that the Senate take recess until 11 o'clock Monday morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m. Saturday, April 25) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 27, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, Thou hast ordained that in the leadership of the nations the welfare of the many must ever rest upon the shoulders of the few. We beseech Thee, give understanding, humility, and charity to those who in Thy name and for the Nation's sake are entrusted here, in this historic Chamber, with the power of governance. We pray that Thou wilt refresh our faith, that the tensions of life may not break our spirits. Make us vividly conscious that beyond the appraisals of man there falls upon our decisions and our actions the searching light of Thy judgment. Save Thy servants from false choices and guide their hands and minds to heal and bind, to build and to bless. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, April 24, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4507) to amend and extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAVEZ was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GREEN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to transact such routine business as would be in order during a morning hour, with the usual understanding that no remarks shall exceed 2 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and a letter, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 45)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the amount of $55,000, for the legislative branch, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 44)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DRAFT OF PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO AN APPROPRIATION FOR ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 43)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the fiscal year 1953, for the Economic Stabilization Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (S. Doc. No. 42)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Robert Troy from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2849, pertaining to use of certain land in vicinity of Pier 1, Kahului, Maui, T. H.

"Whereas by act of Congress approved June 19, 1936, the War Department was authorized to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii certain lands in the vicinity of Pier 1, Kahului Harbor, Kahului, Maui, for park purposes; and

"Whereas by quitclaim deed dated March 22, 1937, the United States, by the Secretary of War, did transfer ownership of said property to the Territory for park purposes; and

"Whereas due to increased shipping through the port of Kahului, it is now necessary for the Territory of Hawaii to extend the shedded area and provide additional outside storage space in the area covered by said deed; and

"Whereas there is no land other than that covered by said deed in the vicinity of Pier 1, Kahului, which can be used for the needed

expansion of harbor facilities at this port; and

"Whereas in order that said land be made available for harbor purposes, it is necessary that the restriction of the use thereof to park purposes, as provided in said act of Congress approved June 19, 1936, and said deed, be removed; and

"Whereas the area desired for harbor purposes is not near any residential area and is not desirably situated nor needed for park purposes; and

"Whereas in order to provide for a removal of the said restriction by the Department of Defense the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate from Hawaii, on February 9, 1953, introduced legislation designated as H. R. 2849 which provides for an amendment of the act of Congress approved June 19, 1936, by substituting for the word 'park' where the same appears in the last line but one thereof the word 'public': Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to enact into law H. R. 2849, as introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate from Hawaii, on February 9, 1953.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 20th day of April A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relating to the issuance of land patents in fee simple to certain lessees under 999-year homestead leases and amending Joint Resolution 12 of the 25th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas by Joint Resolution 12 of the 25th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, approved September 1, 1950, by the Congress of the United States (Public Law 746, 81st Cong., 2d sess.), the commissioner of public lands and the Governor of said Territory were authorized and directed to issue a land patent to each lessee of a 999-year lease who, following 10 years' occupancy under such lease and willingness to pay the appraised value of the lands therein demised, desires to acquire the fee simple title to the land subject to such lease; and

"Whereas under the governing law, since repealed by section 3 of said Joint Resolution 12, each homesteader, in order to qualify as a lessee of a 999-year lease, must occupy under a certificate of occupation for a period of 6 years next preceding the issuance of such lease the lands therein to be demised; and

"Whereas the terms and conditions of said certificate of occupation require of the homesteader the erection of a dwelling house and the maintenance of a home on the premises within a period of 2 years from the date of the issuance of said certificate; and

"Whereas under Joint Resolution 12 no credit is given a lessee of a 999-year lease who is desirous of acquiring the fee to the demised premises for any earlier residence upon said premises under a certificate of occupation; and

"Whereas it is the sense of this, the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, that continuous residence by a homesteader for a period of 10 years of lands subject to a 999-year lease, though such residence be partially under a certificate of occupation and partially under a lease, should qualify him as one entitled to the benefits provided by said Joint Resolution 12: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. Section 1 of Joint Resolution 12 of the 25th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SECTION 1. A fee simple patent shall be issued to every lessee under a 999-year homestead lease of public lands where such lands have been improved under such lease or pursuant to a prior certificate of occupation and have been occupied as a place of residence by the lessee under such lease or under such lease and certificate of occupation for an aggregate period of not less than 10 years, upon the payment to the commissioner of public lands of a fair price, disregarding the value of the improvements made by the lessee, which price shall be determined by three disinterested citizens to be appointed by the Governor.'

"SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval by the Congress of the United States.

"Approved this 21st day of April A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors, Manhattanville Neighborhood Center, Inc., New York, N. Y., protesting against any reduction in the Federal housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Huntington Park, Calif., favoring balancing of the national budget without impairment to essential defense; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to the designation of February 15 as Susan B. Anthony Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President, on April 25, 1953, p. 3867, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relating to the elimination of the Federal motor fuel tax and leaving that area of taxation entirely to the States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President, on April 25, 1953, p. 3867, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 4–H CLUBS IN DELAWARE—JOINT RESOLUTION OF DELAWARE LEGISLATURE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I present for appropriate reference, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, under the rule, a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Delaware, which pays tribute to the outstanding accomplishments of 4–H Clubs throughout our State.

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

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY—STATE OF DELAWARE

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

We hereby certify that the enclosed is the same act that was passed by both Houses of the One Hundred and Seventeenth General Assembly.

THOMAS L. JOHNSON,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. ALBERT JONES,
Speaker of the House.

We hereby certify that the enclosed act is properly backed, stamped and sealed, and is the same act as above certified to.

LUCINDA M. VIEKAIS,
Bill Clerk of the Senate.
EVA N. SCOTTON,
Bill Clerk of the House.

Certified with—

HOWARD T. EVINS, Jr.,
Secretary of the Senate.
GEORGE T. BIERLIN,
Clerk of the House.

Received at executive office April 23, 1953.

Approved April 23, 1953.

J. CALEB BOGGS,
Governor.

Senate Substitute 1 for Senate Joint Resolution 1

Joint resolution paying tribute to the 4–H Clubs of Delaware

Whereas the Honorable John M. Longbotham represents the Fifth Senatorial District of Kent County in which the first 4–H Club was duly organized in the United States at Houston, Kent County, Del., the club having been established as the Houston Cardinals and the late Dewey Sapp having served as the first president; and

Whereas the 4–H Club movement has continued to grow and progress throughout the years to the point that it is now one of the most prominent youth organizations in the United States; and

Whereas the 4–H Club leadership in the State of Delaware has been superbly outstanding; and

Whereas the farm youth of Delaware has cooperated with this leadership; and

Whereas the membership of the 4–H Clubs in Delaware is composed of some of our most energetic youths who, as a result of their efforts and accomplishments, show promise of becoming leading citizens of tomorrow; and

Whereas the President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the Governor of the State of Delaware, the Honorable J. Caleb Boggs, have by appropriate proclamations, called upon all good citizens to observe 4–H Club Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 117th General Assembly of the State of Delaware as follows:

That the various 4–H Clubs existing throughout the State be highly praised for the outstanding work now being accomplished by the members as well as the leadership of the club; and

That the parents of the young men and women participating in the 4–H Club movement be congratulated upon their giving the necessary encouragement and assistance in helping to make the movement a success; and

That the farm youth of the State be encouraged to follow the vocation of their parents and ancestors with the full knowledge and thought that tilling the soil is one of man's noblest undertakings; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be made available to the press and a copy forwarded to the President of the United States and to each of the Delaware Representatives in Congress, the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the Honorable J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr., and the Honorable HERBERT B. WARBURTON.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution introduced in the Senate of the Legislature of Pennsylvania by Senators A. H. Letzler and Murray Peelor, relating to the importation of foreign products and the lowering of the standard of living in America.

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

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY SENATORS A. H. LETZLER AND MURRAY PEELOR IN THE SENATE APRIL 15, 1953

Whereas increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms, and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability; and

Whereas the lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our own smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price-cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment; and

Whereas our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions, that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto, lest we become insolvent; and

Whereas pressure that comes from imports of residual fuel oil, having risen from an average of 50 million barrels in the 1946–48 period to more than 125 million in 1952, or the equivalent of 31 million tons of coal; from imports of pottery, watches, and parts, glassware, lace, carpets and other textiles, hats and millinery, chemicals, scientific apparatus, cutlery, dairy products, wall paper, luggage and leather goods, and many other articles, will render the upholding of the economy at its high levels most uncertain and difficult unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus contained; and

Whereas a maximum of such trade results from a prosperous domestic economy freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition: Therefore be it

Resolved (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided in tariff and trade legislation against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standards of our workmen and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that existing trade agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

DEPRESSED MARKET CONDITIONS—RESOLUTIONS OF IDAHO CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, POCATELLO, IDAHO

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the Idaho Cattlemen's Association, at Pocatello, Idaho, April 14, 1953, relating to depressed market conditions, and so forth.

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:

RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE 39TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE IDAHO CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION AT POCATELLO, IDAHO, APRIL 14, 1953

Whereas in the present depressed market conditions, occasional suggestions have come forth that the cattlemen should have support prices on their cattle; and

Whereas the Idaho Cattlemen's Association has traditionally opposed Government handouts and favored a free market without support of ceiling controls on cattle: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we oppose any form of direct Government support or subsidy for our product; and be it further

Resolved, That we heartily endorse the stand of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, on the question of price supports.

CONTROLS

Whereas it is generally conceded that price regulations, by their very existence, have a depressing effect on the prices of cattle and interfere with the process of marketing; and

Whereas the administration has for this reason removed compulsory beef grading and price controls on cattle and beef; and

Whereas any reimposition of such controls on livestock, whether through standby controls or other means, will inevitably interfere with marketing of livestock and the merchandising of its products to the best advantage of the consumer, the producer, the processor, and the retailer; and

Whereas even the existence of legislation authorizing such impositions will have a similar effect: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge our representatives in Congress not to enact price-control legislation in the form of standby controls, or other similar legislation.

WORLD TRADE

Resolved, That the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and equitable competition and must be done within the principle, long maintained, that foreign products produced by cheap foreign labor shall not be admitted to our country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer or stockman, or threaten serious financial injury to a domestic industry.

RESOLUTIONS OF SWIFT COUNTY FARMERS UNION, BENSON, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the Swift County Farmers Union, Benson, Minn., relating to the construction by the Federal Government of electric power-transmission lines, and the title to certain submerged lands.

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

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"To the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY:

"We wish to express our continued support for the construction by the Federal Government of electric power-transmission lines from the hydroelectric plants on the Missouri River to eastern North Dakota and South Dakota, western Minnesota, and northwestern Iowa. In order that cheaper electric power may be available for the growing needs of our rural electric co-op in this area on a fair and equitable basis.

"We, of the farmers union, consider this as necessary legislation, considering that private power is getting too expensive for most low-income families to pay for: Be it herewith

"Resolved, That the locals of the Swift County Farmers Union in meetings assembled sponsor and support same legislation to this effect.

"SWIFT COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
"RAY NASH, *Secretary*."

Ordered to lie on the table:

"To the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY:

"Whereas great petroleum reserves lie off the coast of the United States which should be developed for the benefit of all the people. The United States Supreme Court has heard this case, and has ruled 3 times that oil beyond tidelands belongs to all the 48 States: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Swift County Farmers Union in meetings assembled do hereby express our opposition to all efforts to transfer to the States any of the existing rights of the Federal Government in oil resources beyond the tidelands; and we sincerely urge our representatives in Congress to work and fight to retain the present status of the offshore-oil rights as ruled by the Supreme Court.

"SWIFT COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
"RAY NASH, *Secretary*."

TIDELANDS OIL—TELEGRAM FROM INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS, LOCAL 49, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a telegram from the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 49, St. Paul, Minn., relating to the tidelands oil legislation.

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

ST. PAUL, *April 16, 1953*.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
140 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Action was taken by the membership of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local No. 49, totaling approximately 6,000 to go on record as opposing any legislation giving tidelands oil to any individual State.

L. J. GOUGH,
President, IUOE, Local No. 49.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1413. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 169).

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

S. Res. 89. Resolution to study juvenile delinquency in the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 170); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 171).

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

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Anny Del Curto (Rept. No. 172);

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Toni Anne Simmons (Hitomi Urasaki) (Rept. No. 173);

S. 207. A bill for the relief of Jimy Okuda (Rept. No. 174);

S. 226. A bill for the relief of Keiko Tashiro (Rept. No. 175);

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Georgia Andrews (Rept. No. 176);

S. 448. A bill for the relief of William Junior Jami and Sachiko Suwa (Rept. No. 177);

S. 607. A bill for the relief of Thomas Dale Fawcett (George Yamamoto) (Rept. No. 178);

S. 674. A bill for the relief of Kikue Tsurukawa (Rept. No. 179);

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Teresa Lee Tipton (Kinuko Sakai) (Rept. No. 180);

S. 1147. A bill for the relief of Karen Ruth Bauman (Rept. No. 181);

S. 1228. A bill for the relief of Patric Dorian Patterson (Rept. No. 182);

S. 1389. A bill for the relief of Ami Hanada (Margaret Ami McClung) (Rept. No. 183);

S. 1390. A bill for the relief of Ann Marie Longworth and John Francis Longworth (Rept. No. 184);

S. 1418. A bill for the relief of Linda Marlene Kolachny (Mariko Furue) (Rept. No. 185);

H. R. 688. A bill for the relief of Takako Niina (Rept. No. 186);

H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann) (Rept. No. 187);

H. R. 884. A bill for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey (Rept. No. 188);

H. R. 886. A bill for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi (Rept. No. 189);

H. R. 955. A bill for the relief of Paula Akiyama (Rept. No. 190);

H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary (Rept. No. 191);

H. R. 1186. A bill for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez (Rept. No. 192);

H. R. 1193. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley (Rept. No. 193);

H. R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr. (Rept. No. 194);

H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki (Rept. No. 195);

H. R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat (Rept. No. 196);

H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter (Rept. No. 197); and

H. R. 2624. A bill for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford (Rept. No. 198).

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

S. 228. A bill for the relief of Irene Ezitis (Rept. No. 199); and

S. 383. A bill for the relief of Francisca Egurrola (Rept. No. 200).

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

H. R. 731. A bill for the relief of James Rennick Moffett (Rept. No. 201);

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 202); and

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 203).

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 204) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

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

[redacted], Aaron, Joseph Louis or Joseph Luis Aaron.

[redacted], Ackerman, Carolina McDowell or Carolina Peralta or Carolina Peralta McDowell or Carolina McDowell.

[redacted], Amso, Khalid Iskander alias John Amso.

[redacted], Anderson, George Newton.

[redacted], Atteyeh, Zehia Najm or Victoria Atteyeh.

[redacted] Bain, Kenneth Bruce.

[redacted] Beard, Harold Edwin.

[redacted], Bell, Joseph Lee.

[redacted], Ben-Kiki, Salomon or Shlomo.

[redacted], Borenstein, Dyna or Dyna Bernstein (nee Kozuchowicz).

[redacted], Bradaschia, Alberta or Alberta Bradaschia Hatch.

[redacted], Brando, Antonio.

[redacted], Browne, Sam.

[redacted], Bulieris, Nick.

[redacted], Cantu-Ornelia, Tomas.

[redacted], Carlson, Mary Theodora or Mary Theodora Rawlence.

[redacted], Carnegie, Gladys Lucille Campbell.

[redacted] Chen, Kuang Tsao or Joe K. Chen.

[redacted], Mun, Chiew Chen or Mun Chiew Chen.

[redacted], Chu, Phoebe Fei.

[redacted] Colohan, Mary.

[redacted], Costakis, Michael Zacharias.

[redacted] D'Amico, Italo.

[redacted] De Balle, Carmen Esparas Viuda.

[redacted], Di Cola, Giuseppe Schiano.

[redacted], De Grace, Clifford.

[redacted], De Guoy, Suzanne Elizabeth or Suzanne Philipine Pulig.

[redacted], De Iglesias, Francesca Villamil (nee Duran).

[redacted], De Licon, Josefa Corral or Josefa Corral.

[redacted], Denes, Mary Ann.

[redacted], Dominguez, Lauro or Lara Dominguez or Lauro Dominguz.

[redacted] Dono Avelino Dglesias or Avelino Iglesias or Avellino Iglesias.

[redacted], Dorducoff, Carl.

[redacted], Durand, Lucion.

[redacted], Fernandez, Maria Antonia Gelpi y Diaz Fernandez.

[redacted], Fernandez, Roberto Boluffer or Roberta Bolufer Fernandez or Roberta Fernandez.

[redacted], Fischer, Alexander or Alex Fischer.

[redacted] Formoso, Domingo (Gonzalez).

[redacted], Fornalewicz, Stanley Francis or Stanley Francis Foreman or Stanley Francis Kwiatkowski.

[redacted], Fortier, Albert Arthur or Joseph Jean Baptiste Albert Arthur Fortier or Albert Fortier.

[redacted], Foster, William Molson or William Marshall Farrell.

[redacted] Franye, Miriam Gwenda.

[redacted], Garneau, Arline Marie (nee Pare or Perry).

[redacted], Geddes, Eileen Melvin or Eileen Morgan or Eileen McFadden.

[redacted], Geier, Wilhelm Herman.

[redacted], Geli, Josephine Alvarez.

[redacted] Georgieff, Anna (Gheorgieff) (nee Hrankova).

[redacted] Gesso, Ugo Del.

[redacted], Gill, Caroline Beatrice (nee Caroline McLean.

[redacted], Giordano, Bianca Rosa (nee Nocerino or Bianca Rea).

[redacted], Girdharry, Reginald Oswald.

[redacted], Gitter, Reinhold Curt.

[redacted], Grbin, Liberat or Liberat Gribin.

[redacted], Haghani, Parvin.

[redacted], Harocopos, George Dimitre.

[redacted], Henriques, Oscar.

[redacted], Herrera, Fernandez Rodriquez or Fernanda Herrera-Rodriguez.

[redacted] Herrera, Argelia Rodriguez, or Argelia Herrera-Rodriguez.

[redacted], Hill, Katharina Anna (nee Turner).

[redacted], Huie, Gladys Moy.

[redacted] Huie, Moy Ling.

[redacted], Ilicin, Sandor or Alexander Ilicin.

[redacted] Jessel, Enrique De Alba or Henry Jessel.

[redacted], Jones, Joan Lee.

[redacted], Karagovalis, Nicolas Lemony.

[redacted], Kastrinakis, Maria Panagiotis.

[redacted], Kolley, Edith May (nee Valkenier).

[redacted], Koo, Freeman or Freeman Fuchang Koo.

[redacted], Koo, Edith Tsai.

[redacted], Lafayette, Stanford.

[redacted], Liang, Ping Yee.

[redacted] Liang, Alice Kao (nee Alice Shih Hsien Kao or Shih Hsien Kao).

[redacted], Lin, Yip Sho or Julia Yip Tong.

[redacted], Liu, Tso-Chow.

[redacted], Lowry, Kathryn.

[redacted], Luksch, Andreas.

[redacted], Makovsky, Frantisek or Frank Makovski.

[redacted], Malone, Annie Woods, formerly Lyons (nee Woods or Higgins).

[redacted], Markantonatos, Nester.

[redacted] Marks, Helen Korakis (nee Helen Aristotelis Koarkis).

[redacted] Martelle, Theresa (nee Theresa Guay).

[redacted] Matheson, Flora Gilchrist.

[redacted], Martinez-Castaneda, Felix.

[redacted], McKenzie, Herman Augustus or "Rhod."

[redacted], Meeuwissen, Jacobus F.

[redacted], Mekjian, Massis or Movses Makkajian or Mike Nakjian.

[redacted], Miah, Aflak or Akbar Mohamed.

[redacted] Minardi, Emanuele.

[redacted], Modny, Nikoloj or Nick Modny alias Joe Pastuszenko.

[redacted] Moy, Harry May or Harry Kasim.

[redacted], Muniz, Stella or Estrella Muniz (nee Iglesias).

[redacted], Negro, Giovanni.

[redacted], Nepil, Jessie Chatman.

[redacted], Nevarez, Maria Lidia Nieves or Minerva G. Nevarez or Maria Lidia Romo or Maria Lidia Hernandez (nee Maria Nieves Lidia Hernandez).

[redacted], Nuzzo, Antonio or Tony Nuzzo.

[redacted], Orellana, Francisco or Francisco Beltran Orellana.

[redacted], Osley, Christna (see Foltin).

[redacted], Paap, Antonie Herbert.

[redacted], Panagis, Efstathios or Efstathios Panos or Stathis Penogis or Stathis Panos.

[redacted], Papa, Gaetano.

[redacted] Parker, Elizabeth Claras or Claris or Clarice (nee Butt or Betty).

[redacted] Perrotta, Ernesta Ilda.

[redacted], Pervanidis, Leonidas or Leonides Pervandis or Louis Pervandis.

[redacted] Pichardo, Maria del Carmen Villegas Calvo.

[redacted], Pilotti, Sisto.

[redacted], Pirak, Hirell Mary or Hirell Mary Williams.

[redacted], Pizzimenti, Cristoforo.

[redacted] Prapas, Ionnis or John Athanisou or Ioannis Athanasiou Prapas.

[redacted], Preciado, Maria Gloria or Gloria Preciado, or Gloria Ravago Preciado.

[redacted], Quagliata, Pietro Joseph.

[redacted], Quinones, Iris Iglesias.

