funds to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry in the State of South Dakota in order to more adequately prosecute cooperative programs on livestock disease control and eradication; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the repeal of section 1154 of title 18, United States Code Annotated, known as the Indian liquor law and all laws and parts of laws in respect thereto which would treat an Indian differently than any other citizen of the State of South Dakota and in the United States of America; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the appropriation of funds in lieu of taxes not received from nontaxable Indian land to the State of South Dakota for the benefit of the counties therein and to direct that such funds be used for welfare, law enforcement, road construction and maintenance, health, and education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the water being impounded behind McNary Dam on the Columbia River, and recommending that it be named "Lake Wallula"; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting a copy of house memorial No. 5 concerning appointment to the office of Governor of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3616. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta Di Donato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3617. A bill for the relief of Joseph Miele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3618. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the board of foreign missions of the Pentecostal Holiness Church for a mission site and other public purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of Rufin Manikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3620. A bill for the relief of Georgia Christos Demarelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 3621. A bill for the relief of M. G. Huff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 3622. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Hadrosek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 3623. A bill for the relief of Willard Chester Cauley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 3624. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Leaming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 3625. A bill for the relief of Luigi Rosella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3626. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3627. A bill for the relief of Biaggio D'Alessandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3628. A bill for the relief of Michael El Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3629. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Bertoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 3630. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Ilione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3631. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Sonya Goldschmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 3632. A bill for the relief of Milan P. Vojvodic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

74. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of Columbia-Northumberland County convention in annual session at Berwick, Pa., February 23, 1953, in opposition to (1) any change in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act which would weaken our economy and Nation; (2) every proposition providing Federal aid to education where Federal control is involved; and (3) urging that the Voice of America be continued under the supervision of the State Department and its controlling committee be appointed and investigated properly prior to appointment, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. A. Ray Cartlidge, D. D., pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Champaign, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-present Father, as we start this session of duties and opportunities we know our need of strength in body, mind, and spirit. Alone we are not enough. All that we have comes from Thee and all that we shall become and do is governed by Thy grace. Send Thy spirit into us.

May Thy patience shown to mankind through the ages inspire us to a deeper patience toward the thoughtless, the ignorant, and the petty that press upon us.

May wisdom from Thee enable us to sift the truth from falsehood, justice from partisanship, and greatness from smallness; and thus enlightened may we have courage to do the better thing.

Grant unto us each an inner core of faith and trust that after we have done the best we know with these hours we may leave the rest with Thee in peace of heart and mind. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

#### OFFICER PERSONNEL IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the action of the House last Wednesday in passing H. R. 2332, as temporary legislation relating to officer personnel in the Armed Forces, I rise to advise the House that next Thursday the Armed Forces Subcommittee on Personnel, of which I am privileged to be chairman, will begin hearings on this subject.

We intend to make a thorough study of the entire promotion program. We have already asked the respective services to furnish our committee with certain basic information. In order that the House may be advised as to our approach to this problem, that you may have assurances of thoroughness with which we will study this whole matter of promotion of officers, I am including as part of my remarks a statement I released to the press setting forth in detail the type of information we have requested and will review.

Inasmuch as much of the information we will study is of a classified nature, our committee will hold all hearings in executive session until further notice. It is my best estimate that it will take approximately 4 weeks of hearings and concentrated work on the part of the committee to make this study. We will be thorough and wholly objective.