[redacted], Rapanos, Pamaquiatiz Andreou or Pete Rapanos Andrews.
[redacted], Rasmussen, Carl or Carl Adolph Kreutzfeldt.
[redacted], Retrain, Pierre Paul.
[redacted], Rintchen, Adam Adolf.
[redacted], Ristich, Bozidar or Bozidar Ristitsch.
[redacted], Robatscher, Johann Heinrich or John Henry Depew.
[redacted], Roberts, Ertie Helen formerly Schauer (nee Turpin).
[redacted], Rock, Margaret Anderson (nee Lawrence).
[redacted], Fernandez, Ada Pilar Alonso Y or Ada Rodriguez.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Evelio Pena.
[redacted], Rossiter, Esther Elizabeth (nee Sondergaard).
[redacted] Sabatelli, Andrea Ranella.
[redacted], Saliba, Helene Elias.
[redacted], Salas-Salik, Maria Teresa.
[redacted], Sandate, Ambrosio.
[redacted], Mani, Josefa or Josefa Mani de Sandate.
[redacted], Sandoval, Jesus Maria Zapata.
[redacted], Scafidi, Maria Lombardo (nee Maria Lombardo).
[redacted], Schermerhorn, Angelita Odulio.
[redacted], Sefcik, Frantiska (Frances).
[redacted], Semedo, John Moreira.
[redacted], Servin-Maya, Manuel Silvestre or Delfino Madrono Velasquez.
[redacted], Shen, Chao Lin or Leo Shen.
[redacted], Shen, Mei Yu (nee Mei Yu Kuo).
[redacted], Sigala-Munoz, Francisco.
[redacted], Sims, Stephen A. or Stephen Augustus Simms or Stephen A. Simms.
[redacted], Spampanato, Paolino or Aophonse Cadabrese or Aophonse Cacabrese.
[redacted], Stanimiroff, Reina Vanko.
[redacted], Stasinowsky, Rudolf Gustave Wilhelm.
[redacted], Stephenson, Ison George.
[redacted], Stollop, Esther (nee Schinazi).
[redacted], Szender, Bela or Bela Aldebert Szender or Gedalia Szender.
[redacted], Tabella, Enrichetta (nee Di Pietrantonio).
[redacted], Vela, Jose Ramon.
[redacted], Voight, Agnes Kirsten formerly Hansen (nee Schiellerup or Agnes Knice Larson).
[redacted], Vonikis, Anthy (nee Pitilaki).
[redacted], Voskidis, Theodore John or Voskides or Voshides.
[redacted], Vuoso, Aniello.
[redacted], Vuskovich, Marin or Mario Marin Vuckovich or Marino Vuskovich.
[redacted], Walker, Samuel Lureon or Jonathan Waterman.
[redacted] Watanabe, Hikomune.
[redacted] Wei, Luy or Wei Luy.
[redacted], Wilson, Helena Altagracia.
[redacted], Wint, Cecil Theodore.
[redacted], Wong, Ah.
[redacted], Yu, Shao Chi.
[redacted], Yu, Shao Chen.
[redacted], Zaferopoulous, Sophia G. or Sophia Zaferopoulos (nee Palapanibou).
[redacted], Zito, Luigi.
[redacted], Zournitzes, Anna.
[redacted] Zuczek, Jan Sylvester.
[redacted], Acevedo, Teodoro Juvenal Tovet or Teodoro Juvenal Jovet Acevedo or Juvenal Jovet Acevedo.
[redacted], Agarwal, Jagdish Chandra.
[redacted], Alamo, Frances Francisca Gonzalez.
[redacted], Amiri, Leon Barukh.
[redacted], Angell, William Donald Henry.
[redacted], Auriemma, Silvio or Sylvia Auriemma or Silvio D. Auriemma or Silvio Aueriemma.
[redacted], Barba, Antonio.
[redacted], Barnett, Bertram Leopold alias Albert Lobbom or Lobbon.
[redacted] Bauseler, August.
[redacted], Benvenuti, Angelo.
[redacted] Binternagel, Alfred or Fred Nagel.
[redacted], Black, Wilfred Constantine.
[redacted] Blonqvist, Waldamar or Waldemar or William Blonquist or Bloomquist alias Charles Hill or Charles Oscar Hill or Charles E. Hill.
[redacted], Boccanfuso, Luigi or Louis Boccanfuso.
[redacted], Bodner, Naftali alias Nathan Bodner.
[redacted], Bodner, Maria (nee Wasser).
[redacted], Borges, Fabio Augusto Eschalante.
[redacted], Bosotina, Tome or Toma or Tom Basotina.
[redacted], Boss, Karl Heinrich.
[redacted], Brokke, Cornelis Jacobus or "Cees" or C. Y. Brokke.
[redacted], Bronner, Otto Robert alias Otto Brunner alias Oskar Rudolf Bronner alias Jacob Hoffman.
[redacted], Bullough, Elizabeth alias Lillian Bullough.
[redacted] Byer, Louis Ernest.
[redacted], Campbell, Adolphus.
[redacted], Carrillo, Bruno.
[redacted] Cartwright, Harcourt Lemorn.
[redacted], Cavalieri, Lucia Teresa formerly Menzel (nee Papasso).
[redacted], Chen, Jean Ting or Mary-Jean Vung-Hwa Ting.
[redacted], Ching, Chin Shew or Shew Ching Chin now Chin Ginn.
[redacted], Chow, Ah Kin or Ah Kin Chu or Ah Kin Chow Yuan.
[redacted], Chow, Wah.
[redacted] Choy, Cheung.
[redacted], Chu, Charles Chi-Jung or Chi-Jung Chu or Charles J. Chu.
[redacted], Cirillo, Francesco or Frank Cirillo or Jack Cirillo.
[redacted], Clark, Lester.
[redacted], Clarke, Esther Amanda formerly Draggan (nee Vernon).
[redacted] Colias, Angelo or Evangelos Koliaroudis.
[redacted], Crawford, Hertha Asta (nee Koeppen).
[redacted], Crawford, Beatrix Doris formerly Koeppen.
[redacted], Cruz, Avelino Manuel.
[redacted], Cruz, Jaime Quiason or Jimmy Cruz.
[redacted], Cutri, Giuseppe or Joseph Cutri.
[redacted], Davis, Charles Norman or Jack Charles Davis.
[redacted], DeAlessandri, Luigi.
[redacted], DeAngelis, Joseph or Giuseppe DeAngelis.
[redacted], De Carrizalez, Angelina Garcia.
[redacted], Demopoulos, Pete or Pete Demas.
[redacted], Djado, Lenus Louse.
[redacted], Donna, Ciro Di.
[redacted], Duncan, Clifford Uriah alias James H. Heron or Herron.
[redacted], Duran, Julio Martinez or Julio M. Duran.
[redacted], Eredita, Filippo.
[redacted], Eskenas, Victoria or Victorias Levi or Levy.
[redacted], Falzone, Arcangelo alias Angelo Falzone.
[redacted], Ferguson, Joyce Irene (nee Castle).
[redacted], Fierro, Felix.
[redacted], Fierro, Angela.
[redacted], Fierro, Alejandro.
[redacted], Gabbay, Jacob Noonoo.
[redacted], Garcia, Heriberto Llagostera y.
[redacted], Garcia-Santiago, Santos.
[redacted], Garcia, Paula Lozano de.
[redacted], Garim, Henrique David Fernandez.
[redacted], Georgiafentis, Michael Ioannis.
[redacted], Gerner, Balthazar or Bill Gerner.
[redacted], Gianino, Domenico M.
[redacted], Giovanopoulos, Athanasios.
[redacted], Goldhammer, Renee formerly Ronai (nee Regina Rezsin Roth).
[redacted], Gomez, Jose alias Jose Gomez y Cantero.
[redacted], Gonzalez-Ramos, Jose.
[redacted] Goskin, Hudson or Hudson Gaskin.
[redacted], Grey, Doris Arlene.
[redacted], Hall, Charles Vanderbilt or Victor Hall or Charles Hall.
[redacted], Hanke, Kurt George.
[redacted], Harms, William.
[redacted], Hartanian, Dero or Hartinian.
[redacted], Hartanian, Sarah or Seranoosh Hartanian (nee Kupenian or Afarian).
[redacted], Heim, Stanley Harasim.
[redacted], Heng, Fong or Fang Heng.
[redacted], Hernandez-Avila Gonzalo.
[redacted], Hernandez, Tovar, Jesus.
[redacted], Hirai, Harumitsu.
[redacted], Hoglund, Kristina Elizabeth K.
[redacted], Howard, Emma alias Emma Josephine Klein (nee Zoeller).
[redacted], Hurdle, Alexander Rudolph.
[redacted], Hurtado-Alejandro, Isabel.
[redacted] Gallardo-Gonzalez, Maria Natividad alias Natividad Ybarra.
[redacted], Hurtado-Gallardo, Ruben.
[redacted], Hurtado-Gallardo, Miguel.
[redacted] Hymowitz, Sophie formerly Sophie Avrutik (nee Sophie Nedner).
[redacted], Ito, Kenjiro.
[redacted] Jacome-Sanchez, Jorge alias Roberto Sanchez-Barrera.
[redacted], Jerome, Nick or Nicola Di Girolamo.
[redacted], Kallenbach, Rudolf Werner.
[redacted], Kania, Julian.
[redacted], Kariotis, Demetrios George alias James Pappas.
[redacted], Karistianos, Ioannis Antonios alias John Karistianos.
[redacted], Kaszuba, Stefan.
[redacted], Kendall, Beatrice Paule (nee Pellitti).
[redacted], Keuker, Frances Else Siemsen.
[redacted], Khalil, Joseph or Joe Khalil, or Joseph Cahil or Joseph Cahil or Joseph Kahill or Joseph Khalill.
[redacted], Kirpalani, Mohan Santdas.
[redacted], Kokorelis, Demitrios George.
[redacted], Koutroukis, Athansios or Tom.
[redacted], Kouzounis, Smara.
[redacted], Kwan, Cho Shun or C. S. Kwan or Cho Snun Kuan.
[redacted], Kwan, Margaret Mo-Hing or Margaret Kwan (nee Margaret Ho-Hing Yeung).
[redacted] Kypreos, Zaharias E. or Zaharias Ephemius Kypreos.
[redacted], Lamela, Jose.
[redacted] Lampert, Tadersz.
[redacted] Leberman, Solomon or Solomon Greenbaum.
[redacted], Lee, Wah or Lee Wah.
[redacted], Levitan, Ryfka alias Beatrice Levitan alias Reba Rosenberg.
[redacted], Loo, Ah Ping.
[redacted], Lorenz, Anna or Anne Catherine Lorenz or Annie Lawrence.
[redacted] Lorenzetti, Livio.
[redacted], Loureiro, Felzia Bettencourt Sancho.
[redacted], Luci, Maria (nee Ambesi).
[redacted] Lum, Mun Kit alias Lin Wen Cheich.
[redacted] Mahovtas, John Evangelo or Ioannis Evangelo Mahovtas.
[redacted], Margitic, Daniel Vladimir.
[redacted], Martin, Joseph Marks.
[redacted], Martin, Eva.
[redacted], Martinez, Roberto or Roberto Morales.
[redacted], Martinolich, John.
[redacted] Matyskiel, Sophia.
[redacted], Mavridis, Sotirios or Sotirios Themistocles Mavridis.
[redacted], Nakawatase, Tatsuo.
[redacted], Nanos, Harry Christos or Hariloas Christos Nanos or Harry Christ Nick Harris or Nick Harris.
[redacted], Norcia, Michele or Michael or Michael Prestigiacomo or James Milone.
[redacted], Norcia, Rosalia Mustacchia or Rosalia Mustacchia or Margherita Mustacchia.

[redacted], Novelli, Gino.
[redacted], Mendes, Paaixano or Paxao Mendes.
[redacted], Meyer, Majer or Mayer Spatz.
[redacted], Meyer, Nanno.
[redacted], Millarson, Leonard Paul or Leonard P. Millarson.
[redacted], Mohamed, Dost.
[redacted], Moraglis, Michaelis Stefanos.
[redacted], Munter, Johann Karl Bernard alias Bernard Werner.
[redacted], Olivares-Saucedo, Angel or Juan Montanez or Angel Olivares.
[redacted], Omlie, Ricardina Lozano (nee Cacho).
[redacted], Opitz, Paul Rudolf.
[redacted], Ortega, Alfonso or Alfonso Ortega Marin.
[redacted], Ortiz, Monina Dones or Monina Dones de Ortiz.
[redacted], Ostolaza, Edith Cortez alias Edith Cortez Cortez or Edith Cortez Heredia.
[redacted], Ozyurt, Muhittin.
[redacted], Ozyurt, Perihan.
[redacted], Pahk, Karl Friedrich.
[redacted], Pai, Hua Shen or Livy Hua.
[redacted], Hua, Lily Kuh Veng Chao or Kuh Ving Chao.
[redacted], Palmer, Sara alias Sadie Palmer.
[redacted] Papiannou, Vasilios or William Basil.
[redacted], Parascandolo, Salvatore.
[redacted], Pearson, Mary (nee Aune Maria Vassi or Mary Vassi).
[redacted], Perez, David Cobb.
[redacted], Peterson, Axel Wilhelm or Axel Vilhelm Petterson or Axel William Peterson.
[redacted], Pineault, Laureat or Andre Albert Laureat Pineault.
[redacted] (1), Planchart, Carlotta Patricia.
[redacted] (2), Planchart, Anthony Delano.
[redacted], Prete, Aldo Del.
[redacted], Psichoulis, Dimitrios.
[redacted], Puglionisi, Orazio alias Harry Puglionisi.
[redacted], Reid, Cristeta.
[redacted], Rivera-Torres, Manuel.
[redacted], Rocha, Pablino.
[redacted], Martinez, Maria.
[redacted], Rodas-Shaw, Guillermo Ricardo.
[redacted], Ruggiero, Giovanni or John.
[redacted], Sabattini, Mario Enrico.
[redacted], Sabourin, John Ambrose.
[redacted], Sahrten, Otto Arthur.
[redacted], Salas, Enrique Valdavia.
[redacted], Samaha, Khalil.
[redacted], Sameshima, Hideshi or Hideshi Samejima.
[redacted], Sarantis, Pantelis G.
[redacted], Schiraldi, Maria Rosaria (nee Politano alias Rosaria M. Politano or Maria Rosaria Politano Schiraldi).
[redacted], Schulze, Johann Gustav.
[redacted], Schwarz, Alter or Schwarc.
[redacted] Seemann, Rudolf Christian Johannes.
[redacted], Seemann, Gertraut Luise.
[redacted], Seemann, Johannes Wilhelm.
[redacted], Sinodinos, Spiros.
[redacted], Slatwinski, Lucrecia (nee Lucrecia Sanchez).
[redacted] Smith, Maria Luisa.
[redacted], Solomon, Theresa Talmadge (nee Theresa Naftaly Assayas or Theresa Naftaly Talmadge).
[redacted] Soon, Eng Hung alias Toby Eng.
[redacted], Spielmann, Frederic Bedrich.
[redacted], Spielmann, Lieselotte.
[redacted], Syriopoulos, Constantine.
[redacted], Tang, Seetoo Ngan.
[redacted], Tartaras, Constanino Eftimiou.
[redacted], Teshima, Hisashi.
[redacted], Theirault, Sigrid Waltraut (nee Pfeiffer).
[redacted] Thomas, Marie Louis Denise (nee Minos).
[redacted], Tolberg, Thomas Edward.
[redacted], Torres-Puga, Rutilio or Rutilio Puga-Torres.
[redacted], Tow, Li Cho alias Luk Tow or Hing Seam Wong.
[redacted], Tse, Oi Ming.
[redacted], Vasko, Frank alias John Lang.
[redacted], Vasquez, Juan alias Juan Manuel Vasquez y Santos.
[redacted], Vecina, Iremio.
[redacted], Venidis, Nicholas or Nikolaos Venidis.
[redacted], Victoriano, Severino Sangil.
[redacted] Villegas-Arango, Alberto.
[redacted], Vlavianu, Michael.
[redacted], Waldman, Katherine Ruth (nee Moor or Moore).
[redacted], Walthery, Franz Maurice Marie.
[redacted], Wang, Kung Shou.
[redacted], Wang, Lucy Shou.
[redacted], Ward, Gertrude May (nee Bessie Gertrude Hatton formerly Johnston formerly Wiseman).
[redacted] Welch, Gerald Oscar Darlington or Gerald Olde.
[redacted], White, Albert or Bela Weisz.
[redacted], Wick, Oscar Albert.
[redacted], Wizenfeld, Szmul Najer.
[redacted], Wizenfeld, Dina.
[redacted], Wong, Chai Bong alias Edward Goon alias William Wong.
[redacted] Wong, Hing.
[redacted], Wu, Ching Te or Carl Ching Te Wu.
[redacted], Wu, Annie Chen Hua or Nee Yang.
[redacted], Yantsis, Evangelos Soterios or Vangels Sotir Yantsis.
[redacted], Yasa, Nikola Yakov or Nikola Jasa.
[redacted], Yuen, Wai Loo or Wai Loo Sung or Woo Nei Lu.
[redacted], Yureklier, Iskender.
[redacted], Zaccarelli, Gianfianco or Gianfranco Mandrelli.
[redacted], Zaccarelli, Pier Giorgio or Pier Giorgio Mandrelli.
[redacted], Zaimas, Nicholas or Nicholas John Zaimas formerly Nicholaos or Nicholos Ioanou Zaimas alias Nicola John Nick.
[redacted], Zazzera, Yolanda or Maria Chiesa or Iolanda Mazza.
[redacted], Abraham, Angela Mahbub (nee Zeidan).
[redacted], Aguilera y Julve, George Segundo.
[redacted], Amin, Nural.
[redacted], Antzakas, Angelo Augustus.
[redacted], Arguinano-Sarri, Antonio Maria Pedro.
[redacted], Arreola, Miguel.
[redacted], August David Lewis.
[redacted], Bakal, Rose.
[redacted], Beattie, Ursual Gwendolyn formerly Slack (nee Ryan).
[redacted], Blees, Johann.
[redacted], Braun, Anna Maria (nee Kaumbach or Grohs).
[redacted], Bulmer, Yta (nee Yebizawa).
[redacted], Caccamo, Philip Joseph.
[redacted], Carrillo, Antonio Nunez.
[redacted], Carrillo, Juan Brigido or John Brigido Carrillo Androve.
[redacted], Cavaioli, Elizabeth McKenna formerly Elizabeth Miller Matezie (nee Elizabeth Miller McLean McKenna).
[redacted], Celli, Nemmo Ciccone.
[redacted], Chai, Young Kow.
[redacted], Chang, Yuen.
[redacted], Chen, Huan Yung.
[redacted], Chen, Suzy Chin-Sheng Wang.
[redacted], Chin, Dot.
[redacted], Cicero, Nicolo Lo.
[redacted], Crosthwaite, Tatians Eugene formerly Tatiana Pavlichenko.
[redacted], Decandia, Spiro.
[redacted], De Torres, Braulia Lira (nee Braulia Lira-Paz).
[redacted], Dilalos, Georgios Aristidis.
[redacted], Dimeglio, Giuseppina.
[redacted], Dominguez, Amelia (nee Legaspi alias Barbara Pla).
[redacted], Dudine, Joseph.
[redacted], Duffy, Catherine Mary.
[redacted], Dulka, Pauline (nee Zadoreska).
[redacted], Estrada-Ojeda, Benito.
[redacted], Farese, Antonio.
[redacted], Fernandez, Jose or Ralph G. Fernandez or Jose Carlos Manuel Fernandez-Gonzalez.
[redacted], Fiallo-Suazo, Luis Omar.
[redacted], De Fiallo, Carmela Tavares.
[redacted], Flores-Arredondo, Tomas.
[redacted], Fortunis, Athena Louis or Athina Michael Nicholopoulou, or Athena Fortunes or Athena Adams.
[redacted] Gall, Stephen John.
[redacted], Gee, Chin.
[redacted], Gong, Hoy Sing alias Gong Hoy Sing alias Hay Sing Gong.
[redacted], Grego, Umberto or Umberto Greco.
[redacted], Guidici, Louis or Luigi Zudich.
[redacted] Guishard, James Selwin.
[redacted], Harangi, Laszlo.
[redacted], Harangi, Antonia (nee Yuhasz).
[redacted], Hartman, Otto Frank or Otto Franz Hartman.
[redacted], Hernandez, Hector Ruiz or Hector Ruiz.
[redacted], Houle, Thomas or Hull or Hall.
[redacted], Hymans, Eugene Henry.
[redacted], Jabalera, Eustacia Marta.
[redacted], Jiminez-Romero, Leonardo.
[redacted], Kolodny, Anna.
[redacted], Kuong, Yung Po.
[redacted] Lai, Fred Wing or Lai Wing Lai or Lai Wing Fook.
[redacted], Lafkas, Efstathios Kostas or Steve Lafkas.
[redacted], Lajacona, Gilda Margaret (nee Geltrude Salamone).
[redacted], Lee, Jack or Wah Jack Youngh.
[redacted], Leon, Maria Rincon y Padilla.
[redacted], Lin, Ho Kwin alias Harry Ho.
[redacted], Lomibao, Socorro Zenaida.
[redacted], Loy, Yip Sing alias Frank Loy.
[redacted], Lukanowski, Paul.
[redacted], MacKenzie, John.
[redacted], Madrigal-Mejia, Miguel.
[redacted] Magalhaes, Manuel Piereira.
[redacted], Mango, Attilio.
[redacted], Mayer, Alex.
[redacted], Mihalitsis, Constantinos alias Constantinos Mihailidis or Gus Mihalidis.
[redacted], Mireles, Eugenia or Eugenia Mireles Diaz, or Engenia Mireses-Nava.
[redacted], Modica, Salvatore.
[redacted], Montoya, Adolfo or Adolfo Montoya-Salazar.
[redacted], Muskardin, John alias Giovanni Muskardin or Ivan Muskardin.
[redacted], Nathanielsz, Edward Basil.
[redacted], Nathanielsz, Ault Mellor.
[redacted], Nieh, Ching HsiaChange or Ching Hsia Chang alias Helen Chang or Elaine C. Nieh.
[redacted], Nieh, Edward Kwangpoo.
[redacted] Palho, Edward or Eljas Polho.
[redacted], Panos, Peter or Panagiotis Tsilipanos or Tsilimbanis.
[redacted], Papalexatos, Spiros.
[redacted], Papvasiliou, Sotiris.
[redacted], Paris, Ferdinand John.
[redacted], Patselas, George.
[redacted], Pena, Jose Angel.
[redacted], Pietranera, Ivo.
[redacted], Prado, Jose or Jose Prado Teijido.
[redacted], Raimonde, Giovanni alias John Raymond.
[redacted], Renda, Giuseppe.
[redacted] Rodriguez, Aurora (nee Pena Rivas).
[redacted] Romer, Joseph.
[redacted], Sakowitz, Peter or Sakozitch.
[redacted], Sang, Lee Fook or Song.
[redacted], Satoyoshi, Yahei.
[redacted], Seglem, Thoralf.
[redacted], Shurry, Vibert or Vibart Shury alias Thomas Simons.
[redacted], Siefert, Rose (nee Zachgruber alias Riedl).
[redacted], Speranzo, Luigi.

[redacted], Suarez-Perez, Napoleon or Miguel Suarez-Perez.
[redacted], Tang, Ching Tsien.
[redacted], Thanh, Nguyen Duc.
[redacted], Theodorakis, Stavros or Steve Theodorakis.
[redacted], Tinker, Mae Eloise or Mae Eloise Souchon.
[redacted], Tong, Cheung King of Jimmy Jong or Charles Cheung or King Tong Chong or Charles King or James King.
[redacted], Tung, Chen-Dao.
[redacted], Tung, Doreen.
[redacted], Vandoros, John.
[redacted], Walcott, Frank Murril or Walcot.
[redacted], Wazumi, Minoru or Minoru Joe Wazumi or Joe Minoru Mazumi.
[redacted], Weinberger, Erwin.
[redacted], Weissman, Samuel.
[redacted], Weston, Charles Henry.
[redacted], Wong, Yet-Wee or Wong Yut Wee.
[redacted], Wroclawski, Amelia (nee Urbanski).
[redacted], Zinovieff, Vladimir Alexei.
[redacted], Asheo, Samuel.
[redacted], Bryce, Lucille Adessa Douglin (nee Lucille Adessa Louglin) alias Lucille Bryce or Brice alias Margaret Louise Jackson.
[redacted], Dames, Henry J.
[redacted], Doerfler, Philipp.
[redacted], Foster, Raymond Leroy.
[redacted], Godfrey, Thomas Waring.
[redacted], Godfrey, Alice Laura (nee Blackwell).
[redacted], Hing, Seto.
[redacted], Kraak, Erich Adolf.
[redacted], Lauh, Welthy Shao-Chin or Welthy Carges.
[redacted], Leong, Chiu King or Arthur Chu or Hai Sing.
[redacted], Lopez, Maria Emilia Rajo Alvirez or Emilia Lopez.
[redacted], Meguerdichian, Haigaz alias Haikaz Mkurtichian.
[redacted], Norton, Swidbert Harry or Harry Naughton.
[redacted], Peterkin, Eglon James or James Pearson or Pierson.
[redacted], Ravalico, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Schuelein, Bertha.
[redacted], Tassmere, Aurelia Mae.
[redacted], Aguillon-Garcia, Vicente Lazaro.
[redacted], Altieri, Vincenzo.
[redacted], Andersen, Alf Harding.
[redacted], Ashby, Isabella.
[redacted], Ashby, Arthur Raymond.
[redacted], Ashby, Ethel Mary.
[redacted], Bak, Nip or Nick Back.
[redacted], Bauer, Max Peter or Max Sernatinger.
[redacted], Biggio, Eduardo Edward.
[redacted], Blank, Harry or Harry Blane.
[redacted], Bogleff, Anton.
[redacted], Castillo, Gladys (nee Gladys Walsh Bonilla).
[redacted], Catalfamo, Andrea or Catalfano.
[redacted], Cimino, Rosa Guida (nee Rutilio or Rosa Guido Botolio).
[redacted], Conte, Antonina (nee Antonina Conti).
[redacted], Cuiman, Teodoro.
[redacted], De Angelis, Francesco.
[redacted], De Carrasco, Ignacia Pena.
[redacted], De Falco, Giovanni.
[redacted], De Freitas, John.
[redacted], Deguchi, Keiko (nee Eda).
[redacted], Duck, Cheror Hsich-Ti or Hsieh-Ti.
[redacted], Du Luart, Else Olivia.
[redacted], Du Luart, Evelyn Rose.
[redacted], Durlacher, Annie David.
[redacted], Echeverria, Mario Rene.
[redacted], Economou, Theofanis Constantinou.
[redacted], Eivosic, Sime Vink or Sam Ivosich.
[redacted], Engel, Alfred or Jack Keey or Alfred Jacob Beckman.
[redacted], Febus, Betty Gradl.
[redacted], Fei, Tung-Chia or Katherine Fei (nee Sheng).
[redacted], Froberg, Bo Edgar.
[redacted], Ganotis, Nicholas Demetrios.
[redacted], Giordano, Mary or Maria (nee Mammola).
[redacted], Gonzalez-Padilla, Ildefonso.
[redacted], Haguel, Rosita (nee Tabah or Belmonte).
[redacted], Hall, Simone Marie Eugenie (nee Merlin).
[redacted], Himot, Lucile (nee Fox or Lucile Yablochnick or Niusia Yablochnick).
[redacted], Holley, Margot Winawer (nee Margaret Winawer or Margot Peterson).
[redacted], Holmes, Maria Mercides (nee Velazco).
[redacted], Intriago, Amado Benigno.
[redacted], Jogewest, Ewald Bernhard or Ewald Bernhard West or Ewald West or Jorgewest Ewald or Evald Bernhardt Jogevest; Jagewest; Jogeveste; Jorqwest, Jorgwest; Jorgewest; Joegewest; Jogewist, Jorquest.
[redacted], Johnson, Ellen Louise (nee Ness).
[redacted], Josefowitz, Ziche or Zishe Jozefovicz.
[redacted], Joseph, Ann Margaret (nee Bolles).
[redacted], Kanellos, Elefterios.
[redacted], Katsuki, Takashi.
[redacted], Kerrinis, Frederich Jakob.
[redacted], Kerrinnis, Miriam.
[redacted], King, Lau.
[redacted], King, Lloyd Beresford or Octavius N. Robinson.
[redacted], Kressevich, Pietro.
[redacted], Kulman, Alexander or Paul Bikow or Alexander Sprogis.
[redacted], Liao, Ping Ling.
[redacted], Lieberman, Mollie.
[redacted], Ling, Clara S. (nee Szeto or Clara Soo-Hoo Ling or Clara Szeto Soo-Hoo Ling).
[redacted], Lopez, Eduardo.
[redacted], Lopez, Paulina.
[redacted], Lopez, Eduardo Miguel.
[redacted], Lopez, Manuel.
[redacted], Lubrano, Michele or Michele Lavadera Lubrano.
[redacted], Luk, Chan Shing.
[redacted], Malucelli, Mario.
[redacted], Manfredi, Mario.
[redacted], Mantello, Salvatore.
[redacted], Manuel, Jr., Eusebio David.
[redacted], Maria, Ignazio.
[redacted], Mavromatopoulos, John Nicholas or John Nicholas Mavroson.
[redacted], Mazier, Juan Alandro.
[redacted], McKenzie, Allan George.
[redacted], Minieri, Domenica Virginia (nee Tortora).
[redacted], Miram, Jan or Paul Pogul or Janis Mizan.
[redacted], Moreno-Pantoja, Robert or Robert Moreno or Robert Pantoja-Moreno.
[redacted], Noecker, Anna Maria Ruppert.
[redacted], Noon, Wong or Neon Wong or Wong Non or Wong Neun.
[redacted], Parda, Emil Fernandez or Emil Fernandez.
[redacted], Patron, Elias.
[redacted], Pavlis, Virgina.
[redacted], Perez, Pedro or Pedro Pascual Perez Mendoza.
[redacted], Pretzel, Horst Jan or Frederick H. Pressel, or Horace Pressel.
[redacted], Price, Fitzgerald Laing or R. Fitzgerald Blake.
[redacted], Quevedo-Nava, Agustin.
[redacted], Recchia, Pasquale.
[redacted], Riachi, Nicolas Kabalan.
[redacted], Rokos, Melachrinos or Michael Rokos or Mike Rokos.
[redacted], Russell, Herbert Leroy or Hugh Leigh Robinson.
[redacted], Russell, Oscar George.
[redacted], Sandoval, Rafael Lemus or Rafael S. Lemus.
[redacted], Scavo, Giosofatto or Guiseppe or Joe Scabo or Giovanni Anacleria.
[redacted], Schramm, Erich Max.
[redacted], Smuga, Slawomir Maciej or Slawomir Smuga or Slawomir M. Smuga.
[redacted], Sorlie, Finn Rudolph.
[redacted], Stadlmayer, Matthias.
[redacted], Stapley, Walter Samuel.
[redacted], Tabah, Angelita Rebecca or Belmonte.
[redacted], Thompson, Kermit Godfrey.
[redacted], Toboada, Juaquin Louzan.
[redacted], Torres, Rolando Harol Francisco or Rolando Harol Francisco y Torres.
[redacted], Vitale, Gaetana (nee Mazzeo).
[redacted], Voyer, Otto Thomas formerly Otto Thomas Piffer.
[redacted], Weinstein, Lilly or Rose L. Weinstein or Rosa Nashelska or Rosa Cymberg.
[redacted], Wong, Chong.
[redacted], Xenakis, George or George John Xenakis.
[redacted], Yacuone, Concetta (nee DiCesare).
[redacted], Yuen, Hing or Harry Yuen.
[redacted], Agostino, Joseph alias Giuseppe Agostino.
[redacted], Aldeguer, Tomas A.
[redacted], Amaro, Simon Fernandez.
[redacted], Arias-Melo, Jose Altagracia or Jose Arias.
[redacted], Aronov, Pauline or Pauline Rothman alias Pesra Aronov.
[redacted], Aronov, Morris alias Mozes Aronowsl or Mozes Aronowski.
[redacted], Ashley, Maria Carmen alias Carmen Ruiz (nee Maria Carmen Martin Del Campo).
[redacted], Avila, Juan or Juan Avila-Asunce.
[redacted], Bakboord, Percy George Rene.
[redacted], Barbosa-Lozano, Andres.
[redacted], Bates, Thomas Adam.
[redacted], Berezowicz, John.
[redacted], Bene, Armando Del.
[redacted], Boekhout, Hansen Geradus.
[redacted], Boniecki, Stanislaw or Stanley Bonieki or Boniski.
[redacted], Bulmas, Jaime Malla y.
[redacted], Burg, Manfred.
[redacted], Cabrera, Georgia (nee Deetjen).
[redacted], Calhao, Francisco Da Silva or Francisco Da Silva.
[redacted], Cardee, Philip.
[redacted], Carlo, Felice Del.
[redacted], Carrillo, Edmund or Edmundo.
[redacted], Case, John or John Albert Case.
[redacted], Case, Mary or Maria Louise or Couturier.
[redacted], Castro, Filomena Bonilla.
[redacted], Cavallo, Bruno.
[redacted], Charest, Oscar or Oscar Joseph Charest or Francois Oscar Charest.
[redacted], Charest, Lena or Lena Elizabeth Thibeault.
[redacted], Chen, Robert Wen-Yi.
[redacted], Chen, Della Wai-Kuen (nee Li Wai-Kuen).
[redacted], Chiaramonti, Fernando Annibale.
[redacted], Chong, Chin.
[redacted], Chuen, Moy Wing.
[redacted], Cohen, Benjamin or Benjamin Perlman.
[redacted], Corrado-Floridia, Salvatore.
[redacted], Corrales y Teuma, Humberto or Humberto Corrales.
[redacted], Corona-Ruiz, Gregorio.
[redacted], de Corona, Maria Guevara.
[redacted], Coscoros, Daria (nee Scarpa).
[redacted], Coscoros, Nicholas John alias Nicholas J. Coscoros.
[redacted], Cronkhite, Herbert Willard (or Cronk).
[redacted], Cuevas, David.
[redacted], DaCampo, Antonio alias Tony Campo alias Antonio D' A Campo.
[redacted], Dagher, Philippos Ameen alias Philip Lewis.
[redacted], Danavali, John Robert.

[redacted], Darlingtion, Leonard.
[redacted], Davis, Helen Lillian.
[redacted] Delavogias, Nicholas Leonidas or Nick Delavogias or Nicholas Delavogias.
[redacted], DeMules, Anastasia.
[redacted], DeVargas, Maria Morales.
[redacted], Dimantstein, Joseph or Diamantsztyn.
[redacted], DiSchino, Attilo Biagio.
[redacted], Dishington, Eluise Emma (nee Hoelzl).
[redacted], Dowling, Roseta Elizabeth.
[redacted], Edie, Fermina Elodia Peres.
[redacted], Erezuma, Julian.
[redacted] Farquharson, Luther or Luther Theophilus or Theophelius or Luther Theophlous Farquharson.
[redacted], Finn, Jolae Martha (nee Wilkie alias Jolae Martha Daigneault Walters).
[redacted], Fook, Chin.
[redacted], Foon, Tom Lee or Jim Man Lee.
[redacted], Forza, Mark alias Antonio Faraguna.
[redacted], Fuentes-Medina, Erick Genaro.
[redacted], de Fuentes, Berta Trujillo.
[redacted], Fukushima, Unokichi.
[redacted], Fung, Fung Kuen.
[redacted], Galvani, Celio Celso.
[redacted], Gam, Mar or Sun Gum Mar or Mar Yan.
[redacted], Golaw, Clemente San Luis.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Jose Antonio alias Jose Antonio Gonzales Machado.
[redacted], Grotle, Harold Andreas or Harald Andreas Grotle.
[redacted], Guillan, Manuel Antonio alias Emanuel Antonio Guillan.
[redacted], Hardie, William George alias Carl Stewart.
[redacted], Hsu, James.
[redacted], Hsu, Lo or Tsoo or Eu Hsu or May Hsu or Mabel Hu.
[redacted], Huang, Henry alias enry Ng Teng Hong.
[redacted], Hyssop, Charles.
[redacted], Iacobazzi, Nicola or Nick Iacobazzi.
[redacted], James, Seymour Wesley or Seymour W. James.
[redacted], James, Mavis Claire (nee Grant).
[redacted], Jendro, Alexander or Alexander Tygreys.
[redacted], Johnson, Aaleen Carylon (nee Pindra).
[redacted], Johnson, Mildren Louise or Mildred Louise Stroman.
[redacted], Stuart, Lillian.
[redacted], Jong, Lee Buck or Jong Lee or Buck Jong Lee.
[redacted], Kalpides, Constantinos Christopher alias Constantine or Gust Kalpides.
[redacted], Kao, Keh Ding or Wilbur Kao.
[redacted], Kilgren, Oscar Louis or Oscar Lois Maldemar Kilgren.
[redacted], Kin, Lin or Kin Li.
[redacted], Lagstein, Salomon.
[redacted], Lagstein, Anna Maria.
[redacted], Lai, Harry or Lai Har or Har Sau Lai.
[redacted], La Porta, Patricia Ann (nee Levi).
[redacted], Larsen, Axel Wedel.
[redacted], Lee, Wai or Lee Jack Wai or Lee Wai or Jack Wai Lee.
[redacted], Lenczner, Lillian.
[redacted], Leong, Frank Lai or Lai Leong.
[redacted], Leon-Rodriquez Abraham De.
[redacted], de Leon, Guadalupe Contreras.
[redacted], Lewnes, Efstathia (nee Giannopoulos).
[redacted], Li, Kuo Fan alias Kuo Fan Li Chun or Anita Chun.
[redacted], Li, Yau Luen.
[redacted], Loyo, Francisco Uribe.
[redacted], Luna de Garcia, Refugia alias Aurelia Delgadillo.
[redacted], Macias, Manuel Camacho.
[redacted], De Camacho, Manuela Cortez.
[redacted], Maizler, David.
[redacted], Mattera, Giovanni Francesco.
[redacted], McEwan, Sarah.
[redacted], Medina, Paul Carmelo.
[redacted], Milian-Pulido, Lazaro.
[redacted], Miller, Eustace alias Eustace Sylvester Miller alias Eustace Miller.
[redacted], Millett, Knolly Everard.
[redacted], Mock, Lee alias Moch Wah.
[redacted], Mogensen, Cecille M.
[redacted], Montoya, Fernando Oscar.
[redacted], Morgan, Hubert William.
[redacted], Moustakeas, Vasilios alias Bill Manos.
[redacted], Mykytiuk, Sophie or Sophie Zwarych or Sophie Ostapchuch.
[redacted], North, George A. or George Antoniou Borias.
[redacted], Okuno, Bunshichi.
[redacted], Pao, Chen Wang-Tsung (nee Chen Wang-Tsung).
[redacted], Papazoglou, Dimitrios Ioannis.
[redacted], Pelayo, Jose Luis.
[redacted], Pelayo, Margarita Maria.
[redacted], Perez, Carmen Hipolita.
[redacted], Perez, Francisco.
[redacted], Pilalis, Theodore George.
[redacted], Pina, Bonifacio or Bonifacio Pina-Hernandez.
[redacted], Pitchford, Gladys Ivy.
[redacted], Puccini, Maria (nee Maria Lo Bue).
[redacted], Puerta, Graciela.
[redacted], Puertas, Antonio.
[redacted], Radovcic, Roco or Rocco Radoviach.
[redacted], Ramirez, Cdaudio Silvino.
[redacted], Richardson, Kitty.
[redacted], Richardson, Michael Eric.
[redacted], Richardson, Dorothy Patricia.
[redacted], Richardson, Frances Margaret.
[redacted], Robinson, Alleyne.
[redacted], Roman-Elli, Giovanni.
[redacted], Rosman, Clara (nee Fischer) alias Lenke Perlstein.
[redacted] Ruggiero, Vitantonio.
[redacted], Sandoval, Josue Paco alias Josue Sandoval Paco.
[redacted], Sang, Hee or Hui Sang or Chan Chong or Hee Shen or Cheng Hong Hee or San Hui.
[redacted], Scarpantonio, Giovanni.
[redacted], Schier, Alfred Adolf or Alfred Schier.
[redacted], Scipilliti, Antonio.
[redacted], Scotto, Joseph Cesare.
[redacted], See, Tsai.
[redacted], Sekiguchi, Fusakichi.
[redacted], Sharpardanis, Kostantinos Gust.
[redacted], Siems, Emil Wilhelm Gustav.
[redacted], Sneider, Aase Margarethe (nee Aase Margarethe Goldberg-Finhert nee Rostvig).
[redacted], Sorrentino, Aneillo.
[redacted], Soto, Jose Martinez alias Ernesto Cuervo.
[redacted], Swartout, Mary Dorothea alias Mary Dorothea Borden-Castro.
[redacted], Tiniakos, Demetrios alias James John Tiniakos.
[redacted], Tong, Shui alias Hong Mon Shui.
[redacted], Tsao, Shu-Ming Thomas or Thomas Shu-Ming Tsao.
[redacted], Ullah, Abrus.
[redacted], Varria, Jesus Sala.
[redacted], Vasquez-Enriquez, Fidel Real y.
[redacted], Velardi, Giovanni or John Vilardi.
[redacted], Vignolles, Sara Seoane.
[redacted], Voulogaropoulos, Elias Pavlou or Ilias Pavlou Vougaropolous.
[redacted], Wah, Lok Fook or Fook Wah Lock.
[redacted], Ward, Alfred G.
[redacted], Wilkinson, Basil alias Clyde Johnson.
[redacted], Wu, King Yan.
[redacted], Wu, Sylvia Cheng (nee Chue Tchang).
[redacted], Yasransky, Celia Dinerman alias Celia Dubitsky.
[redacted], Adler, Hugo.
[redacted], Aguilar-Figueroa, Gilberto.
[redacted], Alfonso, Anita (nee Chatel).
[redacted] Alvey, Amy Ruch (nee Parks).
[redacted] Amarantides, Genevieve (nee Eleftheriou).
[redacted], Amezquita-Hernandez, Alberto.
[redacted], Ampiro, Solly N. or Bin Salleh Ampira.
[redacted], Andersen, Albert.
[redacted], Arango y Mata, Rene Fernando Diaz or Rene Arango Mata or Rene Diaz.
[redacted], Assoumany, George alias Assoumany Georges.
[redacted], Au, Kitman or Au Kit Man.
[redacted], Au, Fuk-Chun Chiu (nee Fuk-Chun Chiu) alias Fuk-Chun Au.
[redacted], Ayala, Manuel.
[redacted], Aycart, Arturo.
[redacted], Bagos, Vivencio.
[redacted], Bec, Eva-Garcia alias Eva Glorencia Garcia y Dominguez.
[redacted], Becerra-Madrigal, Victoriano.
[redacted], Becerra, Francisca Franco De (nee Francisca Franco-Mendoza).
[redacted] Belosic, Maria (nee Fekete).
[redacted], Benenelis-Avino, Jaime Esteban or James Benenelis.
[redacted], Benvenuto, Dino.
[redacted], Bestrin, Pavel or Paul.
[redacted], Biris, Theodore G.
[redacted] Birnbaum, Rywa alias Rywa Wiegutone y Fuks.
[redacted], Bjelland, Frieda Graub.
[redacted], Bogaisky, Zillah (nee Rosen).
[redacted], Breitbart, Helen (nee Hinda Chaja Joselewich or Hinda Fine).
[redacted], Brown, Sylvia Elizabeth.
[redacted], Carr, Neil Arthur.
[redacted], Carrozza, Eugo (Hugo).
[redacted], Carsten, John.
[redacted], Chang, Kei or Key Hyung.
[redacted], Chen, Chu Pei.
[redacted], Chen, Helen (nee Eng).
[redacted], Chen, Keo.
[redacted], Chen, May Yel Yok alias Yoh Mei-Yee.
[redacted], Chen, Kwoh-Kwon.
[redacted], Chung, Chiu Yuan.
[redacted], Clarke, Edgar Alonza alias Edgar Clark.
[redacted] Corpora, Gaspare.
[redacted], Cortez-Flores, Anselma.
[redacted], D'Arpa, Antonio Francesco or Antonio Francesco Diarpa or Anthony Frank D'Arpa.
[redacted], Davis, Geneva.
[redacted], DeGutierrez, Guadalupe De La Cruz alias Guadalupe De La Cruz.
[redacted], DeHidalgo, Maria Mora or Maria De Los Angeles Mora Rojas.
[redacted], Dell, Christopher Edward Morris alias William Ennis.
[redacted], Diaz, Francisco.
[redacted], Dolgopiaty, Jankel.
[redacted], Dorsena, Clementinsa (nee Quaglia).
[redacted], Dovellos, Nicholas George.
[redacted], Dziadek, Fiszel or Fiszel Felek Dziadek.
[redacted], Ebe, Olga or Olga Embeoglou (nee Olga Sotirhou).
[redacted], Ebe, Mary John or Mary John Embeoglou.
[redacted] Edwards, Muriel Constance (nee Muriel Constance Fernandez).
[redacted], Eley, Sheila Bamford.
[redacted], Epstein, Hersh or Hersz.
[redacted], Ereno, John or Juan Zabala.
[redacted], Fajardo, Manuel Rodriguez.
[redacted], Fernandez-Arrillaga, Teofilo Juan.
[redacted], Findley, Cyril Bartholomew.
[redacted], Fisher, Peter Thomassen or Peter Thomassen.
[redacted], Fixler, Alexander.
[redacted], Flamos, Antonios Theodore.
[redacted] Franco, Flerida Maria (nee Mauricio).
[redacted], Freeman, Cleveland or Cleveland Formington Freeman.
[redacted], Friedman, Leib or Leopold.
[redacted] Fuentes, Adalberto Jesus.
[redacted], Fung, Kay, alias Fung Shew.

[redacted], Gallardo-Fierro, Eduardo or Eduardo Gallardo.
[redacted] Ganaires, Ioanis John.
[redacted] Gasparini, Giuseppe or Joseph Gasparini or Joe Gasparini.
[redacted] Gerold, Michael Mauritis Laurentius.
[redacted] Gerow, Edythe Marion (nee Tombyll).
[redacted] Giorsos, Kostas Elias.
[redacted] Goldslager, Abraham alias Abe Gold.
[redacted] Grant Lavington James.
[redacted], Grundel, Ferdinand Robert.
[redacted] Han, Lee Kun.
[redacted], Haro-Charles, Juan.
[redacted] Hart, Patrick.
[redacted] Hathiram, Gustadji Merwanji or Gusdtadti Hathiran or Gustav Merwan Hatheran.
[redacted], Hionis, Gerasimos Nicholas.
[redacted], Hoffmann, Alfred.
[redacted], Hong, Wah May.
[redacted], Ikic, Mike.
[redacted], Jeu, Mary Hum.
[redacted], Jones, Pearl Louise Campbell.
[redacted], Jozsef, Nicolae.
[redacted], Kalishman, Millie Sweder or Millie Kalish or Millie Sweder.
[redacted], Karczewski, Stefan.
[redacted], Kekkonen, Towo.
[redacted], Keller, Frank Joseph.
[redacted], Kelt, Charles Edward.
[redacted], Khan, Noroz or Neroes Khan or Naroz Kahn.
[redacted], Kim, Bok Duk Ryu.
[redacted], Kolin, Joseph.
[redacted], Korakas, Michael Constantinos.
[redacted], Kulukundis, Michael E.
[redacted], Kulukundis, Fotini Michael (nee Fotini Nitza Yannachas).
[redacted] Kutasow, Stelir alias Stella Manik or Sala Manik.
[redacted], Laidna, Jaan.
[redacted] Landsman, Joshua Lejb.
[redacted] Lapidus, Jacqueline Sonia (nee Lapidue).
[redacted], Laurent, Mary (nee Leibovitch).
[redacted], Lassemillante, Charles Albert or Lassy.
[redacted], Lee, William alias William Toll.
[redacted], Leibschwager, Paul Karl Alfred.
[redacted], Leibschwager, Bertha Pauline (nee Harrass).
[redacted] Li, Han Hun.
[redacted], Liakis, George Constantinos.
[redacted], Louie, Sing.
[redacted], Lowry, Johanna (nee Sunkel).
[redacted], Mak, Joe.
[redacted], Mancebo, Antonio De Sousa.
[redacted] Manlohee, Lucas Bin or Lucas Nanlohee.
[redacted], Maola, Carmine Francesco or Francesco Carmine Maola.
[redacted], Martinsons, Nikolajs.
[redacted], Matheson, Sydney Augustus alias Sydney Matheson.
[redacted] Medlin, Patricia Eve Brown.
[redacted] Mendoza, Lucrezia (nee Neto Beltran).
[redacted], Miguez, Ignacio Roupeiro alias Mike Miguez alias Ignacio Miguez.
[redacted], Milich, Herta.
[redacted], Monovasios, Aristides Yacov.
[redacted], Moore, Charles.
[redacted], Mortreuil, Francoise Annie Paule, alias Maria Charlotte Maclennen, alias Francoise Maclennan.
[redacted] Mowlem, Aboudi Robin, or Aboudi Reuben Mawlem, or Aboudi Robin Maulim, or Aboudi Robin Mouallem.
[redacted], Murguia Jose Capote y.
[redacted], Capote, Haydee Gonzalez.
[redacted] Mutors, Gerhard Waldemar Gregory or Gregorn Waddell.
[redacted], Nakamura, Eitaro.
[redacted], Nava, Luisa (nee Luisa Sambrano).
[redacted], Ng, Yick Tung.
[redacted], Nolan, Thomas K.
[redacted], Nosco-Bucenec, Jan, alias John B. Nosco.
[redacted], Nosco, Bozena Maria (nee Votavova).
[redacted] Ostos, Juan or Juan Ostos Mateos-Canero.
[redacted], Pacillas, Antonio.
[redacted], Padilla, Roberto.
[redacted], Panicz, Hersz.
[redacted], Papadopoulos, Nicolas or Nicolaos, alias Nick Pappas.
[redacted], Patrao, Plinio Pereira.
[redacted] Patrao, Maria Da Conceicao Batista.
[redacted] Perelli, Nicola.
[redacted] Pirolozzi, Domenico.
[redacted], Pirro, Antonio, or Anthony Pirro, or Tony Pirro.
[redacted], Poyhonen, Anna Maria, or Anna Maria Suomi, or Anna Maria Virtanen.
[redacted] Rasmussen, Alf Kristian.
[redacted], Rave, William.
[redacted] Rhymer, Ilva Rebecca.
[redacted] Rivera, Carolina (nee Juarez y Lopez).
[redacted], Robles, Angela Agustina (nee Rodriguez Y Gamboa or Angela Rodriguez).
[redacted] Rosato, Francesco.
[redacted], Rosenblatt, David.
[redacted], Saat, Repin.
[redacted], Sacristan, Manuel Lannegrand.
[redacted] Saka, Ester Nakash, or Ester Nakash Sakka.
[redacted], Sancton, Gertrude Emma.
[redacted], Schefstad, Lina (nee Aguilar).
[redacted], Schmerler, Rebecca.
[redacted], Schwabe, Kurt Herbert.
[redacted], Scott, Melvyn Lee.
[redacted], Seliste, Bruno Voldemar.
[redacted], Seng, Fong Fook or Fong Jun.
[redacted], Shunda, Enache, or Enache Vangel Shunda, or John Shunda.
[redacted], Siclari, Francesco.
[redacted], Sigona, Francesco.
[redacted], Silva-Marques, Argentino.
[redacted], Smith, Anna (nee Friedman).
[redacted], Smith, Gershon.
[redacted], Spritzer, Netty (nee Frank).
[redacted], Stein, Ida Sara.
[redacted], Stender, Libe Emma.
[redacted] Stray, David, or David Tsui, or Tsui Yu Shan.
[redacted], Suda, Alfred, or Alfred George Suda.
[redacted], Sztybel, Tadeusz, alias Tadeus Karpinski.
[redacted], Sztybel, Tatiana.
[redacted], Teira, Antonio Sainas.
[redacted], Tien, Jack Minpung, alias Minpung Tien.
[redacted] Todman, Joseph Emanuel.
[redacted], Todman, Dorothy Joyce.
[redacted], Trivisani, Emilie Lilli.
[redacted], Truppi, Antonio.
[redacted], Truswell, Richard.
[redacted], Truswell, Mary Pauline (nee Sudsbear).
[redacted] Tsakiery, Lefkothea Manzacoufa or Lefkothea Manzacoufa.
[redacted], Uribe-Flores, Eriberto.
[redacted], Madrigal, Fidela Becerra or Fidela Becerra De Uribe.
[redacted] Uribe-Gomez, Aurelio Alberto.
[redacted], Valdes, Felecia Maden.
[redacted] Valentine, Edla J. M. (nee Kelly J. M. Zjocelyn Marcella).
[redacted], Velci, Stefano or Steve.
[redacted] Vera-Valdez, Jose Dionisio.
[redacted], Villa, Ena Nuele.
[redacted] Wagner, Monserrat.
[redacted], Wang, Cheng Ching.
[redacted], Wang, Florence Wu (nee Florence Shu-Fang Wu, alias Florence Wu, or Shu Fang, or Wang Chang Ching).
[redacted], Weiss, Arieh.
[redacted], Wittelsohn, Shaye, or Shaya Wittelsohn, or Sam Wittelson.
[redacted], Wo, Loy.
[redacted], Woo, George Fat or Woo Fat or Ng Fat.
[redacted], Yablonik, Jennie, alias Yablokoff (nee Flieshman).
[redacted], Zamora-Rojas, Cecilio.
[redacted], Zanger, Leonard De.
[redacted], Zanger, Ellen Kelly De or Ellen Kelly, or Ellen De Zanger, or Anne Kelly.
[redacted], Zeito, George.
[redacted], Zgombic, Mate, or Mike Zgombic.
[redacted], Zuvich, Pilar.
[redacted], Alexander, George Vassile or George Vassile Alexandrevis.
[redacted], Alhadeff, Rachel Hassan.
[redacted], Ali, Abas.
[redacted], Ali, Peer or Peter.
[redacted], Allie, Benny alias Bin Ali Oodin.
[redacted], Amezcua-Madrigal, Pedro.
[redacted], Andonyadis, Todori alias Theodore Andoniadis.
[redacted], Ankenbrandt, Ellen Maud.
[redacted] Aragundez, Jose Luis Pavia or Jose Pavia.
[redacted], Ataman, Mustafa Tarik.
[redacted], Bailey, Julia Jui Cheng (nee Sze).
[redacted], Balatocan, Ricardo.
[redacted], Barbey, Henri Raoul.
[redacted], Bauman, Margaret.
[redacted], Bavas, Eleftherios Antonious.
[redacted], Benites, Carmen or Carmelo Benites or Eusbeio Del Carmen Benites.
[redacted], Berezowicz, Anna.
[redacted], Besada, Juan or John Besada.
[redacted], Blaauw, Dirk Pieter Andries.
[redacted], Blackman, Herman Elliot.
[redacted], Bonifacic, Anton.
[redacted], Bottenbley, Cecil George or C. Bottenbley.
[redacted], Brieland, Andreas Emil Mark Mathian alias Andreas Emil Mork Mathison.
[redacted], Brown, Horace Arthur.
[redacted] Campbell, Alphonso.
[redacted], Capetillo-Fraga, Jesus.
[redacted], Castellanos, Juan alias Juan Americo Castellanos-Quintana.
[redacted] Chang, Mei Chien June.
[redacted] Chang, Nelson.
[redacted] Chang, Shelley.
[redacted], Chatel, Frank Emanuel or Franck Chatel.
[redacted] Chen, Teh Tsan or T. T. Chen.
[redacted], Chinnery, Eric Ezekiel.
[redacted], Cohen, Bella (nee Wine alias Rapps).
[redacted], Colombo, Giovanni.
[redacted], Concepcion y Torres, Orestes.
[redacted], Cooper, Mary (nee Solway).
[redacted], Cottam, James Harry.
[redacted] Cox, Esther Verland Jean (nee Lucas).
[redacted], Dagsie, Kol.
[redacted], Davoli, Malvina Passini.
[redacted], Bisschop, Joseph De or Joe Bishop or Joseph Bishop or Joe De Bisschop.
[redacted], Dedeurwarder, Alfonso.
[redacted], Dedo, Ivo.
[redacted], Estrada, Maria Petra Luna De.
[redacted], Estrada-Luna, Francisco.
[redacted], Estrada-Luna, David.
[redacted], De Hentzen, Maria Isabel Carballo.
[redacted], De Hernandez, Paula Chavez.
[redacted], De La Cruz-Ramirez, Hipolito.
[redacted], Del Coro, Sofia (nee Sofia Ippolito alias Elena Grassi).
[redacted], Delgadillo-Aguayo, Jose Pablo alias Martin Martinez.
[redacted], De Luca, Antonio.
[redacted], De Oliveira, Jose Martins or Jose Martins.
[redacted], De Vela, Nicolasa Avellaneda or Nicolasa Avellaneda or Elvira Avellaneda.
[redacted], Del Toro, Elsa Maria (nee Hernandez).
[redacted], Diness, Celia (nee Wolas).
[redacted], Do Couto, Antonio.
[redacted], Ebelini, Giacomo Guilio or Jack Ebelini.
[redacted], Fair, Catherine B. Webster.
[redacted], Feller, Frances Annie.
[redacted], Fernandez, Emilio Rodriquez.
[redacted], Feuer, Lucia (nee Juster).
[redacted], Fifer, Doris or Doris Rubin (nee Rabiner).

[redacted], Finley, Virginia Ruth.
[redacted], Fiore, Michele.
[redacted], Fitzsimmons, Beatrice (nee Camprini).
[redacted], Flagg, Russell Grant.
[redacted], Fong, Lo alias Fong Lo alias Lo K. Ming or Lo Ket Ming.
[redacted], Formosa, Jack or Joaquin Formoso Pico.
[redacted], Fragomeni, Nicola.
[redacted], Friedman, Edita or Edith Friedman or Edith Schwartz.
[redacted] Fuentes-Iglesias, Eugenio De La alias Eugenio De La Fuentas alias Eugenio Fernandez.
[redacted], Gardyn, Lujza Berger.
[redacted], Gaytan-Vasquez, Daniel.
[redacted], George, Jesus Rogaciano alias Jesus R. George.
[redacted], German, Filip.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Alfredo Prieto.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Jorge Morfin.
[redacted], Gonzalez-Martinez, Pedro or Pedro Martinez Gonzalez.
[redacted], Gordon, Olive Maud (nee Olive Maud Dickson).
[redacted], Gottlieb, Simon.
[redacted], Grun, Margit (nee Margit Weiman).
[redacted], Haag, Signe Elisabeth Ekland.
[redacted], Hagglund, Marie or Hilja Marie Kaipiainen alias Mary Adams.
[redacted], Hannon, Evelyn Joan (nee Mary Evelyn Joan Kemp).
[redacted], Heike, Ernest Bruno.
[redacted], Heike, Elizabeth.
[redacted], Hidalgo, Antonio Cesar Asias.
[redacted], Hillman, Edmund H.
[redacted], Hohenwald, Richard Emil.
[redacted], Hudson, Walter Roy.
[redacted], Hudson, Vera Noreen.
[redacted], Hurrell, William Henry.
[redacted], Igge, John.
[redacted], Jensen, Barbara Anderson (nee Barbel Anna Johanna Andersen alias Barbel Andersen).
[redacted], Johnson, Arnida Fabon.
[redacted], Johnson, Elese Adline (nee Wood).
[redacted] Jose, Jacinto, known as Jacinto Joseph.
[redacted], Kaempfe, Walter Emil.
[redacted], Kajganic, Vasil, known as Mike Minic.
[redacted], Kalinowski, Stephanie Stella.
[redacted], Kalistian, Deckranouri (nee Beshgeturian).
[redacted], Kartsounis, Efstratios or Stavros or Steve Karonas or Steve Pappa.
[redacted], Kee, Tang Wong.
[redacted], Kwai, Tsu Ding or Tsu D. Kwai.
[redacted], Labastida-Aguilar, Carlos.
[redacted], Laird, Mary Aparici.
[redacted], Laird, Elizabeth Welderica.
[redacted], Laird, Robert Fulton.
[redacted], Lass, Elise Marquard.
[redacted], Lazo, Benito Padilla.
[redacted], Lee, Hum Fay Jin or Hum Fay Jin or Hum Shee.
[redacted], Kai, Lee Mon or Guy Lee or Mon Kai Lee.
[redacted], Lee, Sherman H. or Lee Hsueh-Wen.
[redacted], Legax, Marian or Marijan or Marian or Marijan Lejac.
[redacted], Lenetsky, Ray (nee Roman).
[redacted], Lenetsky, Beatrice.
[redacted], Lenetsky, Constance.
[redacted], Lenetsky, Sybil.
[redacted], Lenetsky, Evelyn.
[redacted], Letsche, Julius Eugene.
[redacted], Linforth, Lionel Keith.
[redacted] Linforth, Moya Jean (nee Thistleton).
[redacted], Ling, Ping.
[redacted], Lloyd, Betty.
[redacted], Longo, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Lopez, Jesus Rios alias Juan Jose Elizarraras Y Rios or Jesus Lopez Rios.
[redacted] Lopez y Lloret, Pilar Dora Maria Pascuala or Pilar Perez.
[redacted] Loung, Pai Yen.
[redacted] Loung, Min (nee Min Lin).
[redacted], Low, Woo Ah or Ah Low Wing or Mrs. Chin Dor Wing or Mrs. George C. Wing.
[redacted], Maggio, Mario August or Augusto May.
[redacted], Mainas, Artemis.
[redacted], Martinez, Timothy Henry or Timothy Henry Martin or Timothy H. Maxwell.
[redacted], Mathias, Elsie Doreen.
[redacted], Mathias, John Eaton Keary.
[redacted], Mathias, Mark Orson Niguel.
[redacted], Mathias, Francine Alden Elizabeth.
[redacted], Mattsson, Ruben Isidor.
[redacted], Matz, Jack Jacob.
[redacted], McClarty, Barbara Frances.
[redacted], McCoy, Mackie or Mike.
[redacted], Mena, Evangelina Francisca Hernandez Lara aka Evangelina Mena.
[redacted], Mena Y Abreu, Olalio.
[redacted], Mendoza-Mora, Bernabe.
[redacted], Mersliker Maria Knaus or Maria Knaus.
[redacted], Mesa y Dorta, Vincente Jesus or Jesus Solis y Mesa.
[redacted], Mizialek, Walenty.
[redacted], Mojica, Judith Morales or Judith Morales or Judith Morales de Banuls.
[redacted], Molina-Gonzalez, Felipe.
[redacted] Mon, Wing Lung or Mon Gee Mow or David Mon or Mon Yin.
[redacted], Monreal-Yanez, Roque.
[redacted], Montenegro, Silvia.
[redacted], Moutzalias, Gerasimos Demetrios or Mike Moutzalias.
[redacted], Mow, Chang Siao.
[redacted], Nesserella, Amanda Hanna.
[redacted], Nitkin, Max.
[redacted], Nuqui, Elena Soriano.
[redacted] Oka, Masahiko.
[redacted] Oka, Miyuki.
[redacted] Oka, Naohiko.
[redacted], Orcutt, Borgia Marcia or Borgia Marcia Woods.
[redacted] Orsi, Maria Iaci (nee Maria Iaci).
[redacted], Otero, Jose Benito or Sotero or Bennie Jose Sotero.
[redacted], Pantaleo, Saverio.
[redacted], Parada, Ramon alias Ramon Parada Rocende.
[redacted], Pasqutti, Mario alias Giuseppe Truant.
[redacted], Pelaez, Jorge Oscar or Jorge Oscar Pelaez y Rodriguez de Cancio.
[redacted], Perres, Mike or Emmanuel Pyrovolicos.
[redacted], Pettipher, Frank.
[redacted], Pimental, Pablo.
[redacted] Pina, Carmen Rodolfina.
[redacted], Poldmets, Mart.
[redacted], Pollak, Bernard.
[redacted] Preisig, Julia Maria (nee Julia Maria Basto da Silva).
[redacted], Puleo, Cesare.
[redacted], Radovich, John alias Ivan Radovich or Radovic or Ivo Rodavic.
[redacted], Ramirez-Ramirez, Mario.
[redacted], Ribeiro, Alfredo Gomez.
[redacted], Rivera, Rodrigo Fernandez.
[redacted], Roberts, Windel.
[redacted], Rodgers, Alice Lorane aka Alice L. Rodgers.
[redacted], Rodriguez, de Scala, Maria Teresa.
[redacted], Rogers, Richard.
[redacted], Roumbinis, Georgios alias George Macris.
[redacted], Rudnikoff, John.
[redacted], Rudnikoff, Fannie.
[redacted] Ruiz, Maria Lydia alias Lydia Ashley.
[redacted], Rusu, Petre.
[redacted], Saffory, Elisabeth.
[redacted], Salomon, Albino or Albert.
[redacted], Salzano, Pasquale.
[redacted] Sanchez, Julia (nee Julia Puente y Lacera).
[redacted], Scalla-Scalla, Francisco.
[redacted], Schnoor, Fred Wilhelm.
[redacted], Schwabe, Rosa.
[redacted], Schweitzer, Irene Anna (nee Kafka).
[redacted], Scully, Margaret alias Peggy Dennis.
[redacted], Scale, Lambert Oswald.
[redacted], Seto, Fai alias Seto Fai alias Deanna Fong.
[redacted], Sew, Sue Lin.
[redacted], Shajii, Shamseddin.
[redacted], Shatkin, Harry or Harris Shatkin or Henry Shatkin or Harris Shatsky or Hersch Schatzki.
[redacted], Sideris, Sid.
[redacted], Sinclair, Randall George.
[redacted], Sing, Theodore L.
[redacted], Siskopoulos, George Evanelos or George Poulos or George E. Siskos.
[redacted], Sorrentino, Bartolomeo.
[redacted], Spetland, Trygve Einan Bjarne.
[redacted], Spineto, Giuseppe.
[redacted] Stachowiak, Kryzytan or Christ Stachowiak.
[redacted], Stashko, Michael.
[redacted] Stephan, Elaine Delphine.
[redacted], Stratis, Demitrios.
[redacted], Tang, Yu Shang Chang.
[redacted] Thaler, Max.
[redacted], Thomson, James.
[redacted], Tin, Loh Tsung alias Chew Loh Tsung Tin.
[redacted], Titsidou, Dosta or Tetsidou or Tetsios or Tatseff or Tetseff (nee Yanchiou or Ianchiou also known as Dosta Dimitroff, as Dosta Dimitry or Dimitri and as Dosta George).
[redacted] Tollaksen, Olga, Charlotte.
[redacted], Tsamisis, Pauline Kaitery (nee Polyxeni James Kaitery).
[redacted] Van Lent, Andree (nee Andree Agnes Desmaris).
[redacted], Varela, Arturo Lima.
[redacted] Vestarhis, Leonidas Michael or Vestarchis.
[redacted], Walther, Wally Erna (nee Wally Erna Hoffman Reich).
[redacted], Weinberg, Philip.
[redacted], Weiner, Mary (nee Sherman).
[redacted], West, Julio Martinez.
[redacted], Wiesenberg, Raizel alias Roselle Starkman.
[redacted], Williams, Dulcibell Partika (nee Ho Sang).
[redacted], Wisotsky, Meyer.
[redacted], Woodham, Cyril William.
[redacted], Wydryx, Ida Marie.
[redacted], Yaskransky, Abraham alias Abe Dubitsky.
[redacted] Yeh, Hsuan.
[redacted] Ying, Chai.
[redacted] Yong, Hee alias Yong Kin Si.
[redacted], Yong, Lee.
[redacted], Young, Ho or Young Ho alias Cheong Fook Chung.
[redacted], Huisgen, Julius.
[redacted], Huisgen, Else Magdelena Steinder.
[redacted], Morris, Coral Margaret.
[redacted] Reiwkham, Monwipha aka Frances Mary McGowan or Monipipha R. McGowan.
[redacted], Pacini, Silvano Joseph.
[redacted] Hendel, Naumi or Naumi Alekalaj Hemdel (nee Alcalay).
[redacted], Vacchina, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Vacchina, Irene E.
[redacted] Yannouris, Stergias Ioannis aka Steve John Geannouris.
[redacted], Baron, Anna formerly Anna Lukue nee Cyszkiewicz.
[redacted], Chong, Len or Lam Cheung.
[redacted] Dracos, Demitrios Demetre Panagiotis or Drakos.
[redacted], Dracos, Catherine (Aikaterine) Demetre nee Hadjipateras.
[redacted], Farina, Antonio.
[redacted], Garcia-Fresno, Maria Del Carmen or Maria Del Carmen Garcia.
[redacted], Harvey, Ralph.
[redacted] Holt, George or George Kurzholtz or George Holtz or George Kurzhals.
[redacted], Hsi, William Arthur or Hsi Yu-Hao.

[redacted], Hsi, Dorothy Lee or Dorothy Grace Lee.
[redacted], Lee, Yun or Lee Yun alias Lee You.
[redacted], Manfredi, Mario.
[redacted], Rios-Esparza, Juan.
[redacted], Torres-Fernandez, Felix or Felix Torres.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 205) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

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

[redacted], Addad, Encarnacion Javier.
[redacted], Alava, Moises.
[redacted], Alfonso, Daniel Rafael Ortiz.
[redacted], Arguello De Martinez, Amelia.
[redacted], Armas, Jose, or Amas Jose Noguera.
[redacted], Atkinson, Vance Loval alias Vance Alistaire Bowman.
[redacted], Bley, Ernst Ferdinand Max.
[redacted], Brown, William Nicholas.
[redacted], Carabelos, Francisco Acebedo.
[redacted] Castaneda, Dilia or Dilia Molena-Suarez.
[redacted], Chin, Boon Lup.
[redacted] Chu, Chih-Li or Ou Yang Chiyen Chu (nee Ou Yang Chiyen).
[redacted] Chu, Ou Yang Chiyen (nee Ou Yang Chiyen).
[redacted], Davis, Jack Joseph Alexander.
[redacted] Dionisos, Nikolaos or Dennis Stefanatos.
[redacted], Duffy, Thomas Henry.
[redacted], Eleftheriades, Athena.
[redacted], Endsley, Susana Tolmay (nee Susana Haydu).
[redacted] Enriquez, Carmel Leone alias Charles Enriquez alias Carmel Leone.
[redacted], Feola, Luigi.
[redacted], Fernandez, Jose.
[redacted], Gero, Ethel.
[redacted], Giannoni, Alana (nee Questa).
[redacted], Gobell, Margarite Maria.
[redacted], Golt, Leah Black.
[redacted], Hagen, Arnt Hauen.
[redacted], Ham, Wilhelmina Frances.
[redacted], Heredia, Maria.
[redacted], Hsu, Shih-Yi.
[redacted], Hsu, Maria.
[redacted], Jensen, Arne K.
[redacted] Jesus, Guadalupe Moreno or Vavina Moreno.
[redacted], Johnson, John or John G. Johnson or Ioannis Ioannou.
[redacted] Kariofilis, Andrew.
[redacted] Kelly, Joslyn Samuel.
[redacted], Kiehm, Isaac Sungbaik or Sung Ho or Isaac Sunbaik Kiehm or Kim Sung Ho.
[redacted], Klueh, Jacob or Jacob Clue or Jacob Kluh.
[redacted], Kosmitas, Manuel Nicholas.
[redacted], Koutroulis, Rena (nee Rena Theodorou Tsiricoglou).
[redacted] Kum, Wat or Wat Kam.
[redacted], Kypranos, Thermistocles J. or Kyprianos or Themis John or Tain Themistocles.
[redacted], Lampe, Rosa Bradley Lampe (nee Goseco).
[redacted], Laurence, Lloyd Archibald Barrington or Lawrence.
[redacted] Mallozzi, Rosario alias Ronny Mallozzi.
[redacted], Margarit, Primo.
[redacted], Matos, Ramon Armando.
[redacted], Mauricio, Jose Amador.
[redacted], Mayo, Louis or Liezer alias Antonio L. Maya.
[redacted], Montana, Manuel Francisco Matalobos.
[redacted], Morin, Albert Berti.
[redacted], Navarro-Ochoa, Salvador.
[redacted], Nellini, Nunzio Anthony.
[redacted], Ngai, Kai Kin.
[redacted] Phillips, Herbert Washington.
[redacted], Puig, Orlando.
[redacted], Quintana y Maestre, Claudio Damian.
[redacted], Raschke, Ralph John or Rudolph Johann Rachke.
[redacted] Reid, Gladstone Ewart.
[redacted], Reid, Martin L. alias Martin Luther Reid alias Martin Williams.
[redacted], Rosa-Atilano, Sara De La or Sara De La Rosa or Sarah De La Rosa.
[redacted], Rosa-Atilano, Noemi De La or Noemi De La Rosa or Maime De La Rosa or Noami A. De La Rosa.
[redacted], Rose, Percival or John Percival McNamee or John P. McNamee.
[redacted], Rubio-Rojas, Bernardino or Jose Almazan-Rojas.
[redacted], Sanchez De Juarez, Maria Casilda.
[redacted], Sanchez, Maria Vicenta.
[redacted], Sarkan, Jasnor or Sarkan Jasnon.
[redacted] Sassoon, Albertine Yakub.
[redacted], Stager, Trinidad Villamil.
[redacted], Stewart, Ada nee Foster alias Ada Cunningham.
[redacted], Story, Maria (nee Janzen).
[redacted], Tavares, Ignacio.
[redacted], Thomas, Leslie Daniel or Robert Jackson.
[redacted], Ton, Chi Yin.
[redacted], Tong, Man Fung alias Man Fung Ng.
[redacted], Torres de Rodriguez, Alicia.
[redacted], Wajc, Oscar or Uscher Wajc.
[redacted], Waldman, Fela.
[redacted], Weiss, Elsig.
[redacted], Weiss, Hedwig.
[redacted], Wesierski, Erwin Gotthelf.
[redacted], Winbert, Henry Raymond.
[redacted], Yavorsky, Olga or Olga Snatchko-Yavorsky.
[redacted], Yi-Armenta, Juan.
[redacted], Aleman, Leonardo or Leonardo Contreras or Leonardo Armendariz.
[redacted], Amador-Silva, Juan.
[redacted], Asimenios, Spirios.
[redacted], Avaia, Ezequiel Ambrosio Sano Perez y or Ezequiel Perez.
[redacted], Perez, Margarieta (nee Margarieta Pantoja y Perez).
[redacted] Ayriss, Alfred Richard.
[redacted] Baker, David or David Bubis.
[redacted], Baldaeus, Johanna Margarete (nee Gerdes).
[redacted], Baronachi, George or George Baronaki or Baronacki or George Barone or Baroni or Barony or George Carmina.
[redacted] Barton, Richard.
[redacted] Baxevanakes, Theodore or Theodore Vaxevanakes.
[redacted], Beltran, Salvador.
[redacted], Najera, Jovita.
[redacted], Benetato, Evangelo Panagi.
[redacted], Blewitt, Harry William or Harry William Lewis.
[redacted] Boros, Abraham.
[redacted] Boyd, Arthur Ariel or Ariel Boyd.
[redacted]T, Bressant, Albert.
[redacted] Brown, Rita Tercias, Junior.
[redacted], Burgundy, Theresa Anna or Theresa A. Burgundy.
[redacted], Busse, Clara (nee Sage).
[redacted], Buzzell, Hilda Susana.
[redacted] Candy, Brun Arthur.
[redacted], Carballo-Corbeira, Francisco.
[redacted], Cardona, Raquel or Raquel Cardona De Leanos.
[redacted], Carey, Vincent Andrew.
[redacted] Cedillo-Castellija, Mucio.
[redacted], Chae, Wu Young.
[redacted], Chang, Catherine Margaret or Jui Hsien Chang.
[redacted], Chapman, Henry Theodore or Henry Chapman.
[redacted], Charleswell, Pedrito Francisco.
[redacted], Chi, Nai Chun.
[redacted] Cortez-Sanchez, Enrique or Henry Cortez.
[redacted], Curbelo, Irene (nee Irene Fernandez y Martinez).
[redacted], De Avalos, Consuelo Perez.
[redacted], De Berthoty, Paul Charles or Paul Berthoty Murray.
[redacted], De Cardenas, Socorro Mora-Gonzalez.
[redacted], De La Chapelle, Giselle Magyar.
[redacted], De La Chappelle, Alain.
[redacted], De La Chapelle, Philippe.
[redacted], Delan, Imre or James Delaney.
[redacted] De Mondoza, Olga Gomez Hurtado or Olga Gonzalez.
[redacted] De Neria, Maria De Jesus Lizarraga.
[redacted], De Ridder, Robert.
[redacted] Dick, Lynston Alain or Lynston Allen Dick.
[redacted] Dieguez, Siddharta Isidro Iglesias or Isidro Iglesias.
[redacted], Di Miceli, Lucia.
[redacted], Di Santolo, Giuseppe or Joseph Scotto.
[redacted], Elina, Anne or Anne Salonen or Anne Elina Maniec or Nisniec or Anne Namiec.
[redacted] Esquibel-Rodriguez, Gilberto.
[redacted] Esquibel, Maria Del Refugio Zaragosa De.
[redacted] Ferrentino, Antonio.
[redacted] Foo, Wong.
[redacted], Fountoulis, Andrew George or Andrew Fundulis.
[redacted] Fuchs, Sara (nee Izak).
[redacted], Gallardo-Rico, Cliserio.
[redacted] Garcia-Azumulco, Luis.
[redacted], Geldis, Pangiotis or Pete Geldis.
[redacted], Geller, Sara.
[redacted] Gero, Elsie.
[redacted], Gibson, Charles Gladstone or Charlie or Gladstone Gibson.
[redacted], Gimel, Marie-Antoinette de Pradines.
[redacted] Giovine, Nicola.
[redacted] Glyptis, Constantinos Peter or Costas P. Glyptis.
[redacted], Gomez, Jose Maria.
[redacted], Goudjamanis, Georgios Nicholaos.
[redacted], Gross, Anna nee Chava Guchowitzki.
[redacted], Gross, Morris or Moishe Gruttz or Morris David Gross.
[redacted], Guirincich, Umberto.
[redacted], Gumbs, Freeman Augustus.
[redacted], Haardt-Ascarelli, Yvonne.
[redacted], Harris, Frank Wilbert.
[redacted], Harris, Roderick.
[redacted], Hernandez-Servin, Avelina.
[redacted] Hernandez-Servin, Goyeta.
[redacted] Hillmann, Max.
[redacted], Hozian, Anthony.
[redacted], Hsu, William.
[redacted], Hvidsten, Henry.
[redacted], Iribarren, Jorge Manuel Porta Balbonay.
[redacted], Jacobsohn, Peter Mortan Ralph.
[redacted], James, Agatha (nee Walker) or Violet Edwards.
[redacted], Jepperson, Harold J.
[redacted] Jones, Jeanne Gabrielle Manine (nee Mainine Auroux).
[redacted] Jones, Linda Diane.
[redacted] Kalle, Hans.
[redacted], Karstens, Alfred Alarich Emiel Karstens or Alfred Karstens or Alfred Alarich Amil Karstens.
[redacted], Kerkhoven, Peter Johannes.

[redacted] Kin, Lam Suey.
[redacted] Koutelis, Demetrios M.
[redacted], Kuderian, John Zarmaven.
[redacted] Kwong, Yeung, or Ip Sul Yeung Kwong.
[redacted] La Form, Mary Patricia or Mary Patricia Burrel.
[redacted], Lake, Ann Louisa.
[redacted], Larsson, Frithjof Bjarne.
[redacted], Leavitt, Antoinette Van Barrdewijk.
[redacted], LeClerc, Joseph Ernest Aime.
[redacted], Ledee, Joseph V.
[redacted] Lee, Quon.
[redacted] Lipiatos, Thomas or Athanasios Lipiatos.
[redacted] Lombardo, Sergio George.
[redacted] Lopez, Guillermo.
[redacted], Loukas, Paul or Pavlos Spiros.
[redacted], Luchetta, Cesare Guadenzio.
[redacted] Lum, Larry Yee or Lum Ying.
[redacted], Magalee, Ralph Edward.
[redacted] Magalit, Metelo Teodosio.
[redacted], Mihael Edanthia.
[redacted] Mirambeau, Lucien.
[redacted] Moore, Lolita or Lolita Daneo.
[redacted], Moses, Joyce Violet.
[redacted], Moukios, Evdokia.
[redacted], Munguia-Mercado, Jose.
[redacted], Murua, Luis.
[redacted], Murua, Maria.
[redacted], Murua, Victoria.
[redacted], Murua, Junior, Luis.
[redacted], Nercessian, Nishen Leon or Nishan Leon Nercessian.
[redacted] Nesbit, Calvin William.
[redacted], Nieto-Angeles, Jose.
[redacted], Nieto, Carmen Montoya De.
[redacted], Nieuwendam, Arnold Emile or Arnold Emile Sallons.
[redacted] Nin, Fon Fock or Fung Quon.
[redacted], Oei, Jacqueline.
[redacted], Oei, Ing Bian.
[redacted], Oliver, Ellen Charlotte Marcelle (nee Treyvoux).
[redacted] Olsen, June or June Marie Allett Kirkerod.
[redacted], Orfanos, Dimitrios or James.
[redacted], Oyakawa, Yoshiharu.
[redacted], Oyakawa, Oto.
[redacted], Oyakawa, Kenichi Augusto.
[redacted], Oyakawa, Keiji Louis.
[redacted], Oyakawa, Mitsuko Yolanda.
[redacted], Palassolo, Vito.
[redacted], Pappas, Philareti or Filareti J. Nee Siotkas.
[redacted], Patrick, Malia.
[redacted], Perez, Angelina Chagollan.
[redacted], Piceno-Mencaca, Procopio.
[redacted], Piceno, Cristina Garcia De.
[redacted], Pinero, Carlos Manuel or Carlos Manuel Pinero Martinez or Carlos Manuel Martinez Pinero.
[redacted] Polito, Paolo or Paul Polito.
[redacted], Pomili, Pasquale.
[redacted], Porto, Luis or Norberto Rodriguez.
[redacted], Pozo, Louis Alvarez or Juan Louis Alvarez or Louis Alvarez or Louis Allvery Pozo.
[redacted] Prats, Ana Josefa Martinez Garriga.
[redacted], Prieto, Nicolas Enrique Godinez.
[redacted] Radovnikovich, Frank or Frano Andrijin Radovnikovic or Frank Radovinikovich or Frank Radonovich.
[redacted] Ramos, Arnulfo Mario.
[redacted], Rietwyk, August Hendrik.
[redacted], Rivera-Garcia, Santos.
[redacted], Roca, Gualberto Alvarada Y.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Antonio.
[redacted], Rood, Dramen Hassman or Dramen H. or Dramen Hassmen Roop or Hassmen Roop or Abulrahmen Bin Hassan.
[redacted], Salice, Elena (nee Roscio).
[redacted], Salice, Enrico or Henry Salice.
[redacted], Salort, Anthony or Antonio Giner Lort.
[redacted], Sanchez-Sustaita, Vicente or Vicente Sanchez.
[redacted], Sanchez-Rodriguez, Ernestina or Ernestina Sanchez.
[redacted], Sanchez-Rodriguez, Maria Felix or Maria Felix Sanchez.
[redacted] Sanders, Fejga (Fijga) (nee Kemelgor).
[redacted], Sang, Chow Kang or Sang Chow Kang.
[redacted] Sauer, Wilhelm or William Sauer or William Otero.
[redacted] Seid, Lum or Henry Lum Seid.
[redacted] Selby, Harry William or Harry Selvy.
[redacted] Seo, Uneo or Joseph Uneo Seo.
[redacted], Shavulsky, Nathan.
[redacted], Shea, Bridget.
[redacted], Shimada, Shigeo.
[redacted] Silva-Torres, Sabino.
[redacted] Silva, Trinidad Leal De.
[redacted] Simms-Lee, Henry Alan John.
[redacted], Simonsen, John Gunnar or Gunnar Johan Simonsen.
[redacted], Smith, Suzanne Julie Puyoulet.
[redacted], So, Pak Tsun.
[redacted] Soto-Ruiz, Jose.
[redacted] Spanos, Sotiros or Sotiros M. Spanos.
[redacted], Stein, Alma (nee Sudmal) formerly Alma Sudmal Pontag.
[redacted], Stoianovich, Michael L. or Michael Lazary or Mial Lazo or Mike Louis.
[redacted] Suarez, Horacio Antonio Villazon Suarez.
[redacted], Suchos, Plouheria.
[redacted], Sze, Chao Yu.
[redacted], Thomas, Christophena Albertha.
[redacted], Thomas, Ellis or Elice Thomas.
[redacted], Torres, Servando.
[redacted], Turco, Francesco or Frank Turco.
[redacted] Ullah, Turab Ali or Turab Ali.
[redacted], Van Syckel, Lucille Lillian (nee Richards) alias Grisch.
[redacted] Wai, Chan or Wai Chan or Hang Pai.
[redacted], Walker, Verna Taylor or Verna Taylor.
[redacted], Watanabe, Hideo or Jerry Watanabe.
[redacted], Weisz, Wilhelm.
[redacted], Whitehead, Charles Stanley.
[redacted], Willem, Raquel (nee Rawuel Mandado Y Bertot or Raquel Saran Mandado Bertot).
[redacted], Williamson, Ferdinand Daniel or Fred Williams.
[redacted] Wilson, Asten or Harold Wright.
[redacted] Wilson, Noel Fitzgerald.
[redacted], Yates, Caroline Albertha.
[redacted], Yiakas, Dimos or Dimosthenis Yiakas.
[redacted], Young, Wong or Yung.
[redacted], Yuk, Lum or John Lum.
[redacted], Zauner, Kaspar.
[redacted], Zauner, Margareta.
[redacted], Ziegler, Hulda.
[redacted], Ziotou, Anna.
[redacted], Ziegler, Alfred.
[redacted], Ahmed, Saleh.
[redacted], Alfonso-Rodriguez, Bernardino Perfecto or Perfecto A. Rodriguez.
[redacted], Altamore, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Alvanou, Helen or Elleni (nee Boutis).
[redacted] Anderson, Donald John.
[redacted] Anderson, Mike or Goldburn Gilroy Myett.
[redacted], Aranda-Gonzalez, Jose.
[redacted], Avalos-Jimenez, Alberto.
[redacted], Ballard, Vera Agnes.
[redacted], Barcelo, Francisco Diaz or Francisco Barcalo Diaz.
[redacted] Basoglu, Muzafer Sherif alias Muzafer Sherif.
[redacted], Benjamin, Simon.
[redacted], Berrardini, Ubaldo.
[redacted] Birthwright, Clinton Vinston.
[redacted], Blair, Jessie (nee Stuart).
[redacted], Bleier, Kain.
[redacted], Bo, Cheong.
[redacted], Bratsafolis, Anthony Nicholas.
[redacted], Breda, Johannes.
[redacted], Breit, Ester formerly Esteva Tugetman.
[redacted], Butwell, James Robert.
[redacted], Calelides, Hercules alias Heraklis Kalalides.
[redacted] Cardoso, Elena Haydee or Elena Haydee Blanco de Cardoso.
[redacted], Carillo-Duran, Miguel.
[redacted], Cascallar, Angel Vilas.
[redacted], Cheng, Shau Hing or Shau Hing Chung or Shau Hing How.
[redacted], Chenko, Basil Michalt.
[redacted] Chiodo, Egildo or Egildo Ilario Chiodo.
[redacted], Choy-Renteria, Olga Maria or Olga Maria Choy.
[redacted] Ciriello, Esther Martha.
[redacted] Clark, Ascon George alias Christopher Williams.
[redacted] Clark, Cora Lavinia or Cora Lavinia Sanford or Cora Lavinia Farr.
[redacted], Contreras-Brambila, Jose.
[redacted] Cruz, Guadalupe Aguirre.
[redacted] Cruz, Felipa M.
[redacted], Curry, Elease Maud.
[redacted], Czaikowsky, Wilhelm Johann alias Will Muller.
[redacted], Davoli, Luigi Giovanni Francesco.
[redacted] De Serra, Esther Filomena Loza y Perez or Esther Serra alias Maria Tapia.
[redacted], Diaz- Rosa, Eleazar Manuel.
[redacted] Dimitratos, Helen (nee Modona).
[redacted] Dishington, Norma or Norma Therese Marie Dishington.
[redacted], Dolgoruki, Igor Edgar Youry Olesha alias Edgar Sanders alias Dino Valencay Sagan Sanders.
[redacted], Dollah, Din Bin alias Ben Din Collah or Dan Dola.
[redacted], Driver, Aloo Shavaksha (nee Jhavbala).
[redacted], Eason, Collette Maud (nee Gillis).
[redacted] Edwards, Ralph Leopold alias Charles Douglas.
[redacted], Ekloff, Helene.
[redacted], Ellsworth, Michael Hall.
[redacted] Eng, Irene Chi Che Wong.
[redacted], Erickson, Edith Sylvia.
[redacted], Farias, Eduardo Bousas.
[redacted] Fee, Ging alias Lai Hong.
[redacted], Feiger, Armin.
[redacted] Feiger, Freda.
[redacted], Fernandez, Domingo Augusto.
[redacted], Fernandez-Alvarez Jose or Jose Fernandez.
[redacted] Ferreira y Silva, Maximo alias Ferreira Silvo alias Maximino Ferreira.
[redacted], Figueiredo, Joaquim.
[redacted], Finuliar, Trinidad Barlaan.
[redacted], Fisher, Joyce Lilian.
[redacted], Flores-Cortez, Bernardo.
[redacted], De Flores, Juana Gomez.
[redacted] Flores-Gomez, Rodolfo.
[redacted] Flores-Gomez, Bernardo.
[redacted] Fong, Eng Long alias Henry Sang.
[redacted], Francis, Emelie Yvonne.
[redacted], Francis, Fitzroy.
[redacted] Franco, Jose Mendez.
[redacted], Frischer, Ada.
[redacted], Galanis, George.
[redacted], Garcia, Jorge Lopez y or George Lopez.
[redacted], Geiger, Kurt.
[redacted], Geneen, Maurice.
[redacted], Giamonetis, Theodore or Theodoros Giamonitis.
[redacted], Goddard, Francis Frederick alias Pat O'Malley.
[redacted], Godlewska, Bertha or Bessie.
[redacted], Gonzales, Pedro Pablo alias Pedro Rodriguez.
[redacted], Gottheil, Zelman.
[redacted], Gottheil, Fanny.
[redacted], Gregorio, Francisco.
[redacted] Gross, Alexander.
[redacted], Guerrero-Olera, Pedro.
[redacted] Gutierrez-Hernandez, Ramon.
[redacted] Guzman, Salvador Munoz.

[redacted], Hernandez-Garcia, Juana.
[redacted], Hewitt, Lulu Mae (nee Ferguson).
[redacted], Higa, Shimatsu.
[redacted] Himer, Nick or Miklos Himer.
[redacted], Hinds, Wilfred Lawson or Wilfred Loshington Edwards.
[redacted], Hsu, Huai Yun.
[redacted] Hsu, Fong Chinn.
[redacted], Hung, Ho Tak.
[redacted], Hunt, Maisie.
[redacted] Hyland, Bridget Bridie.
[redacted], Jackson, Harriet Joy.
[redacted], Jackson, Naomi Constantino (nee Naomi Constantino Flores).
[redacted], Jacobsen, Borghild Tvede.
[redacted] Jensen, Vagn Aage.
[redacted], Jeu, Ng Ngit alias Mrs. Jiu Nai Jeu.
[redacted], Joe, May Ying.
[redacted], Joe, Yung Chu.
[redacted] Jon, Peter or Panayotis Ioannou or Peter Jones.
[redacted], Jung, Pay Yop or Loo Pun.
[redacted], Kadri, Zia or Ziauddin Mustafahasan Quadri.
[redacted], Kahn, Carmen Sameniego.
[redacted], Karfola, Bangora.
[redacted], Kefalides, Nicolaos A. or Nicolaos Kefalides.
[redacted], Ken, Wong. Leu.
[redacted], King, Marcelle Espinozo.
[redacted], Kohler, Alfred Richard alias Frederick Gelien.
[redacted], Kohne, Richard Edward.
[redacted], Kohne, Gabrielle Henriette.
[redacted], Koike, Mantaro.
[redacted] Koike, Kumi.
[redacted], Kontizas, Artemis or Artemis Kontijas.
[redacted], Krasnoff, Rose.
[redacted], Sharfman, Leonard.
[redacted], Sharfman, Sol.
[redacted], Leblond, Marcel Alain.
[redacted], Ledee, Joseph Andre.
[redacted], Lee, Richard Dooban.
[redacted] Lefkovits, Jonas.
[redacted], Lefkovits, Judith (nee Kalisch).
[redacted], Liburd, Terrence Mansfield.
[redacted], Liem, Chang Mo or Chang Moo Lin or Paul Chang Lien or Paul Chang Mo Liem.
[redacted] Ligato, Giuseppe Antonio or Joseph Ligato.
[redacted], Little, Robert Bell.
[redacted], Lopez-Martinez, Adrian.
[redacted] Louie, Harry Fong.
[redacted], Lozano, Serafin.
[redacted] Lozano, Elvira Calderon Grenas.
[redacted] Lucchino, Domenico.
[redacted], Luna, Catalina.
[redacted] Luna, Luz.
[redacted] Luna, Manuel.
[redacted], Luna, Julio.
[redacted] Madonis, Antonis Parashou alias Antonis P. Mantonis.
[redacted], Manstretta, Paolina Borra.
[redacted], Marshall, John Fitzherbert.
[redacted], Martinez, Ramon Antonio.
[redacted], McFarlane, Dudley Vincent.
[redacted], McNaughton, Mildred Grace.
[redacted] McPherson, Cyril George alias Edgar Broogs.
[redacted] Medina-Magdaleno, Luis.
[redacted] Mendez, Jesus or Jesus Mendez-Nava.
[redacted] Mendez, Maria Socorro.
[redacted], Mendez, Serapio.
[redacted], Mendez, Guadalupe Carrasco De.
[redacted], Mendoza-Pedroza, Maria or Maria Vasquez-Pedrosa or Maria Fuentez-Vasquez.
[redacted], Merino, Sofia (nee Sofia Amadora Nevarro-Mon).
[redacted], Meyer, Constance Cornelia Josepha Maria Arts or Constance Cornelia Maria Tan Arts or Constance Arts Meyer.
[redacted], Mezen, James Anthony.
[redacted], Mirza, Rio Nusservan.
[redacted] Mon, Lau.
[redacted], Moo, James Loo.
[redacted] Moran, Joseph Patrick.
[redacted], Mossaides, Panayioties or Paul Mossaides.
[redacted], Moschitto, Anna Marie (nee Cipriano).
[redacted], Mustasch, Mate.
[redacted] Nacarano, Gaspare Gregorio.
[redacted] Nunez-Diaz, Maria.
[redacted] Nunez-Urrutia, Jesus.
[redacted] Okada, Benzo Joe.
[redacted] Pacheco, Jesusita Ernestina (nee Dominguez).
[redacted], Park, Chu.
[redacted] Pao, Chao Rah.
[redacted] Chao, Ah Vong (nee Vong Chen).
[redacted] Pao, Sung Zau alias Zau Pao Sung or Sung Ziang Pao or John Pao.
[redacted], Papazian, Haiguhi (nee Ogretmeroglu).
[redacted], Pell, Irene, formerly Irene Pelstroosoff Pell.
[redacted], Penn, Christian Emanuel.
[redacted], Perri, Filomena Maria Lucia (nee Mirabelli).
[redacted] Pfieffer, August.
[redacted], Pickering, Jens Wallace.
[redacted], Pickett, Evelyn Gladys.
[redacted], Pineda, Ibrahim Gaspur.
[redacted], Pitter, Walter Benjamin.
[redacted] Porter, Isaac N. alias Isaac Nathaniel Porter.
[redacted] Posada, Paul Rodriguez alias Raul Rodrigues Pasada.
[redacted], Prado-Lopez, Jose alias Jose L. Prado alias Jose Lopez-Prado.
[redacted], Pratt, Helen Theresa.
[redacted], Proper, Leendert Gerardus.
[redacted], Randall, Jack alias Johann Bernhard Rebel.
[redacted], Rano, Margret McInnes.
[redacted] Reid, Grace or Graciela Reid (nee Grace Marcano) alias Anna Josefina Reid.
[redacted] Rizick, Kalena Gibreen.
[redacted], Robinson, Ellen Alberta alias Ella A. Robinson.
[redacted] Rodriquez, Mildred Irene.
[redacted], Romero, Gonzalo or Gonzalo Romero Leira.
[redacted], Romero, Rodolfo Rolando.
[redacted] Romero-Goytortua, Xavier or Xavier Romero.
[redacted], Rosenbluth, Leah or Lena or Laah or Laja.
[redacted] Rovira, Pedro.
[redacted] Rowe, Cleveland alias Vincent Jones.
[redacted], Rowell, Alice alias Alice Rowell McCann.
[redacted], Rozovsky, Isajah or Isajar Rozauskas or Isajus Isjar or Isajan Rozaukas Rozovsky or Isajus Rosovsky-Rozaukas or Isajah Rozovski.
[redacted] Rubalcava, Pedro Serna.
[redacted], Ruiz-Torres, Jesus.
[redacted] Ruiz-Morales, Ynes.
[redacted], Ruiz-Morales, Andrea.
[redacted] Santillano-Cardoza, Pedro alias Pedro Armijo.
[redacted] Scala, Vincenzo di.
[redacted] Scott, Carmen Waul alias Carmen Waul Buchanan.
[redacted], Shong, Lee Ting.
[redacted] Simon, Lillian (nee Piltzmaker) or Cary Wang Simon.
[redacted], Simone, Michael.
[redacted], Sin-Tzu, Weng.
[redacted], Weng, Josephine alias Josephine Evelyn Tok Ying Hsi alias Josephine Tok Ying.
[redacted] Solis-Flores, Ricardo.
[redacted], Solomon, Saul.
[redacted], Spadone, Vito.
[redacted], Spina, Alfio.
[redacted] Spyrotos, Christoforos.
[redacted], Smith, Donald Bentley.
[redacted] Stanley, Leo.
[redacted] Stokes, Horace Murray.
[redacted] Suarez-Caballero, Victor Manuel.
[redacted], Sum, Pon Sing or Sing Sum Pon alias Gene Pon alias Pon Sing.
[redacted], Taam, Jennie.
[redacted], Taam, May Chan.
[redacted] Tei, Si Hung.
[redacted] Tjomstol, Steinar Salve alias Steinar Tjomstol.
[redacted] Tom, Kwok Tung or Tom Kwok Tung.
[redacted], Trott, Gwen Marie Allen.
[redacted], Vasilakis, Michael or Mihael Vasilakis or Mike Vasilakis.
[redacted], Vasquez, Rafael Soto.
[redacted], Vekris, Antonios Nikitas.
[redacted], Venturas, Panaghis John.
[redacted], Vigil, Jose.
[redacted], Vitiello, Alfonso.
[redacted], Votting, Victor.
[redacted], Vukusich, Stipan or Stepan Vukusich.
[redacted], Wang, Ching Hsien.
[redacted] Chin, Fan Ju or Ju Chin Fan Wang.
[redacted], Weller, Susan Jenny or Zuzanna Swirska.
[redacted], Wells, Anita or Anita Pitcherlie or Anita Remus or Anita Ames.
[redacted], Wong, Wing Hee.
[redacted] Wong, Tseng Sui Hsu.
[redacted] Yau, Chan Choi or Chan Wing.
[redacted], Yee, Tom Gong alias Hum Gim Wong alias James Wong Tom.
[redacted], Zambrano, Jesus Ramon.
[redacted], Zaton, Oscar.
[redacted] Totoricaguena, Juana Bengoechea.
[redacted] T, Kiritsis, Demetrios Spiros.
[redacted], Aarsheim, Svein Ole.
[redacted] Aceves-Garcia, Francisco or Frank Ramirez Aceves.
[redacted] Agramonte, Raul Colarte or Raul Colarte.
[redacted], Albano, Enrico.
[redacted], Alfonso, Andres Olympia Pena y Andres O. Pena.
[redacted], Aliano, Joseph.
[redacted], Almasmary, Ahmed Kassim or Ahmed Gazin or Ahmed Kassiam or Mohamed Messeri or Ahmed Kasson or Mohamed Masser.
[redacted], Almeida, Raul Arencibia.
[redacted] Alvo, Jennie nee Eugenia Perez or Jennie Perez.
[redacted], Amada, Francisco or Frank.
[redacted], Anastassiades, Athanassios.
[redacted] Apoltelescu, Stefan.
[redacted], Arditi, Albert Abraham.
[redacted], Arditi, Dona Bella.
[redacted], Arias, Bernard or Ben or Beeny Orias.
[redacted] Asgarzadeh, Kamal.
[redacted], Asgarzadeh, Safieh (nee Safieh Damerli Seyedi).
[redacted], Attias, Henri or Henry Attias.
[redacted], Avelar-Macias, Jose or Jose Maria Avelar-Macias.
[redacted] Azioni, Giuseppe or Giuseppe Albertini.
[redacted] Baez, Rodriguez, Leobardo.
[redacted], Baird, Francis or Frank Blair or John William Blair.
[redacted], Bakee, Said Bin or Syed Baker.
[redacted], Bane, Joseph Vejnavowicz or Joseph Vejnevoricz or Bane or Banevowitch or Banevovitch.
[redacted], Baracchini, Ennio.
[redacted], Baresic, Mijo.
[redacted], Baricevich, Jack or Giacomo or Jacob.
[redacted] Baruch, Morris or Barouch or George Kyringis or Kiryakis.
[redacted], Bassile, Moris or Maurice.
[redacted], Behie, William Lewis.
[redacted], Bellotti, Allessandro Angelo.
[redacted] Benfanti, Vincenzo.
[redacted], Benzel, Hazel Pearl (nee Rew).
[redacted], Berchten-Breiter, Hans Carl.
[redacted], Berchten-Breiter, Irene Dolores (nee Lewis).
[redacted] Berger, Katalin.

[redacted], Bianco, Emanuele Esposito.
[redacted], Billi, Lino or Luiz Loyecchio or Luigi Lovecchio or Luigi Louvecchio.
[redacted], Bingham, Alfred Augustus or Aeria Jackson.
[redacted], Blache-Fraser, Elaine Stella.
[redacted], Bless, Miguel Juan.
[redacted], Boller, Peter Joseph.
[redacted], Bove, Salvatore.
[redacted], Bow, Ho or Ho Bo.
[redacted], Brohman, Charles.
[redacted], Bulens, Rosalie Josephine.
[redacted], Burns, John Arthur or John Arthur Brown.
[redacted], Butler, Stanley.
[redacted] Cacioli, Rizieri or Richard.
[redacted], Calatayud-Ramos, Primitivo or Roberto Ramos.
[redacted], Camaioni, Pietro.
[redacted], Carballo, Benito or Benito Carballo Entenza.
[redacted] Cardenas-Garcia, Concepcion or Concha.
[redacted] Cardenas, Salud.
[redacted] Cardenas-Solorio, Jose.
[redacted], Carlson, Hilmer.
[redacted] Cascone, Ulisses.
[redacted], Casimiro, Antonio.
[redacted], Cassen, Aleksandra Olga (nee Stasiulyte).
[redacted], Castelblanco, Dario.
[redacted], Castillo, Santos Matthew.
[redacted], Catanzaro, Damiano.
[redacted], Catz, Frans James.
[redacted], Caudillo, Cruz Maria or de Caudillo formerly Milan (nee Garcia).
[redacted], Chai, Chang Kai.
[redacted], Chan, Man Wei or Chan Nan Wai or Chan Kim.
[redacted], Chang, Albert Chiang or Chiang Chang.
[redacted], Chang, Lita Won or Lita Li-Tang Wu.
[redacted], Chang, Lin Chung-Ching or Chung Ching Lin Chang or Jean Chang.
[redacted], Chang, Wan or Tom Jun Yue.
[redacted], Chao, Gloria nee Gloria Ya Tsung Kung.
[redacted], Chavez, Domingo.
[redacted], Chavez, Eusebia Concepcion.
[redacted], Chen, Chi Tsai.
[redacted], Cheney, John Nelson.
[redacted], Chin, Wee Kay or Sam Lee.
[redacted], Chin, Mong Loong or Chan Yok.
[redacted], Ching, Lee.
[redacted], Chiu, Hin or Chiu Hin.
[redacted], Choo, Anna Emielie Luise (nee Anna Emielie Luise Tuebben Hoffman).
[redacted], Christopher, Dianna.
[redacted], Cho, Chin or Cho Chin.
[redacted], Choy, Hong Hing.
[redacted], Chung, Tom Fun.
[redacted], Cingiryan, Vasken or Changrian.
[redacted], Civelli, Vincent or Chivelly.
[redacted], Claxton, Claristine Albertha.
[redacted], Cliotis, Christos.
[redacted], Cohen, Lulu or Lulu Salman Shamoun.
[redacted], Callop, Mary.
[redacted], Combojinopoulos, Alexandre or Alex Combojinot.
[redacted], Costa, Natale or Nick Costa.
[redacted], Castas, Anna Chris or Anna Giagou or Mrs. Christ Costas.
[redacted], Courville, Blanche Maud nee Hills, formerly Pugsley.
[redacted], Dan, Lee Sing.
[redacted], Danner, Geraldine.
[redacted], Davis, Lillian Ann.
[redacted], Davis, Robert Roy.
[redacted], De Rguilar, Colia Duron.
[redacted], De Calves, Ondina San Martin.
[redacted], De Delgado, Ana Ovidia Ruiz.
[redacted], Dedes, Sophia (nee Dedoglou).
[redacted], Dell, Edmondo.
[redacted], De Luevano, Catalina Cortez.
[redacted], De Monte, Lorenzo.
[redacted], Demou, Michael Kyriakos.
[redacted], De Munoz, Guadalupe Juarez or Guadolupe Juarez.
[redacted], De Munoz, Sara Castillo.
[redacted], De Oca, Pascual Eduardo Calderin Montes or Pascual Eduardo Calderin.
[redacted], De Oliveira, Antonio.
[redacted], De Ramirez, Andrea Castro.
[redacted], De Ramirez, Estefana Rodriguez, or Maria Estefana Rodriguez De Ramirez or Ester Rodriguez De Ramirez or Estela Rodriguez De Ramirez or Ester Rodriguez-Belmares.
[redacted], Ramirez-Mesa, Felipe.
[redacted], Derkacz, Stanislaw or Stanley.
[redacted] Derkacz, Zofja or Sophia.
[redacted] De Torres, Antonia Marrero.
[redacted], De Tovar, Cristina Oroczo or Cartina Oroczo de Tovar (nee Cristina Oroczo-Flores).
[redacted], De Vergara, Paula Nunez.
[redacted] De Verna, Eugenia Gonzalez nee Eugenia Gonzales y Calvadilla.
[redacted], De Vita, Blanca Margarita nee Castaneda.
[redacted], Diaz, Juan Francisco Romeirio y.
[redacted], Diaz-Hector, Candido.
[redacted], Di Benardi, Anthony Vincent or Antonia Benardo.
[redacted], Di Marzo, Vincenzo or Vincent Di Marzo.
[redacted], Din, Lee or Dim Lee.
[redacted], Dorner, Anton John or Tony Dorner.
[redacted], Doros, George.
[redacted], Doros, Elizabeth Dissig.
[redacted], Dos Santos, Antonio Anna.
[redacted], Downs, John Ephriam.
[redacted], Dwyer, Lilla Frances.
[redacted], Eggers, Rose (nee McShane).
[redacted], Elefteriades, Sofia.
[redacted], Ellis, John Lessle.
[redacted], Erlachtegerecht, Leon.
[redacted], Errante, Bruno.
[redacted], Fadief, Fannie K.
[redacted], Fels, August.
[redacted], Firipis, Miltiadis or Milton Firipis.
[redacted], Fischer, Max Richard.
[redacted], Foley, John Frederick.
[redacted], Fong, Mar Hing or Mah Hing Fong.
[redacted], Fontanot, John.
[redacted], Ford, Jonathan or John Ford.
[redacted], Fraser, Constantia Augusta.
[redacted], Fraser, Delphine.
[redacted], Freund, Berta (nee Rosenfeld).
[redacted], Fun, Wong.
[redacted], Gabriel, Maurice or Maurice Gabriel Klaib or Maurice Charles Klaib.
[redacted], Gaetzschmann, Otto Friederich.
[redacted], Galindo-Garcia, Ruben.
[redacted], Gang, Lee Hing.
[redacted], Garciga, Felix Maria De La Caridad Cabrera.
[redacted], Garrison, Alexander Heaven.
[redacted], Gaubert, Martha Block or Matti Block.
[redacted] Gaulle, Reginald Alexander or Gaul or Bobbie Gaul or Clyde Payne.
[redacted], Geismar, Sophie (nee Sophie Lichtenstein).
[redacted], George, Daisy Chaffoo or Daisy R. Chaffoo George.
[redacted], Gesnador, Juan Villacis.
[redacted], Get, Hor Fung.
[redacted], Gianu, Periklis Savas or Pangiotis Koliosas.
[redacted], Giordano, Carmelo.
[redacted], Giurco, Mario.
[redacted], Goldberg, Arnold or Arnold Gould.
[redacted], Golonka, Stefan.
[redacted], Gomez-Urquieta, Gregorio or Gregorio U. Gomez.
[redacted], Gong, William or Gong Dick.
[redacted], Gontan, Jesse.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Joe S. or Jose Salvador Gonzalez or Joseph Salvador Gonzalez.
[redacted], Gonzalez-Aguilar, Luis.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Teresa (nee Castro).
[redacted] Graci, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Gravel, Marie Simone (nee St. Pierre).
[redacted] Gray, Alice Frances or Alice Frances Baksh.
[redacted], Gregory, Clifford A.
[redacted], Groene, Johannes Heinrich or John H. Groene.
[redacted], Gross, Chaim Sandor.
[redacted], Grzan, Sime.
[redacted], Guajardo-Chavez, Juan.
[redacted] Guajardo-Rodriguez, Baldomero.
[redacted] Guajardo-Rodriguez, Isabel.
[redacted], Haaburg, Catherine or Catherine Turrie Warnock.
[redacted], Haidostian, Berj Havhanness.
[redacted], Hallas, James John or Demetrios John Hallas or Dimitrios Hallas.
[redacted] Hamarat, Metin Recep.
[redacted], Hamilton, Harry Joseph.
[redacted], Hatim, Mohammed.
[redacted] Hecht, Gertrude Johanna Krons or Gertrude Johanna Krone or Charlotte Schmidt.
[redacted], Helou, Carlos Samson.
[redacted], Henry, Liliane or Liliane Lesperance.
[redacted], Hernandez-Jimenez, Pedro or Pedro-Guillermo Hernandez.
[redacted], Hernandez-Rodriguez, Oscar.
[redacted], Hirte, Hermann Friederich or Herman Frederick Hirte.
[redacted], Hofman, Gerrit Celis.
[redacted], Hovanessian, Mary or Marieta or Martha or Sedrakian.
[redacted], Huang, Wei Yip.
[redacted], Huffaker, Vilma Gerda Gutta Anna or Vilma Gerda Gutta Anna Jacobsen.
[redacted] Hylton, Norman Ellis.
[redacted], Ingegnieros, Salvatore.
[redacted], Ives, Percy Alfred.
[redacted], Jacobs, Rose or Rose Stotsky.
[redacted], Jensen, Harold Emil.
[redacted], Jensen, Niels Kristan.
[redacted], Jimenez, Abelino or Avelino Jimenez-Ruis or Luis Minor.
[redacted], Jimenez-Calveira, Jose Miguel or Jose Jimenez.
[redacted], John, Klaus Gunther Fritz Helmut.
[redacted] Jones, Neil Royes.
[redacted], Jordan, Joyce Corrine.
[redacted] Jorgensen, Rasmus Peter.
[redacted], Jirmia John or Hon Irimia.
[redacted] Jukich, Rudy.
[redacted], Kalimerakis, George Michael.
[redacted], Kaminsky, Andreas or Andrew Delger.
[redacted], Kampetis, Demetrios Anastasios or Kambitsis or James A. Kampetis or Kambitis or Kamptis or Demetros Kamptis.
[redacted], Karlson, John or Johannes or Johan Karlson.
[redacted], Kaufman, Ida or Ida Greenberg.
[redacted], Kaulins, Brigita.
[redacted], Kayias, Michael.
[redacted], Kee, Chin Dew or Kee Dew Chin or Edward Chin.
[redacted], Kelley, Stella Alice.
[redacted], King, Wong.
[redacted], Kirppu, Anna Wilhelmina.
[redacted], Klein, Samuel or Tibor Schwarz.
[redacted], Klinner, Jutta Klara.
[redacted], Kornilakis, Antonios.
[redacted], Kostas, Evangelia.
[redacted], Kovacic, Frane or Frank.
[redacted], Kristal, Celia or Cyna Krysztal or Celia Krysztal.
[redacted], Kriticos, Nick or Nickolaos Kritikos.
[redacted], Kuran, Ivan or John Kuran or John Gradick.
[redacted], Kwan, Ho or Kwan Ho.
[redacted], Laidlaw, Dorothy Muriel Dickerson.
[redacted], Lakshmansingh, Charles Gordon.
[redacted], Lancos, John or John Billan or Lancon.
[redacted], Landry, Gladys Leotha.
[redacted], Lauh, Ts-Sung Ernest.

[redacted], Layton, William Valentine Osborn.
[redacted], Lee, Dep or Lee Dep or Robert Edward Lee.
[redacted], Lee, Hong Took or Took Lee or Lee Cho or Frankie Lee.
[redacted], Lee, Wealin or Lung Wai Ng.
[redacted], Lee, Wong Yuen or Yuen Wong or Wong Yuen.
[redacted], Legaros, Demetrios Michael.
[redacted], Lehto, John Vilhelm.
[redacted], Leinwand, Shirley (nee Barron).
[redacted], Leitl, Waltraud or Waltrud Leitl Berger.
[redacted], Leitl, Siegbert or Siegbert Leitl Berger.
[redacted], Leiva, Hector Munoz.
[redacted], Lekkas, Vassilios or Bill Lekkas.
[redacted], Leong, Ng or Bennie Wu.
[redacted], Leong, Sai Yee or Leong Chow or Charlie Leong.
[redacted], Letsch, John Peter.
[redacted], Leung, Sue Jean Ng or Sue Jean Ng or Shee Ng.
[redacted], Lehem, Matilde Saadi.
[redacted], Lehem, Fortuna Florette.
[redacted], Lilling, Etela or Esther Lilling or Etela Liling.
[redacted], Lin, Ling Kin or George Kin Lin.
[redacted], Ling, Annabelle or Perseus Annabelle Ling.
[redacted], Ling, Lai Soon.
[redacted], Linke, Paul Erwin.
[redacted], Lionas, Leontios.
[redacted], Loo, Fook.
[redacted], Lopez, Antonio Garcia or David Espineira.
[redacted], Lorier, Andries or Andrew Lewis.
[redacted], Los Santos, Jose Tomas De.
[redacted], Low, Yen or Low Yen or Lou Yit or Yit Lou.
[redacted], Lozado, Leodegario B.
[redacted], Lazaroff, Tsvetco.
[redacted], Lazaroff, Helen.
[redacted], Luchs, Harry Alfred.
[redacted], Lum, Lee, or John Lee or Howard Lee.
[redacted], Lumley, Edward Nathony.
[redacted], Luna-Castedo, Jose.
[redacted], Lupu, Eulalia.
[redacted], Lupu, Vasile or Fred Walters.
[redacted], MacFarlan, Vida Gladys Anna.
[redacted], Maffei, Giovanni Francesco.
[redacted], Maidenbaum, Samuel or Samuel Magdenbaum or Josef Rutbowsky.
[redacted], Maki, Anna-Liisa (nee Makela).
[redacted], Makrinos, Michael Markou.
[redacted], Maldonado L. (nee Maria Luisa Pereyra).
[redacted], Malz, Samuel.
[redacted], Mandel, Hans or Hans Jean Mandel or Johann Mandel.
[redacted], Mandel, Phyllis Barlow (nee Jackson).
[redacted], Mandelbaum, Moses or Moses David Mandelbaum.
[redacted], Manis, Michael Christ or Mike Mennis or Michael Manis or Michel Mennis or Mike Manis or Maki Manis.
[redacted], Manzon, Mario Ramones.
[redacted], Marsala, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Martinez, Eugenio or Eugene.
[redacted], Martinez, Josema (nee Josefa Rafaela Cazanas Monserrat).
[redacted], Martinez, Melecio.
[redacted], Martis, John Ernesto or Johan Ernesto Martis.
[redacted], Mas, Damian Garcias y or Damian Garcias.
[redacted], Matsumoto, Hitoshi or Chojiro Sumi or Jack Chojiro Sumi.
[redacted], Maxwell, Leonard Fritz or Arnold Maxwell.
[redacted], Mazon, Celebi Robert.
[redacted], McCourty, John.
[redacted], McKim, Olive Kate.
[redacted], McLellan, John or John Ronald McLellan.
[redacted], McLoughlin, Isabella (nee Isabella Cronan).
[redacted], Medovay, Moisha or Morris or Maurice.
[redacted], Medrono, Junior, Luis Montes.
[redacted], Mellon, Wilhelmina Lydia.
[redacted], Mestril Renee (nee Casanova).
[redacted], Metcalf, Henriette.
[redacted], Miku, John or Frank Kartush.
[redacted], Ming, Barbara Luke.
[redacted], Modonas, Antonios.
[redacted], Mombacher, Karl Ewald.
[redacted], Mon, Frank or Mon Suey or Johnny Wah.
[redacted], Mondlak, Sawa Yaroslaw.
[redacted], Monkarl, Hassen S. or Hassan El Sayed Menkar or Hasson Monkal.
[redacted], Montanaro, Gioacchino.
[redacted], Montrand, Juana Cortez.
[redacted], Mook, Lam Sang or Yee Lee.
[redacted], Moons, Victor.
[redacted], Morales-Avila, Gabriel.
[redacted], Moretti, Dominick or Mario Moretti or Dominick Marchetti.
[redacted], Moroch, Simeon.
[redacted], Mortuza, Golam or Mohamed Ghulam Murtaza.
[redacted], Mouquinho, Sofia (nee Sofia Jiminez Chavez).
[redacted], Mueller, Carl Josef Peter.
[redacted], Mui, Phaik-Sim L.
[redacted], Muller, Heinrich Arthur or Henry Arthur Miller.
[redacted], Mulley, Anne Jane.
[redacted], Munoz, Eduardo Castaneda or Eduard Castaneda or Eduard Castaneda Munoz.
[redacted], Naiman, Moshe or Moszek Najman.
[redacted], Nass, Goldie.
[redacted], Navarro, Raymundo or Raymundo Navarro Carrol.
[redacted], Nevison, Herbert Peter.
[redacted], Ng, You Lin or Yau Ng or You Ng.
[redacted], Ngar, Chow See or Chow Pang or Pang Joe or Joe Pang.
[redacted], Nicholson, Catherine (nee Byrne).
[redacted], Nieto, Jose Galvan or Joseph Nieto Galvan or Jose Nieto Galvan.
[redacted], Noutsopoulos, Spiros.
[redacted], Novack, Jean or Zalata Nowik or Jennie Novack.
[redacted], Nuzzolese, Hendrika Jacoba (nee Van Eyck).
[redacted], Olsen, Einar Gran or Einar Olsen.
[redacted], Olsen, Hans.
[redacted], Orabona, Giuseppe.
[redacted], Ordorica, Marcelino Vidaurrazaga or Marcilino Vidaurrazaga.
[redacted], Orlich, Nikola Vincent or Nick Orlich.
[redacted], Osman, Hassan or Hasan Hajee Eoner or Omer Hassan Hagi or Agi Omer Hassen or Victor Barbere or Barbarie or Barbari or Abdi Ibrahim.
[redacted], Otero, Jose Gomez or Jose Gomez Otero Leon.
[redacted], Padla, Ksenia.
[redacted], Palacios-Valadez, Roberto.
[redacted], Pahagopoulos, John or John Nick Pappas.
[redacted], Paoli, Roberto Giovanni or Roberto G. Paoli or Roberto or Roberto Paoli or Giovanni Paoli.
[redacted], Papa, Bertha.
[redacted], Papazoglou, Dimitrios Emanuel or Papasoglou.
[redacted], Parron, Maria De Los Nieves or Maria P. Pena.
[redacted], Passerini, Luigi.
[redacted], Pataca, Abilio or Joaquim Rodrigues.
[redacted], Pavich, Frank.
[redacted], Pena-Romero, Eduardo or Ruben Alcarez-Hervey.
[redacted], Pena, Aurora Ortiz De or Aurora Ortiz-Perez.
[redacted], Pender, Bridie Christina.
[redacted], Pereda, Yolanda Mazar now Yolanda Marty.
[redacted], Pereira, Luis or Luis Masa Pereira.
[redacted], Perez, Jose Dominguez or Joseph Dominguez.
[redacted], Perez-Hernandez, Deise.
[redacted], Perez, Narcisa Estrella De La Osa y.
[redacted], Pesa, Vicko Ante.
[redacted], Pezold, Frederick Emil.
[redacted], Pian, Richard or Hsueh-Jui Pian.
[redacted], Pian, Mabel or Mel-Po Lou Pian (nee Lou).
[redacted], Picut-Diaz, Guido Hilario or Guido Hilario Picot or John Avalos or John Gomez.
[redacted], Piller, Karin or Kaarin Wirgo Piller.
[redacted], Pina, Antonio Jose or Pinna or Pinno.
[redacted], Polemis, Leonidas.
[redacted], Polemis, Afrodite (nee Dracos).
[redacted], Poon, Tung or Poon Tung.
[redacted], Profenna, Francesca or Frances Profenna or Francesca or M. Francesca Cancro.
[redacted], Psiakis, Andrew Nicholas.
[redacted], Pugliese, Angela (nee Stucci).
[redacted], Quan, Lee Kee.
[redacted], Quoey, Lui or Liu Quoey or Liu Kwai or Liu Kai or Liu Kway or Lu Kai.
[redacted], Rabinowitz, Dina (nee Zaidman).
[redacted], Raisanen, Aino Alfrida (nee Vaukonen).
[redacted], Ramos, Manuel.
[redacted], Ramos-Perez, Francisco.
[redacted], Rana, Sudhir Narasinha.
[redacted], Rankines, Elkanah Jacob.
[redacted], Rea, Raffaele or Ralph Rea.
[redacted], Refele, Hans Rainer.
[redacted], Reid, Resmond James.
[redacted], Reid, Joseph Joseph or Timothy Lynch.
[redacted], Reyes, Ramon Joaquin.
[redacted], Rincon-Chavoya, George or Jorge Chavoya-Rincon.
[redacted], Ripley, William Charles.
[redacted], Rivieccio, Michele.
[redacted], Roberts, Constance Faith Alimo.
[redacted], Robertson, Henry Alexander.
[redacted], Robinson, Vernal.
[redacted], Rodriguez, Teresa (nee Perez Digon).
[redacted], Rodriguez-Rodriguez, Martin.
[redacted], Rodriquez, Elsa.
[redacted], Roggio, Santo.
[redacted], Roper, Ivan Leopold or Leeman Searchwell.
[redacted], Roque, Jose Goncalves.
[redacted], Roros, Kostas.
[redacted], Rosini, Vice.
[redacted], Rotenberg, Izak or Jack.
[redacted], Roumeliotis, Nicholas.
[redacted], Rowlands, Timothy Bowen.
[redacted], Rumsey, May Eleanor.
[redacted], Ruse, Gloria Roberts.
[redacted], Ryan, Margaret Bertha (nee Hartlieb).
[redacted], Safyurtlu, Mahmut Iskender.
[redacted], Safyurtlu, Gulnar (nee Assadulah or Ecadullah).
[redacted], Sarkkinen, Jenny Karia.
[redacted], Sauro, Federico or Federico Sauro Costagliola.
[redacted], Sawchuk, Anna.
[redacted], Schidlowski, Alice Tamm or Ursula Tamm Schidlowski.
[redacted], Schurmann, Milda (nee Eglit).
[redacted], Schwarz, Carl or Karol Szwarz or Karl Schartz.
[redacted], Scott, Lydia Nicholas.
[redacted], Serna, Elvira Tarin or Elvira Tarin.
[redacted], Shabov, Joseph or Mohamed Ben Ali Shabov.
[redacted], Sherson, Beulah Dolly or Buelah Dolly Levine or Bulah Dolly Steinberg.
[redacted], Shults, Maria Magdalena.
[redacted], Simmons, William Leopold.

[redacted], Smith, Herta Jacobi.
[redacted] Smith, Otto or Otto Oertwig or Otto Ertwig.
[redacted], Smolinski, Bernice.
[redacted], Soon, Mark or Mark Lee or Mark Kee Watt.
[redacted], Sossoff, Basile.
[redacted], Spring, Adolph or Adolf Spring or Joe Spring.
[redacted], Stafford, Andre Cochelin.
[redacted], Stagner, Frank Harcourt.
[redacted], Stagner, Lawrence or Lawrence Robert Stagner.
[redacted], Stammer, Willy.
[redacted], Stamos, Anna.
[redacted], Stamos, Catherine Belle (nee Bremner).
[redacted], Stellatos, Ioannis.
[redacted], Stephenson, Margaret Gertrude or Marguerite Gertrude Stephens.
[redacted], Stern, Silviu Alexander.
[redacted], Stewart, Harold Irving.
[redacted], Stilidiotis, Evangelos Theodoros or Angelo Still.
[redacted], Stover, Maxine Mae.
[redacted], Stowe, Sam.
[redacted], Strauss, Anita.
[redacted], Strobbia, Comenick Jerome or Domenico Girolano Strobbia.
[redacted], Sulich, Giuseppe or Joseph Sulich.
[redacted], Sulskis, Gertrud Hildegard (nee Leutheuser).
[redacted], Sum, Lai or Sun.
[redacted] Sun, Chang or Wong Fook.
[redacted] Symonette, Melvin Paul or Lewill Winter.
[redacted], Szekely, Anthony.
[redacted], Szekely, Julia Balla.
[redacted], Tai Lee Yung or Lee Yung or Lee Tai.
[redacted], Tang, Ah Chang.
[redacted], Taylor, Cyril or Frank Earle Williams.
[redacted], Thaller, Fay (nee Feige Lerner).
[redacted], Thomas, Beatriz or Beatrice (nee Camargo).
[redacted] Thompson, Eric Houston.
[redacted], Thompson, Mary or Mary Bowe.
[redacted], Thompson, Kenneth Leon.
[redacted], Tim, Chan Fook or Fook Tim Chan.
[redacted] Timis, John or John Tennas.
[redacted], Tjostolfsen, Nils T.
[redacted] Tomczak, Mieczslaw.
[redacted], Topel, Jacob Isaac or Jacob Isaac Toppel or Jacob Toppel.
[redacted] Torres, Enedina Alvarez.
[redacted] Torres, Geronimo.
[redacted], Torres-Carpio, Rogerio Alejandro or Rogerio Alejandro.
[redacted], Tortora, Louis.
[redacted], Tron, Gustavo Giovanni.
[redacted], Tsalapinas, Evangelos.
[redacted] Tsalapinas, Theodoros.
[redacted] Tso, Eugene or Hsi Chang Tso.
[redacted], Tubel, John.
[redacted], Tung, Anders Pedersen.
[redacted], Tuya, Maria Luz Martinez.
[redacted], Tyrnaeur, Lily.
[redacted], Tyrnauer, Abraham.
[redacted] Usher, Albert Winston or Michael Blake or Winston Churchill Usher.
[redacted], Utianski, or Elia Yapko or Elia Utkanski or Alec Utianski.
[redacted], Utianski, Mina or Mina Utkanski or Mina Muler.
[redacted], Valmas, Charalambos M. or Harry Valmas or Harry Michael Valmas or Haralambos Michalis.
[redacted], Vara-Brito, Alfonso.
[redacted], Vargas, Candido Perez.
[redacted], Vargas, Maria.
[redacted], Vasard, Richard Martin or Richard Martin Hamme.
[redacted], Vasquez-Gonzales, Candido.
[redacted], Vastakis, Spiridon Eleftherios or Spiros Eleftherios Vastakis or Spiros Vastakis.
[redacted], Ventimiglia, Giovanni.
[redacted], Vicuma-Salazar, Gregorio.
[redacted], Vidies, Theresa.
[redacted], Visco, Philomene Marie or Stasse or Cys.
[redacted] Vitoratos, Stefanos or Stephen Vitoratos.
[redacted], Vorraso, Giuseppa Scannelli.
[redacted], Voz, Monique or Monique Constance Emma Antoinette Voz.
[redacted], Wai, Young Fook.
[redacted], Walzel, Klaus Dieter.
[redacted], Wang, Chao, Chen.
[redacted] Wassberg, Thorsten Reinhold.
[redacted], Watt, Eileen (nee Currant).
[redacted], Westby, Evan Lewis.
[redacted] Wetzel, Renate.
[redacted], Wha, Ling Shao or Shao Wha Ling.
[redacted], Williams, Charlotte Rebecca or Lottie Williams.
[redacted] Wing, Eng or Wing Suey Eng.
[redacted], Wing, Ho Chee or Robert Ho or Wing Ho.
[redacted], Wing, Jung or Ah Wah or John Wing.
[redacted], Wong, Hing or Tony Hing Wong or Wong Hing.
[redacted], Wong, Leong or Yep.
[redacted], Wong, Norman Seek Moon.
[redacted], Wood, Louie or Silverio Ladesma.
[redacted], Yadgaroff, Isaac Ishak.
[redacted], Yeung, Qai Bock.
[redacted], You, Chong Mik or Don Chong.
[redacted], Young, David or Young Fook.
[redacted], Young, Yee.
[redacted] Yuen, Chin or George Chin.
[redacted], Zablocki, Joana (nee Abraham).
[redacted], Zadorozny, William or Basil Zadorozny.
[redacted] Zamarripa-Castilla, Indalecio.
[redacted] Zamarripa, Ascencion (Chona) Barrera de.
[redacted], Zavou, Costas Christodoulous or Costas C. Zavou or Castaes Zavou.
[redacted], Zeller, Kurt Robert.
[redacted], Zichichi, Natale.
[redacted], Zonoff, Andrew Neketo.
[redacted], Zuber, Harry Isaac.
[redacted], Farmanfarma, Ali Dad.
[redacted], Fook, Haw aka Victor Haw or Victor Haw Fook.
[redacted], Storper, Gertrude K.
[redacted], Wang, Niah-Tzu alias Wang Nian.
[redacted], Wang, Mabel U. alias U. Taiyang.
[redacted], Pai, Ei Whan alias Edward Whan Pai.
[redacted], Yen, John Teng-Chien or Teng-Chien Yen or John T. C. Yen.
[redacted], Kulukundis, Eugenie (nee Diacakis).

IMMUNITY OF THE WITNESSES APPEARING BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES — INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. KEFAUVER, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted his individual views on the bill (S. 16) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 153.

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. CASE (by request):

S. 1767. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the individual exemption for income tax purposes from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1769. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Young Women's Christian Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1770. A bill for the relief of the Florida Dehydration Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 1771. A bill to authorize creation of small business insurance and investment corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1772. A bill to provide for the transfer to the States of the money in the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, for the establishment and operation by the States of old-age insurance systems, and for the abolition of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1773. A bill to amend section 1402 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the venue of civil actions against the United States; and

S. 1774. A bill for the relief of Eleonore Baganz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1775. A bill for the relief of Hildegard M. Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1776. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

1777. A bill for the relief of Carlton Hotel, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1778. A bill to authorize certain modifications in the existing project for Ocean City Harbor and Inlet, and Sinepuxent Bay, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 1779. A bill to provide for the permanent approval of certain State plans for aid to the blind under title X of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1780. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself, Mr. LONG, and Mr. GILLETTE):

S. 1781. A bill to authorize emergency appropriations for the purpose of erecting certain post office and Federal court buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1782. A bill to furnish emergency food aid to Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1783. A bill for the relief of Leonard J. Moen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the

Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ISSUANCE OF COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in 1955 the members of the Young Women's Christian Association of the United States of America will celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of their organization. The YWCA is a great organization. It was born at a time of great changes in opportunities for women.

The industrial revolution had made its impact. To a few this new era gave new leisure. To many women it brought long hours in factory and sweatshop. As hundreds of young women began to move out of farm homes and country villages to the new industrial centers, older women began to feel concerned for the problems which faced these girls living away from home on scanty incomes.

In England in 1855, and then throughout the United States, groups of women began to meet to plan and provide for the temporal, moral, and religious welfare of young women who are dependent on their own exertions for support. Within a few years the YWCA's had established a network of boarding homes, and pioneered the first vocational training courses for working girls.

Around some of its early work, the YWCA founded national groups which are now independent bodies. A grant from the YWCA National Board in 1919 aided in founding the National Federation of Business and Professional Women. Its International Conference of Women Physicians called in 1920 resulted in the Women's Foundation for Health.

Today in this country more than 3 million girls and women are members of the 1,080 local associations; 440 of these associations are in cities and towns of every State in the Union; 640 associations are on university and college campuses. Through the national board, the YWCA united with uncounted millions in 65 other countries to form the international fellowship which is known as the world's YWCA.

Under the aegis of the blue triangle are girls and women of every race, creed, color, and economic status. The blue triangle of the YWCA symbolizes body, mind, and spirit. The millions of girls and women in the YWCA are seeking and finding help to themselves in achieving physical health, mental growth, and moral strength derived from a Christian way of life.

It is on the basis of the high principles on which this great organization is founded and the great achievements which it has attained among the women of the world that I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Young Women's Christian Association of the United States of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received, appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 1769) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Young Women's Christian Association, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Young Women's Christian Association.

SEC. 2. Such postage stamp shall be issued in such denomination and design, and for such period, beginning after January 1, 1953, as the Postmaster General may determine.

FAMINE CONDITIONS IN PAKISTAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a week ago, I addressed letters to the Secretary of State, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Mutual Security Administrator calling attention to famine conditions existing in Pakistan and the threat such conditions were to political stability in that country. I urged immediate steps be taken to make use of some of the huge reserves of wheat owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide assurance to the people of Pakistan that they need not starve, and to show the whole world the United States is concerned about human suffering anywhere.

Since that time, the crisis-ridden Government of Pakistan has fallen. Unrest over the food shortages is reportedly the principal reason. Fortunately for us, Pakistan's Ambassador to the United States for the past year, Mr. Mohammed Ali, has been called to become the new Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Ali will face the same acute food shortage, and will need help in solving it.

The need for such assistance was commented upon in an editorial in last night's issue of the Washington Star, entitled "Pakistan's Critical Needs."

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to furnish emergency food aid to Pakistan. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1782) to furnish emergency food aid to Pakistan, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAKISTAN'S CRITICAL NEEDS

The vagaries of nature and of external economic circumstances beyond localized control have been the major contributors to the political crisis in Pakistan.

A drought condition that has extended through more than a single crop season has turned the south Asian country from one of self-sufficiency in foodstuffs—and even an exporter of wheat in the better years—to one which has come face to face with famine. So serious has this problem become that some of the population has been reported living on wild vegetation. In less than a year, Pakistan has imported nearly a million tons of wheat—financed in part by an Export-Import Bank loan—and a further wheat deficit of 1.5 million tons in the coming 12 months still ahead.

At the same time, a drop in world prices for cotton and jute—two of the country's big export products—has damaged seriously the Pakistani foreign-exchange position.

Affecting both the political and economic problems has been the interminable tension between India and Pakistan over the Kashmir issue, a question of highly explosive quality in each country.

Faced with these grave problems, the ousted Prime Minister Nazimuddin seemingly has been unable to act with the vigor and imagination that were demanded by the situation. Governor General Ghulam Mohammed, accordingly, has taken the initiative of removing the Nazimuddin government and replacing it with one headed by Mohammed Ali, Ambassador to the United States since February 1952. Obviously, Mohammed Ali is facing a critical and complex situation but his own record in public service and his demonstrated energy in posts of authority during recent years give grounds for encouragement.

In many ways, Pakistan during its brief period of independence, has been one of the most stable and responsible of the nations of the Near East-south Asian area. As a Moslem country, it has offered no breeding ground for Communist ideology and it has shown unquestioned tendency to aline itself with the West in the cold war which has divided the world so deeply. Furthermore, it has provided restraining influence on the extremist inclinations that have cropped up among some of its sister states in the Islamic bloc.

Pakistan's crisis today is one that warrants consideration, and any reasonable help that can be given by the free nations. The new government of Mohammed Ali represents a solid hope not only for its own country but for all others that are joined in the common cause of progress and peace.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate Joint Resolution 13, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate Joint Resolution 13, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate Joint Resolution 13, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduced on April 24, 1953, the bill (S. 1746) to assist in relieving the current immigration and refugee problem by providing for the issuance of 240,000 special immigrant visas during the 2 fiscal years commencing July 1, 1953, and July 1, 1954. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Howard C. Botts, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio, vice Harold K. Claypool;

Harry P. Cain, of Washington, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, vice Peter Campbell Brown, resigned; and

Thomas J. Herbert, of Ohio, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, vice James O'Connor Roberts, deceased.

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

John B. Stoddard, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois, vice Howard L. Doyle, resigned.

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

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address delivered by Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, at the convention of the Speedwriting School Administrators, held at Palmer House, Chicago, April 25, 1953.

Address delivered by Gen. Kazimierz Sosnkowski at protest rally against religious persecution in Poland held on March 22, 1953, at Northwest Armory, Chicago, Ill.

By Mr. MORSE:

Telegrams received by him from persons who are in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 13, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Article entitled "Take an Ax to the Budget, but Where?" written by Eric Johnston and published in the New York Times magazine of April 19, 1953.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Editorial entitled "Lost Leadership," published in the Boston Herald of April 14, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Kangaroo Policy," published in the Boston Herald of April 21, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Tradition of Loquacity," published in the Boston Herald of April 14, 1953.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Editorial in opposition to the submerged lands joint resolution, published in the Chattanooga Times.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Editorial entitled "Let's Get Interested," published in the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of April 21, 1953, dealing with the submerged lands joint resolution.

ECONOMIC SURVEY BY NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the inadequacy of the compensation of post-office employees. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a Report of Economic Survey of the Post Office at Sheridan, Wyo., made by the National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

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

REPORT OF ECONOMIC SURVEY, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS

Number of local 2340; post office, Sheridan; State, Wyoming.

Number of clerks surveyed, 16.

Number of clerks returning questionnaires, 16.

Classified clerical complement of the office, 16.

Number of clerks who do part-time work in addition to their postal work, 12.

Number of clerks who have wives working, 9.

Average number of persons per family, 4.

Average total debts (not including mortgage on home) of clerks surveyed, $1,200.

Number of clerks whose debts increased during the past year, 13.

Number of clerks whose debts decreased in the past year, none.

Number of clerks who have been forced to borrow on insurance policies or other tangible properties, 11.

Number of clerks who have bought new automobiles in past 2 years, none.

Number of clerks who have bought new automobiles who hold other jobs or have wives working, none.

This survey was taken by interviewing each member of the clerical force in this office and taking an average of the group.

The majority do not favor having their wives work due to the hardships it places in the home and on care of growing children, but the cost of living is so far beyond reach of their salary that they have no alternative.

Also, the supervisors at this office are on record as being unfavorable toward clerks having part-time jobs to aid them in obtaining a living wage.

These clerks would gladly give up the outside interests if their salary was sufficient to give them the necessities of a normal living.

JACK W. BARE,
Secretary.

Copies should be sent to Senators, Congressmen, and national office in Washington, D. C.

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, yesterday the Sunday Star published an excellent article entitled "To Lift or To Lean?" written by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris. Because the article is so profound and inspiring, and because it was written by our able Chaplain, I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the body of the RECORD.

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

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—TO LIFT OR TO LEAN?

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, United States Senate)

To lift or to lean? That is the question which heads toward the final judgment in the solemn trust called life. For, as some one has phrased it, "Across all the Nation two groups can be seen, the people who lift and the people who lean."

Those who dedicate their utmost for the strengthening of their own character and for the enrichment of the society of which they are a part are the world's builders and benefactors. Those who, like clinging parasites, seek their own advantage by appropriating the achievements and the accomplishments of others are life's hitchhikers, riding on cushioned tires provided by somebody else. Those who lift belong in the first of these two categories; those who lean, in the second.

A gentleman has been defined as one who puts into the common pool a little more than he takes out. The most creative conception that can dawn upon a human, finding himself amid the mortal strife, with its competitive tugs in various directions, is this: I am here to be something, not to acquire something; I am here to give, not to get. If that is once fully apprehended and accepted, all attitudes and actions will fall into a master pattern.

There are those constantly measuring their lives by the returns and rewards made to them by people, by society, by Government. But even modern fiction, depicting those crowned with so-called success, bent on getting on in the world by leaning on any influence which can be grasped, even after they have arrived at coveted goals, paints character after character compelled to make their own the confession of the writer of Ecclesiastes: "All is vanity and vexation of spirit." That is the inevitable terminal of those who lean. In spite of the glitter and hectic excitement characterizing our western life as it is reflected in the literature, music, and art of the day, and which displays its phosphorescent rottenness in sex-saturated best sellers, there is evidenced very little calm and peace and durable satisfaction as men and women, with blinded eyes and hobbled feet, grope down a narrow gorge and call it life.

Getting and spending, that is, spending on self, multitudes lay waste their souls. The trouble is our gadget-age has raised a generation in dire danger of thinking much more of what life owes them than of what they owe life. There is all the difference in the world between a sponge and a spring. In order to grasp what it wants a sponge swells up to several times its size. It does that because it is a sponge. We talk about a selfish person as sponging on others. What a sponge does is no sign of life, because it is a corpse. But the rippling spring, with its low, sweet music, flows along, making the meadows green and giving to all who will partake a refreshing draught of its crystal water. If a spring becomes stagnant, it commits suicide. The Dead Sea is dead because it takes everything in and gives nothing out. That will kill a sea and all in

it. It will kill a life. To give is to find life's purest joy. To give is to live.

For one who understands human nature and nature's law that to save life is to lose it, the peril of the so-called welfare state, which specializes in props and crutches, is that by taking away from a man the lure of accomplishment by his own prowess and power it is tampering with something very precious, his self-respect—the drive of personal initiative. Of course, the prospect of getting everything to give to everybody by the simple method of taxation has ominous social, economic, and ethical consequences. The logical end is that after a while there will be nothing left to distribute. Such a conception tends to the glorification of mediocrity. The goose which lays the golden eggs cannot be strangled to death and the basket still be filled with golden eggs.

A fatal weakness with most socialistic schemes is that they regard government as a sort of escalator upon which even the indolent may step to be carried up, whether they exert themselves or not. When such social schemes have been tried there have been alarming indications that far too many people are perfectly willing just to recline on the moving stairway and themselves do little but enjoy the scenery.

A voice, which from a famous London pulpit constantly reaches multitudes on both sides of the sea, recently speaking of the escalator philosophy as it has been applied to his own country, solemnly declares: "What is so often forgotten is that, if you give amenities endlessly to people who are at heart grabbing and selfish, you will bring the life of the community to chaos. In this serious hour, human motives are being poisoned with a drug that is sapping the moral grandeur and stamina of the whole land. We might label the drug thus: How can I do less and gain more?" That famous preacher was warning that the escalator philosophy of life is dangerously increasing the number of those who lean and decreasing the number of those who lift. And, so far as America is concerned, it is indicative of a wistful, lazy yearning to bask in unproductive fields of leisure, that a current popular song, which has sold well over a million copies, is a whine because the complainer has to work "like the devil for his pay, while the lucky old sun has nothing to do but to roll around heaven all day."

Long before he was President, Abraham Lincoln, on a visit to New York City, on a Sunday morning slipped quietly into a room in an industrial institution where a weekly Sunday school class was being held. The children gathered there came from the poor classes, the parents of most of them having fled from the poverty in Europe. The railsplitter from Illinois was asked to speak, and did so without any premeditated preparation. One present took down that day what that tall American, on his way to the greatness which makes him belong to the ages, said. Here are just two sentences: "You children must always thank God that you have been born in a country where, if you will live a decent, clean life, trust God, and work hard, you can rise. The only things that will limit you are your industry, your character, and your brains." Lincoln, to that Sunday school class, was preaching the personal responsibility which is the central secret of democracy. It stems out of the dignity of the individual person.

Toil is the ticket to the only Utopia where dreams are not mocked. To be coddled and carried is the sure method of personal and national suicide. America has not been made by leaners, but by lifters. The symbol of all that has made our American democracy great and mighty enough now, in this hour of destiny, to save the world from the horror of world domination by regimented communism is not the escalator on which people ride, but the stairway up which people climb.

EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial which appeared April 25 on the President's emergency immigration program. I believe this editorial from the Washington Post is especially important since it points out not only the great need to admit into this country a portion of the world's political and religious refugees, but also the fact that emergency legislation should not be confused with the basic need to revise the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

The editorial refers to a fine speech recently made by former Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman which I inserted in the RECORD of March 25, 1953. The editorial also speaks of the activities undertaken by organizations representing many diversified groups and members of both political parties which are directed at rewriting our immigration and naturalization laws. I am proud that my office has had a major share in coordinating this work, and within a very short time I hope we will be prepared to present to the Senate a new and comprehensive bill on this vital subject.

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

EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION

Humanitarian and practical considerations alike support President Eisenhower's request to Congress for emergency legislation for the special admission of 120,000 immigrants per year for the next 2 years. As the President pointed out, there has been a steady flow of escapees who have fled in recent months from the Communist dictatorships; and these have augmented the still tremendous number of homeless and stateless refugees who complicate the economic problems and aggravate the population pressure in Western European countries. The United States has, as it recognized through its participation in the work of the International Refugee Organization, a clear obligation to help resolve this problem in the tradition of our American policy.

At the same time it is important to avoid confusion regarding the emergency character of the legislation which Mr. Eisenhower has sought. This in no sense constitutes the revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act which he advocated in the course of his election campaign and which Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization reported as imperative. Emergency immigration can be no more than a temporary palliative. What is needed in the case of the McCarran-Walter Act is outright repeal and the adoption of an immigration law which will reflect our faith in the democratic and equalitarian principles of American life.

There is danger, as Philip B. Perlman, former Solicitor General and Chairman of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, pointed out, that the drive for emergency legislation will lead Congress to ignore the larger problem.

It happens that the preparation of a new, comprehensive immigration law is now near completion. It has had varied and bipartisan support centered in Senator LEHMAN'S office, and it deserves, as does the emergency measure requested by the President, the fullest backing from administration and opposition sources alike. We hope that the emergency measure will be adopted by Congress; and we hope also that it will be considered no more than a step toward the adoption of an enlightened immigration program. As Mr. Perlman observed, "So long as the McCarran-Walter Act remains on our statute books we shall be handicapped in our efforts to convince the people of other nations that we are morally equipped and worthy to lead them along the path to enduring peace."

MEMORIAL DAY COMMEMORATING ARMENIAN MARTYRS IN WORLD WAR I

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, April 24 was Memorial Day for the Armenian victims of persecution in the Ottoman Empire, and we recall with sorrow that few peoples have had to make as many sacrifices to maintain their religion and their national way of life as have the Armenian people. For many centuries, leading up to this very day, their freedom to live as they please in their home country has been restricted or even denied to them. Throughout this time the Armenian people have clung to their culture and their traditions. Many have left their home country, and, through their ability and industriousness, have enriched many another nation. Our own country has been one of these beneficiaries as we count today many citizens of Armenian descent who have made fine contributions to our development.

As we commemorate the Armenian dead, we must rededicate ourselves to the principle of protecting the living, of safeguarding the sanctity of human life. We must brand genocide for the crime that it is, and warn that anyone responsible for it shall ultimately be brought to justice. We have learned that the persecution of defenseless minority peoples must be stopped, lest such localized violence ultimately erupt into international lawlessness. Through a world conscience alert to this danger, we can assure that the terrible crimes which have in the past been committed against the Armenian people will not be repeated.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE DULUTH NEWS-TRIBUNE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Duluth News-Tribune entitled "St. Louis Embarrasses Seaway's Enemies," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ST. LOUIS EMBARRASSES SEAWAY'S ENEMIES

With the vehemence of the badly scared, opponents of the St. Lawrence Seaway are proclaiming the somewhat obvious fact that no very large proportion of the world's total oceangoing tonnage would be using the seaway—not at first, anyway.

This argument could be used with equal effectiveness against the construction of superhighways in Europe. Most motor vehicles are in the United States; only a tiny proportion of them are likely to be taken to Europe for use there; therefore, a German autobahn makes no sense. But the Europeans think a highway is worth while if enough vehicles use it, even though most of the cars and trucks in the world won't ever roll over its surface. Similarly, it won't take half or a third of the world's merchant marine to justify the seaway.

Actually, ships are designed for various types of work. When changing conditions offer new opportunities, suitable combinations of hulls and power are developed very quickly.

For instance, St. Louis, of all places, is starting direct waterborne freight service to the West Indies, to Canadian ports and to Alaska. Tow barges will be hauled down the Mississippi, through the Panama Canal and north through the Pacific. European vessel owners believe they can make a profit with boats drawing 8 feet of water—less than a third of the 27 feet proposed for the seaway, a figure which the organized opposition to the seaway has been chanting as a cabalistic symbol.

St. Louis expects to save $80 a carload on flour shipments to Cuba. There is considerable other freight whose owners aren't much troubled about time or distance, but who take an intense interest in shipping costs, as who doesn't?

Now the seaway's detractors must find an argument which supports the idea that 8 feet is profitable and a 50-foot channel is dandy but 27 feet is right in between and so abominable and possibly un-American, too. Discovering that argument will really take some hunting.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS, ETC., FROM CERTAIN TAXPAYERS BY CARLISLE R. CAVE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, last week on April 22 I made a statement as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date in which I called attention to the improper manner in which revenue agent, Mr. Carlisle R. Cave, accepted gifts and services from certain taxpayers in the Florida area. Following that statement one of the individuals involved, namely, Mr. Julius Gaines, a Florida contractor, emphatically denied the allegations as referring to his part in the transactions.

In his denial Mr. Gaines is quoted by the Associated Press as having said he "never even met Mr. Cave until long after the house was built. Even today I wouldn't know him if I fell on him."

Mr. President, my remarks regarding the transaction between Mr. Cave and Mr. Gaines are substantiated by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue Mr. T. C. Andrews, in a letter under date of April 21, 1953.

On March 3, 1953, I first called these allegations to the attention of Mr. Andrews and requested a report.

On April 3, 1953, I received a reply from Mr. Andrews in which report he outlined the disciplinary action that had been taken against Mr. Cave but he failed in this letter to refer to the accuracy or inaccuracy of the allegations referred to in my letter of March 3.

On April 10, 1953, I directed a second letter to Mr. Andrews in which I pointed out that while he had outlined the disciplinary action he had failed to either confirm or deny the allegations in reference to the gifts. Again I requested confirmation or denial.

On April 21, 1953, I received a second letter from Mr. Andrews in which he confirms these allegations. I quote from that letter:

This is in response to your letter of the 10th and your informal inquiry of the Personnel Division regarding certain allegations and information pertaining to Mr. Carlisle R. Cave.

Our records indicate that the allegations referred to in your letter were true.

Among those allegations referred to as being true was the one relating to Mr. Gaines, as follows:

Subsequently Julius Gaines, head of the Gaines Construction Co., constructed on this lot a house which was priced to Mr. Cave substantially lower than it cost. Also, the allegations are that the contractor or his firm was at the time in tax difficulties.

Notwithstanding Mr. Gaines' denial the record stands that Mr. T. C. Andrews, the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, flatly states that these allegations were true.

I ask unanimous consent that all these letters referred to above be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

MARCH 3, 1953.

Mr. COLEMAN T. ANDREWS,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: It is my understanding that Carlisle R. Cave, formerly employed as head of the Income Tax Division at your Jacksonville, Fla., office, has recently been transferred from that area to Washington where he is now serving in the Field Management and Planning Division.

I have received allegations to the effect that Mr. Cave's transfer was primarily to remove him from the area in which he was facing severe criticism and that the Department's files, either here in Washington or in Florida, show that Mr. Cave, while serving as a Bureau employee, accepted in 1950 from Samuel Anderson, Coral Gables, the gift of a lot at 1423 Alhambra Circle, Coral Gables, and that subsequently Julius Gaines, head of the Gaines Construction Co., constructed on this lot a house which was priced to Mr. Cave substantially lower than its cost. Also, the allegations are that the contractor or his firm was at the time in tax difficulties.

I understand that this case was investigated and a report issued by Mr. Joe J. Brown, special agent in charge in that area, and that the report was filed with Mr. E. C. Palmer, who is now serving as district commissioner in Atlanta, Ga.

I am forwarding these allegations to you with the request that they be checked, and if found to be true, I would like to know who engineered the transfer of Mr. Cave to Washington and what action is contemplated by the Bureau.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

APRIL 3, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I refer further to the subject of your letter of March 3. I have finally gotten, I believe, all the facts in the case of Carlisle R. Cave, who formerly was in the Bureau's Miami office, transferred from there to the Bureau's Jacksonville office on or about April 13, 1952, and finally was transferred to headquarters here at Washington on or about December 21, 1952.

Cave's transfer from Miami to Jacksonville was a disciplinary action and to some extent his transfer from Jacksonville to Washington was a supplementation of that action.

Frankly, I do not think that the action taken in the first instance was sufficient, but since it happened over a year ago and appears to have been based upon the feeling that Cave's performance had been such as to justify an attempt to preserve his usefulness to the Bureau and give him a chance to live down the indiscretions for which he was disciplined, and since this course seems to have been justified by his subsequent performance and behavior, I am not sure whether I should upset the first action by imposing discipline that I deem to be adequate in relation to what happened.

In addition, if that were the only problem involved, the course that I should take would be relatively easy to determine. What seems to me to be more serious is the fact that after he got to Washington, he was promoted to a higher grade and salary. On the basis of his performance since he has been in Washington, this promotion and raise appears to be justified. However, I am of that old-fashioned school which holds that a reasonable period of probation should be imposed upon those who err seriously before they are again accorded the benefit of the unqualified fellowship of the congregation, and I think that in a case like Cave's promotion should have been withheld from him for at least 2 years.

As you will see, however, I could not very well use the fact that Cave was promoted after he assumed his duties in Washington as a reason for changing the initial discipline that was imposed upon him. Moreover, as you know, I probably would have considerable difficulty with the Civil Service Commission if I undertook to do so. Nevertheless, this makes the case a more glaring one than it was in the beginning and increases my problem.

Perhaps I have taken too much of your time stating and explaining this case, but, if so, it has been only because I feel that I should not withhold anything that I can properly disclose in responding to inquiries from, or in dealing with, you gentlemen on the Hill; I undertook my duties with the firm conviction that I could not hope to achieve what was expected of me unless I cooperated to the fullest possible extent with those who pass the laws that I am required to enforce.

At the moment, I don't know exactly what I will do with the Cave case. However, I assure you that I will take only that course which seems to me to be in the best interests of the revenue service and just to Cave.

Let me thank you again for the interest that you have taken in the problems with which I am confronted, especially for the very cooperative attitude that you have shown in all of our contacts.

Respectfully,

T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner.

APRIL 10, 1953.

Hon. T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: With reference to your letter of April 3, 1953, replying to my inquiry of March 3 regarding certain allegations against Mr. Carlisle R. Cave, while you outlined the disciplinary action taken against Mr. Cave you did not confirm the allegations. Will you please advice me whether or not these allegations as outlined were correct.

I would also appreciate knowing who in the Treasury Department arranged for the transfer to Washington. At the same time indicate who recommended the promotion.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

APRIL 21, 1953.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of the 10th and your informal

inquiry of the Personnel Division regarding certain allegations and information pertaining to Mr. Charlisle R. Cave. Our records indicate that the allegations referred to in your letter were true.

You also asked that I let you know who in the Treasury Department arranged for the transfer of Mr. Cave to Washington. Our records indicate that as a disciplinary measure Mr. Cave was transferred from Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., on or about April 13, 1952. It appears that after Cave was transferred to Jacksonville there was a grand jury investigation which took up the matter of Cave's activities, but the jury did not feel he had committed an indictable offense. The Bureau apparently felt that the additional publicity about the case had destroyed Cave's usefulness to the Bureau in Florida, and on the recommendation of Mr. John L. Fahs, Collector for the district of Florida, the then deputy commissioner, A. H. Cross, detailed Mr. Cave to work in Washington effective June 22, 1952, for a period of 90 days. This detail was extended until Mr. Cave was permanently transferred to Washington effective December 21, 1952. This permanent transfer apparently was made in large part as a result of a letter dated July 1, 1952, from Mr. Fahs to Commissioner Dunlap, which in substance recommended that in view of Mr. Cave's ability and experience that the Commissioner consider utilizing him in a permanent position in the Bureau. In view of this record, I believe it would be correct to assume that while this transfer may not have been ordered by Commissioner Dunlap, it, nevertheless, had his approval.

Specifically answering the questions informally posed by you to our Personnel Division, the questions and answers as they have been furnished me are set forth below:

1. Date of Mr. Cave's transfer from Miami to Jacksonville? Answer: April 13, 1952.

2. Date of Mr. Cave's transfer from Jacksonville to Washington? Answer: December 21, 1952.

3. At the time of either transfer was there any lump sum payment for annual leave? If so, how much? Answer: No.

4. Did Mr. Cave draw any per diem while in Jacksonville, pending transfer from Miami to Jacksonville? If so, how much?

Answer: No.

5. Did Mr. Cave draw any per diem while in Washington, pending transfer from Jacksonville to Washington? If so, how much?

Answer: Yes. $1,396.25.

6. Did the Government pay his moving expenses at the time of transfer? If so, how much?

Answer: $347. Household goods moved directly from Miami to Washington.

Apparently it was felt that the transfer from Jacksonville to Washington was for the benefit of the Government and because of this the Government paid Mr. Cave's expenses while on detail in Washington and for moving his household goods after he had been transferred.

I regret very much the delay in answering your letter of April 10, but further exploration of this case brought out certain inconsistencies which I felt I must completely explore before replying to your letter.

Respectfully yours,

T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, April 25, entitled "The Humphrey-Lehman Filibuster."

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

THE HUMPHREY-LEHMAN FILIBUSTER

Memories are short indeed which do not recall that when Congress convened 4 months ago Senator LEHMAN, Democrat-Liberal, of New York, and Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, declared war on the wicked filibuster.

Messrs. HUMPHREY and LEHMAN, with their New Deal colleagues, including Senator DOUGLAS, are now trying to talk to death the bill to vest title to underseas oil deposits in the States. The so-called debate is in fact a filibuster. It has been going on since April 1, with not an argument advanced on either side that was not well understood by both parties when the bill was brought up.

Among the measures which HUMPHREY and LEHMAN have denounced is the present Senate cloture rule providing that debate may be limited by a vote of two-thirds of the full membership of the Senate—64 votes. Formerly, two-thirds of the Members present could impose cloture. Senator TAFT says that from 60 to 62 of the Senators would now vote for cloture. The antifilibusterers are protected by the rule that they have so roundly condemned.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, because the subject pertains to the debate now under way, an able editorial entitled "When Is a Filibuster?" published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of April 22, 1953.

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

WHEN IS A FILIBUSTER?

A filibuster, says the Dictionary of American Politics, is "long-continued speechmaking by a member or members of a legislative body, deliberately intended to compel the majority to abandon part of its legislative program."

Since April 1 a group of Senators who oppose confirmation of State ownership of the tidelands has been holding a talkathon which has tied the Senate in knots. They are reported to have enough speeches on hand to hold the floor for another 2 weeks.

Senator HUMPHREY explains that what is going on is not a filibuster. It is simply an illumination of the issues. The fact remains, though, that a bill confirming State ownership of the tidelands is awaiting Senate action. Similar measures have been passed twice before by Congress only to be vetoed by President Truman. All hands acknowledge that the measure would pass now if it could be brought to a vote. What needs to be said about it surely has been said many times before.

The attention to precise definition of the marathon debate is necessary, no doubt, because many of the Senators who are masterminding it have for years fought the filibuster on grounds of principle. Only last January the Senate beat back another of their attempts to limit debate by majority vote.

From their present behavior we are tempted to conclude either that the Senators have changed their minds about the principle of unlimited debate or that we were wrong in assuming that southern Senators were filibustering when they refused to stop talking until civil-rights legislation was pigeonholed.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield when I have finished with the next editorial.

Mr. President, as a part of my remarks, I wish to read into the RECORD at this time a very able editorial appearing in the New York Times of this morning, entitled "Senate Filibuster." The editorial reads:

SENATE FILIBUSTER

Our editorial position has been made clear and has been stated more than once. We believe that in the debate over the return of the oil tidelands to the States the Senate minority is in the right and the presumptive majority in the wrong. We have urged the defeat of the measure and would support its veto if and when it were passed.

This position, however, does not lead us to condone the filibuster that the minority is carrying on. Some of the Senators—and some of their constituents—have been loud in condemnation of the filibuster when it was designed to prevent a vote on civil rights legislation. They are curiously silent at this point. We see no reason for this silence. If the filibuster is wrong in principle—and we believe that it is because it is an attempt to thwart the majority will—it is wrong in this case also, even if one disagrees with the majority.

Senator WAYNE MORSE has received more publicity than he deserves for his exhibition of vocal stamina that set a Senate record for continuous and largely pointless talking. The filibusterers have declared that their purpose was to educate and edify the public on this question at issue. They do not even pretend that they expect to influence the eventual vote, if that is allowed. But the public is long since well aware of the arguments on both sides. And Senator MORSE'S meanderings could hardly have been designed to edify anyone, not even the three sleepy Senators who felt obliged to pretend to be listening to him. He certainly did no credit to his "independent" position, and he and his colleagues in this maneuver have certainly added no luster to the highest legislative body in the country.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I rise in defense of the Senator from Florida, who was not sleepy at any time during the night, so far as I could see. I think it is very unfair for the editorial to give the impression that the great proponent of this joint resolution was sleepy.

I also wonder whether the Senator from Florida would object——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield gladly for a question, but not for a continuation of the meanderings so ably mentioned by the editorial in the New York Times.

Mr. MORSE. I shall phrase in the form of a question what I have in mind: Does the Senator from Florida object at all to my wishing to be associated with my very dear friends, Senators whom I consider to be exceedingly courageous in protecting the public interest, the great Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the great Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]? I do not like to see them be the only ones named. I wish to back them up.

If the Senator from Florida does not mind, will he let these remarks by me go along with his, as showing my association with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to do that because it has been a

fundamental principle of mine, ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, that the right of selection of one's associates is a very important American right. [Laughter.]

I have stood for that in connection with FEPC debates and on other occasions; and I certainly accord to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon, the right that I claim for myself and for every other American citizen.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator from Florida have some feeling of pleasure and delight over the fact that the Senator from Oregon is so considerate of his associates and is so desirous of coming to their assistance at any time? Does not the Senator from Florida think that is a rather good sign of loyal friendship?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Oregon is quite wrong in his affiliations and as to his belief. But I certainly approve of the fact that he remains consistently wrong, at least, on this matter. [Laughter.]

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

NOTICE OF MOTION TO LAY ON THE TABLE

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to give notice that at about 3 o'clock this afternoon, I intend to submit a motion to lay on the table the substitute proposal of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

I have been assured by those who would be speaking at the time that they would yield the floor to me at about 2:30; and at that time I shall make some remarks on the amendment, and then I shall offer the motion. I think that time is generally acceptable, and I do not think it is necessary to make a unanimous-consent request and to obtain unanimous consent about the matter.

So I inform the Senate that at about 3 o'clock today I shall make the motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me inquire whether there will be any disposition on the part of the Senator from Ohio to have the Senate vote then on the Hill amendment, which is tied to the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator from New Mexico accepted the Hill amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. TAFT. Then I do not see that we can do that.

Mr. President, I shall make the motion in order to raise the clear issue as between the Anderson substitute and the joint resolution, in connection with the entire issue before the Senate.

The Hill amendment is incidental to the matter of handling the funds which, by the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, would be obtained by the Federal Government from the lands within the boundaries. The Hill amendment could also be offered as a method of disposing of the funds from the Continental Shelf which undoubtedly will go to the Federal Government.

However, so far as the motion is concerned, I prefer to move to lay on the table the Anderson amendment, which would carry with it the Hill amendment. I do not think that will weaken in any way the Anderson amendment, because Senators who favor the Hill amendment can vote for the Anderson amendment; and Senators who do not favor the Hill amendment can still vote for the Anderson amendment.

But, I think the main issue should be before the Senate, and that is whether we prefer the approach represented by the Holland joint resolution, which recognizes State ownership in the lands within their historic boundaries, or whether we prefer the approach of the Anderson amendment in the nature of a substitute, which recognizes the Federal ownership in the lands within the historic State boundaries. That is why I feel rather insistent on making the motion in that form.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wished to make sure that the Senator from Alabama would have an opportunity to have a vote taken on his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the Hill amendment attached to the Anderson amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from New Mexico wishes to attach the Hill amendment to his amendment now, that will be all right with me. I see no reason why any Senator who is opposed to the Anderson amendment should care how the Anderson amendment is changed. The Hill amendment relates only to the Anderson amendment in the nature of a substitute; the Hill amendment does not relate at all to the joint resolution.

If the Senator from New Mexico wishes to accept the Hill amendment now, that will be perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. However, the Hill amendment is now before the Senate, and is the pending question.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then why not move to lay the Hill amendment on the table?

Mr. TAFT. Because I prefer to move to lay the Anderson amendment on the table.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have listened carefully to the debate by both the proponents and the opponents of the joint resolution. I have been impressed by the quality of the debate by Senators on both sides.

While it is true that, because of the very important precedent the joint resolution would set, the debate has consumed much time, yet I am of the opinion that it is the best and most fruitful time the 83d Congress has spent thus far or probably will spend during the remainder of this session.

In view of all the time which was wasted by this great body as we idled for the first 3 months of this session, when we considered only 2 major bills in that length of time, I feel that we need apologize to no one for the effort being made here to bring to the people, and even to the very few Members of the Senate who have followed the debates, all the light possible on this very important question.

It has been repeatedly charged both by those who are opposed to filibustering and by those who are in favor of an unlimited amount of it, that the present procedure is blocking important deliberations in the Senate.

In defense of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—who needs no defense, for he showed that he was able to take care of himself—I should like to say that from 8:30 Friday night, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the distinguished Senator who set an all-time filibuster record, was working on his own time.

It was my understanding that the majority leader had agreed to have a recess taken at 8:30 that night. Therefore, the Senate Chamber would have been dark, the chairs more vacant even than they were, and the galleries empty, leaving only the ghosts of those who have through the years fought for the protection of the rights of all the people to discuss, perhaps, in the early-morning eerie hour, which side is right in the defense now being made of the people's rights.

So I do not believe that even the great New York Times and other papers, editorials from which the distinguished senior Senator from Florida inserted in the RECORD this morning, have a right to criticize the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for speaking in his own time, and for deliberately draining his physical strength from 8:30 Friday night until 10 o'clock Saturday morning.

Certainly, during those hours most of the expense chargeable against the Senate's working time would have been small and perhaps the cost would have been merely the matter of lighting the Senate Chamber with electricity; and I am sure that the kilowatts of illumination the Senator from Oregon spread on the RECORD during that record-breaking debate served to illuminate a great many people of the country regarding certain of the issues. I heard much of the debate. If Senators are to be accused of meandering, I do not believe the record of this debate will disclose such record-breaking meanderings as have taken place in the past in this Chamber. Nor do I believe that the opponents of the pending measure should be charged with conducting a genuine, blue-ribbon, 100-percent filibuster.

Every Member of the Senate today knows that every one of the opponents of the pending measure has stood ready and willing at any moment of the debate to lay aside the pending measure, in order that the Senate might consider impor-

tant legislation necessary to be passed in order to prevent the expiration of a law, or to consider any emergency measure the majority leader might care to call up. Countless times the opponents of the joint resolution have offered to do that, even in the case of emergency price control legislation.

Generally, Mr. President, the offers of those of us who oppose the giveaway measure to lay it aside temporarily, without prejudice to anyone's rights, have been consistently rejected.

I do not believe anyone will be deceived by the attempt to put on the backs of those of us who feel that the pending measure needs adequate discussion the blame for stymying acting on important legislation in the Senate.

All the members of the press, the editorial writers, the radio commentators, and others know the score. They know that if the majority leadership, and if the members of the majority party generally desire to call up any important legislative measure, they can make it the current order of business within a very few minutes.

Mr. President, as more able speakers than I have so clearly demonstrated, the pending question has great and far-reaching constitutional implications. It has implications also in the field of foreign relations which involve such fundamental questions as the freedom of the seas, our international relations, the dignity and finality of the Supreme Court decisions, and many, many other things which have been detailed carefully during the discussion which has taken place on the pending measure.

I regret that I am not a great constitutional lawyer, as many of the proponents of the pending measure seem to be. In fact, at times like these I regret that I am not even a lawyer at all. But perhaps, from a layman's view, it might be important to examine the issue as it appears to me as a layman.

While I was greatly impressed at the tremendous research that had been done on the legal precedents involving underground resources and the title to the submerged wealth in all types of public lands, as extended in the RECORD so ably by the proponents of the pending measure, I am, as a layman, puzzled as to the bearing of such precedents on the proposal under consideration.

As I listened to the debate, it seemed to me that from the vast realm of authority cited, most of the cases, if not all of them, dealt with truths which we in the opposition admit and even go so far as to restate. The question of the ownership of the underground resources under submerged inland waterways and rivers I gather has been well settled for a hundred years or more.

The right of the States to these resources I feel not only has been protected throughout our history by our courts, but the matter is restated again for the benefit of those who still would doubt. It is restated, not only in the pending measure which Senators are attempting to pass, it is also stated in the Anderson substitute; it was restated in the O'Mahoney bill at the session of the Senate last year; it has been constantly restated in every proposal which Members of the Senate who are in the same frame of mind and of the same determination that I am as to the pending measure always brought before this great body.

So the argument which has been expressed so frequently to force passage of the giveaway bill, that, somehow in some way, we jeopardize the rights of all the other inland States to their inland waters, and their submerged lands under navigable streams, bays, and inland lakes, seems to me not to be legitimately entitled to a place in the pending debate.

In most of the cases cited which the proponents of the pending measure claim give them some right or claim under the court precedents, I can see scant relationship to the question of the ownership or paramount rights to the resources under the marginal sea.

If I were sitting as a juror in such a case, it would seem to me that certainly there is no preponderant weight of authority in their precedents whatever, if any direct and definite authority, which would lead me to believe that they have proven such a case as to cause us, as fairminded men, to decide in their favor.

Indeed, even though through legalistic reasoning some connection with the present issue might conceivably be found to relate their precedents to the pending quitclaim issue, it would seem to me that their force would be infinitesimal in effect compared with the square cut ruling in three decisions by the highest court in the land on the direct issue posed here.

Precedents are precedents, and it would seem to me that our highest Court, being advised of whatever relationship, either distant or real, that previous cases might have to this issue, had before them all of the material here advanced when the Court ruled.

Therefore it seems to me that the Supreme Court was better able than I, a layman, or even our distinguished fellow Senators who are members of the bar, to evaluate the bearing, if any, that these previous holdings had upon the case at issue.

It would seem to me, in considering precedents, that the latest holding of the highest court properly interpreted the law of the land, and that previous holdings, once overturned by the highest court, or even disregarded as not being cogent, important, or closely related, had about as much genuine bearing on the pending issue as yesterday's newspapers might have had.

It would seem to me that if the highest court were at fault, if their interpretation or decision was not in accordance with the law and the Constitution, we, who respect our court system, should look for redress or final corection in the court itself.

With our proper respect and our acknowledgment that ours is a government of laws, I have such confidence in our court system that I am sure that subsequent reviews of cases would not fail to result in equal justice under law. I am not one who would for a minute intimate that an error was made, but if error was made in the three cases decided by the Supreme Court, surely in the future would give, under constitutional procedure, a chance would be afforded for reaffirmation, or, even upon proper showing, a decision might conceivably be changed.

I feel certain that, if all hold the courts in respect to the degree I entertain for them, and as I believe most members of the bar entertain, then surely the court, even if it should err in a decision, through mistaken interpretation of previous precedents, or because of something which might not have been presented in the earlier trial, the proper corrective agency, the proper means of rectifying any degree of error or misinterpretation should be found in the courts of law themselves.

But if such a change should come, it would come under the real meaning of the Constitution and the well-grounded ideal that the Supreme Court is still the court of last resort.

This would be the place to look for any correction that the Congress might wish to have.

What worries me, Mr. President, about the effort here being made, is the fact that we are attempting by legislative design to change a Supreme Court decision. I am afraid that, by this precedent, we will take away what has been the well-fixed rule for 160 years, that once the Supreme Court has spoken on property rights that it is the court of last resort.

Millions of words have been spoken in this chamber deploring political moves against the court. The Nation sprang up in revulsion against the Court packing plan when it was advocated by a previous administration.

This plan, as we well know, was designed to change the personnel of the Court and thus seek to give political effect to its decisions. Almost every lawyer in the land sprang into a defense of the Court and most of the Members of both Houses of Congress refused to countenance such a political approach to the dispensation of justice.

Thus the legislative branch of the Government refused to be a party to permitting the Executive to overreach the powers the Constitution gave him. It was a victory in the abiding faith of our three coordinate branches of government and our insistence that any of the three must be protected against impingement upon their rightful powers and duties as provided for in our Constitution.

But even under the Court-packing plan, Mr. President, the Chief Executive could not move within himself or within his simple powers as President. He could not demand the resignations nor fire the members of the Court whose holdings disappointed him or with which he disagreed. In this case he came to the Congress and asked for the power to increase the number of members of the Court. In this case, even in seeking to pack the Court, he had to ask and to succeed had to receive the approval and consent of another coordinate branch of the Government.

Hence our Government of checks and balances worked to the ultimate preservation of our constitutional system.

As bad as would have been the result had the Congress joined the Chief Executive in this scheme, at least some of the checks and balances of our system would have been at work. In fact, they did work and the efficacies of our system and the protection of our judicial system against political interference of any kind were well established.

But here, Mr. President, we are asked to do something unilaterally in our three independent branch system where only the Congress acts to effectively reverse a decision of our highest Court. We do not have the checks and balances truly at work except perhaps through a Presidential veto. In the present case we can hardly anticipate that such would be used.

I do not think any Member of Congress would argue against the right of the Court to hold an act of Congress unconsitutional. But, in doing so, it is limited to the definite yardstick of the Constitution. It must place our legislation in the scales and weigh it with the Constitution to determine if we in passing laws were acting in strict accordance with the Constitution.

While it is true that at times Congress has passed legislation that the Court has ruled to be unconstitutional in its previous form, in the cases with which I am familiar it has corrected the defects found in the law in accordance with the holding of the Court on the previous law.

Thus, the judiciary—the judicial branch of our system—acts like the other two under a careful delineation of powers and is prohibited from grasping power from either the executive or the legislative branches.

I would not want to be so brash as to label the present move to set aside a Supreme Court decision—yes; three Supreme Court decisions—by legislative enactment, as a legislative court-packing plan. But I would firmly believe that the results of this legislation upon future decisions of the Court would have repercussions as serious and as grave upon the independent and constitutional power of the Court as would a plan to pack the Court with men for the purpose of changing the political philosophy of the Court.

It would seem to me, Mr. President, that the best safeguard for our system of free enterprise and our ideals of private ownership under our capitalistic system would be to insist upon the final determination of property rights by the courts, not to start a precedent—we in this body are well aware of the effect of legislative precedents—that might lead to dozens, yes, hundreds, of cases in which litigants before the Supreme Court, being disappointed in the Court's finding, might be knocking on the door of the Senate Chamber seeking redress from decisions with which they had disagreed.

While it may be argued that this decision in giving the Federal Government the paramount rights to the resources of the marginal sea leaves the way open to the Congress to enact legislation defining navigable waters, it would seem to me that upon this tenuous reasoning would be set a pattern that could upset time-honored and abiding faith in the finality of Supreme Court decisions.

It has been well-settled law that inland waters and the beds of navigable streams and of inland bays belong to the States. What this measure does, in effect, is to place all the marginal sea area in the class of inland waters, at least, placing it under the same rule of law. It so classes all the waters of the marginal sea, at least, up to the 3-mile limit, probably to the 10-mile limit, and, maybe, to the Continental Shelf, and gives them to the States in fee simple. The pending measure provides as follows:

> All lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line 3 geographical miles distant from the coastline of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress extends seaward (or into the Gulf of Mexico) beyond 3 geographical miles.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the junior Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that under the section which has just been read by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the giveaway which is now proposed, would be an open-ended giveaway? It might extend away out to the Continental Shelf and cover property, or title to property, which the United States itself does not possess; in other words, it would give to the States something that it is beyond the power and authority of the United States Government to yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with the Senator from New York, that the language, "as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward —or into the Gulf of Mexico—beyond 3 geographical miles," could cause Congress to be placed in a position of being asked to legislate for a division of the Pacific Ocean, which would give to California half the distance to Hawaii, and give to Hawaii the other half of the distance, should Hawaii become a State. Certainly there is no finality to what is sought by the joint resolution.

I feel certain that the proponents of the joint resolution would not be so brash as to urge any such legislation upon Congress, but we might say it leaves an open end to the open sea, as to how far we could go, because by including all the lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters, we take in the open ocean as navigable waters, and can go just as far as the proponents wish to go now, or as proponents in the future may wish to go, in defining territorial or State limits in the open sea.

In fact, it would seem to me that we are attempting to do that which King Canute could not do. The low-tide mark was always the boundary recognized by the States' rights historians. But now the Senate, assuming the role of King Canute, says, "We roll back the sea by legislation. We literally roll back the sea to make the low-tide mark 3 miles out in the States of California and Louisiana, 3 miles out on the eastern shore of Florida, 10½ miles out on the western shore of Florida, and 10½ miles out, or probably even more, for the great State of Texas." So I feel that we are embarking on something without proper preparation or proper study.

Again, I do not know of any delay that is occurring to any vital, important proposed legislation by the discussion of these questions on the floor of the Senate. I do not believe there are any appropriation bills ready to come before the Senate or that any other important bills are being delayed.

But by the searching debate that is taking place on the pending joint resolution, by the asking of questions which have not, I submit, been answered by Senators who expect to vote in favor of the giveaway, we may open the door to such a point that Congress might wish to appoint a commission, as urged in an amendment submitted by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. Thus, we would be able to explore the subject and determine whether by Senate Joint Resolution 13 we are opening literally a Pandora's box of international, domestic, and geographic complications. Incidentally, the number 13 attached to the joint resolution might prove to carry out the traditional omen of ill luck if Congress should dash forward in this way to override the time-honored tradition of respect for the courts, override international law as it is now understood by most nations, and violate, I believe, a definite pattern which has existed since the beginning of our country, namely, that State boundaries ended at the low-tide mark.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is the Senator from Oklahoma familiar with a statement contained in the letter which the President of the United States sent to 25 Senators, who had asked him for further enlightenment regarding his position on the great issue now before the Senate? His statement reads, in part, as follows:

> I hesitate to express an opinion on legislative procedure, but I am deeply concerned with the delay of the entire administration program in the Senate of the United States.

Is the Senator from Oklahoma familiar with that statement?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am familiar with the letter. As a matter of fact, with the great and abiding respect I have for the tremendous patriotism and understanding of our Chief Executive, it seems passing strange to me that he has been willing to give his party a maximum leeway against interference with the operation of the legislative branch of the Government. But now, in a matter of transcendent importance, the rewriting of new, basic law, almost rewriting what we understood to be as important as the Constitution itself, setting a precedent that might lead to upsetting Supreme Court decisions by the Senate, he indicates that he believes that this debate

might be unduly delaying the business of the Government.

I regret that he has such a belief because it seems to me that the President himself, great man that he is, should realize that once in a while, when we are talking about tidelands, it is necessary to inform ourselves thoroughly on what is being discussed.

If I recall correctly, after he made his first statement about giving the submerged lands back to the States, it developed from what the distinguished former Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, said during the preconvention campaign, that the general, now President, had not been informed that there had been three Supreme Court decisions holding that the States had no rights to the open seas, and that General Eisenhower had not informed himself as to where the title rested; that his statement favoring the giving of those lands to the States had been made without that information.

So I do not believe the President is in such a position, from past experience of the difficulties and depths of this great issue, that he should urge that Congress should not, without proper consideration, explore this issue to its bottom-most depths.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is the Senator from Oklahoma familiar with the calendar of business as of today, Monday, April 27, 1953? If he is familiar with it, as I am certain he is, does he find in that calendar any bill or resolution whose immediate passage is of essential and great emergency importance? I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma will agree with me that there is not a single bill or resolution that has been held up, or would be held up, that is of any great emergency importance, or is a part of the administration's program.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know of no bills which have been held up which are a fraction so important as the pending joint resolution we are now discussing. I know of no bills of an emergency nature which must be passed by reason of forthcoming expiration dates. I know of no bills which would change the course of our preparation for war or our efforts to achieve peace.

I should say that all bills on the calendar are of some degree of importance. Perhaps they are not of high importance to 95 Members of the Senate, but they are of importance at least to 1 Member. I am certain that I have perhaps one bill on the calendar. Therefore, I do not wish to be understood as saying that it is of no importance. But I should say that by comparison, the measures which I observe on the calendar diminish to infinitesimal importance compared with the staggering issue which will either haunt the Senate for years to come, or will plague the executive departments, because of the conferring of title to the open sea, as is sought by the pending measure. This joint resolution does not go into the question of establishing property rights or leasing rights or controls in the Continental Shelf either in the States or in the Federal Government. For some reason, it omits this needed regulation of areas outside these areas given to the States. Why, I do not know. So instead of settling anything, the passage of this measure would merely confuse the issue. Therefore, I believe that opposition to a bill so bad, so dangerous, so uncertain, and setting precedents so undesirable, certainly is highly justified.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that we who are opposing the Holland joint resolution have time and time again offered to lay aside the joint resolution on the request of the majority leader in order to take up any important emergency legislation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the distinguished Senator from New York asked me that question, because to my way of thinking that is the mark of distinction between the efforts of the group who are trying to prevent passage of the joint resolution by adequate discussion and education, and, on the other hand, what is known generally throughout the country as a filibuster.

We have repeatedly yielded, or offered to yield, and expressed our willingness, and even our abiding anxiety, to yield to the majority leader to bring up any other measure which he considers of importance.

Often the main purpose of a filibuster is to prevent other proposed legislation from coming up, while Members engaging in the filibuster continue to talk. But that is not the case in this instance. In other words, we are not holding the baby for ransom. We are merely talking on the subject to inform but we are willing to yield the floor with prejudice to ourselves, in an effort to permit the majority leader to call up any measure he thinks is of sufficient importance.

Does the distinguished Senator from Oregon wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Senator yield to me for a question or two.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that it is very difficult to reconcile the Eisenhower letter to the 25 Senators with the testimony of President Eisenhower's own Attorney General with regard to this case?

Mr. MONRONEY. It certainly is. I wonder if the President has read the testimony of the Attorney General and considered the questions raised by him. I wonder if the President has considered the difference between the testimony of the Attorney General and his own views. We may be able legally to give away the contents of the submerged lands to the States, but we cannot give away title to the bottom of the ocean. The States cannot own it, and there is probably a very serious constitutional question as to whether the Federal Government itself can own, in fee simple, the bottom of the ocean in the open sea.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that when the President says, in his letter to the 25 Senators, that he would sign this measure, and would have signed the previous measures, if he followed the testimony of his Attorney General it would be necessary to revamp and revise the joint resolution in order to reconcile it with the Attorney General's testimony?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon in that conclusion.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think it is very important that we emphasize and reemphasize, state and restate, over and over again in this RECORD, the fact that the little band of liberals, fighting in opposition to this giveaway of between $50 billion and $300 billion worth of the people's treasure, has been willing at all times to lay aside the pending measure and take up any emergency legislation on the calendar, and then resume consideration of the joint resolution, without any loss whatsoever to the majority in connection with their parliamentary status with relation to the joint resolution?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the Senator from Oregon asked the question. When he spoke the other night, he stated that this discussion has many of the characteristics of a filibuster, but that it lacks one characteristic of a filibuster in that it does not erect a blockade against legislation which must be passed. Repeatedly the managers of the opposition to the joint resolution and other Members who are supporting on the floor the opposition to the joint resolution, have repeatedly urged upon the majority leader their willingness to lay aside this measure at any time, without prejudice, in order to consider other legislation. Then, during the intervening periods, the Senate could return to a discussion of this measure.

I do not believe that any of the parties involved in this case would be hurt. Neither the State of Texas, the State of Louisiana, the State of Florida, or the State of California would be injured.

The joint resolution would remain the regular order of business of the Senate. Let us lay aside this measure for the consideration of appropriation bills by unanimous consent, and resume consideration of the joint resolution during our Friday and Saturday sessions, if it is desired.

Those of us who oppose the joint resolution feel strongly in our opposition, but we are dedicated to the purpose of avoiding a blockade of the functioning of the Senate.

So far as the junior Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, if the majority leader will make such a proposal, during the time when the Senate is normally idle the joint resolution can be adequately and amply discussed, and we can pass on amendments at times when appropriation bills or other duties of the Senate do not require its attention. I would be willing to lay aside the joint resolution for a day or two to take up the Senate calendar, or to perform any

of our other necessary legislative duties. That would expedite the business of the Senate.

Therefore, I say to my distinguished friend and colleague from Oregon that the final mark of distinction between what is now happening on the floor of the Senate, and what has been happening for the past few days in the discussion of the joint resolution, and what might be called a genuine filibuster, or an effort to blockade the legislation in the Senate by discussing at great length the merits or demerits of a measure, is the willingness of the opponents of the joint resolution to lay it aside temporarily at any time for the consideration of matters which are considered important.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that there is another distinguishing feature as between the prolonged debate which we are conducting in this instance, which involves some of the techniques of a filibuster, as I indicated in my speech of a few hours the other day, and a genuine filibuster, namely, that we have not taken the position that we will try to prevent the joint resolution from coming to a vote?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct in that statement. Let me add that there is still another feature which distinguishes the present debate from a genuine filibuster, and that is that the debate on the joint resolution has been largely germane to the issues involved, or closely related to them. We have not seen any reading from cookbooks, Sears, Roebuck catalogs, or extraneous material which cannot be related to the pending legislation, or to other legislation likely to be pending before the Senate.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that another feature of this prolonged debate, which involves some of the techniques of a filibuster, is that the opponents of this measure are insisting that a course of action be followed which will give the people of the country time to stop, look, and listen, and see what will happen to them if the joint resolution becomes law, so far as their great heritage in the natural resources of the country is concerned?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon. In the case of many filibusters, those conducting the filibuster do not care to have the debate carried across the country, particularly when it is not germane. It has been the desire of those of us who are conducting the opposition to the joint resolution, within our capacities, to discuss the joint resolution in speeches which have been as carefully written and considered as any speeches which have ever been made by those Members on the floor of the Senate.

In other words, we do not grab up wornout civic-club speeches or extraneous matter and throw it into a Mulligan stew in order to take up the time of the Senate. We try, in our speeches, to get at the vulnerable points in the armor of those who would quitclaim valuable resources which the Supreme Court has three times stated belong in paramount right to all the people of the 48 States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that we have pending on the calendar some very important pieces of emergency legislation?

Mr. MONRONEY. There are some, but I believe we have already shown our willingness—not only our willingness but our anxiety—if the majority would merely indicate their desire to follow such a course, to lay aside the joint resolution and give the right-of-way to those measures which the majority leader feels are of importance and should be passed at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that the pending legislation is not emergency legislation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do not believe it is emergency legislation. I recall that the issue has been before the courts and Congress since approximately 1945. I further recall that efforts to pass legislation which would speed up exploration and drilling immediately, particularly in the areas where most of the geologists say the largest amount of oil is located—and that is beyond the 3-mile limit in the Gulf of Mexico—have not been effective. I may say, as I am sure the distinguished Senator from Oregon knows, that neither does Senate Joint Resolution 13 do one thing to open up or to provide for exploration and development by private industry, through leases with either the Federal Government or the State, of lands lying in the marginal sea beyond the 3- or the 10½-mile limits.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question to my distinguished friend.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that if the pending legislation is considered emergency legislation by anyone, it is only by those powerful economic interests, particularly the oil interests, who simply cannot wait to get their hands on this great natural resource, the great pool of reserve oil, which belongs to all the people?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oregon may be more familiar with that point than I am. Although I do not live in Texas or Louisiana, and therefore am not so familiar with the tidelands-oil problem as I should be, my acquaintanceship with many men interested in oil and oil production leads me to believe that those who are seriously interested in preserving our oil supplies would like to get the situation settled for development of all the Continental Shelf. Of course, the pending joint resolution does not settle the issue. I know that the drive to pass the joint resolution has come not only from large Texas and tidelands interests, but from the States who wish to receive that revenue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a further question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that those of us, in this little band of liberals, who have been fighting the passage of the joint resolution, had the understanding, or at least had formed the impression from reports which were brought back to us by our two very able leaders, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and also based on what we have read in the newspapers for a long time, that it was the position of the majority leader, apparently speaking for the majority, that under no circumstances was the majority going to lay the pending joint resolution aside for any purpose whatever?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is my understanding.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Was the Senator from Oklahoma pleasantly surprised and pleased, therefore, as I was, on Saturday, when the majority leader, apparently speaking in behalf of his majority colleagues, decided to think better of the previous announced attitude on his part, and did come on the floor of the Senate and agree, as we had been urging for some days in the course of the debate, to lay the joint resolution aside long enough to pass the emergency rent-control bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to my distinguished friend from Oregon I thought it was a very great compliment to the Senator from Oregon, who discussed it at length in his long speech before the Senate on Friday, that he was so convincing and persuasive in his logic in favor of laying aside the pending joint resolution for the consideration of emergency legislation, that the Senator from Ohio changed his position. Therefore, after the Senator from Oregon concluded his speech, it was a matter of only a few hours that the emergency legislation was passed, by unanimous consent, I believe.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a further question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Oklahoma be surprised to hear the Senator from Oregon say that he thinks the Senator from Oklahoma has just paid an undue compliment to him, because the Senator from Oregon is inclined to believe that the Senator from Ohio followed the course of action he followed because he began to recognize what the country wished?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would answer by saying that perhaps the majority leader, during the hours the Senator from Oregon was discussing the pending joint resolution and other matters, perhaps concluded he had made a mistake in thinking he had made a case against those of us who are opposing the submerged-lands bill and in his effort to lay the blame for killing it at our door.

Therefore I am sure that the distinguished majority leader in those morning hours may have asked himself, after the repeated offers during the debate of last Friday and Saturday morning, information as to which offers had gone to the country, whether it would perhaps leave him in an untenable position, and cause the blame and burden for any delay to rest on the proponents of the joint resolution. This was particularly true when it has been repeated so often on the floor of the Senate that we would be willing to lay aside the pending joint resolution, without prejudice, and take up any measure which the majority leader might feel should be called up because of its emergency nature.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma believe, on the basis of the responses which he has received from the country, in the form of telegrams and letters and telephone calls and personal conversations, that there is any doubt about the fact that there is a growing sentiment throughout the country for laying the joint resolution aside whenever it is necessary to take up emergency legislation, and in favor of the Senate taking a long, hard, thorough look at the joint resolution, and not proceeding to vote on it until we have had at least gotten it into an amended form in which it would not do, to the same degree, the great injustice to the public interest which this little band of liberals believe the present text does?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say to my distinguished colleague that I do feel that way about it. I believe the public will support us in an adequate discussion of the joint resolution so long as the majority leader exercises the unanimous-consent privileges we have repeatedly agreed to give him, to forward the consideration of any necessary or emergency legislation. I do not believe the public would support us if, as is the case of a genuine 100-percent blue-ribbon filibuster, we were adamant in our determination to block any other legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a further question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with the Senator from Oregon that in order to underline with emphasis the point which the Senator from Oklahoma has just made, we should state again, through my question and the Senator's answer, that there is no intention on the part of this little band of liberals to prevent a final vote on the joint resolution, after we are satisfied that we have fully disclosed to the American public the great dangers to their interests which are involved in the joint resolution?

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the Senator is eminently correct. The very discussion of the joint resolution, in which it has been pointed out that it declares that the low-tide mark is perhaps 3 miles out at sea, or perhaps 10 miles out at sea, and that perhaps at some later date it may be even 150 miles out in the deep billowing ocean, no State has ever been able to claim under the precedents I have read, is causing the people to become interested in how much is involved in the joint resolution.

The misnomer "tidelands" has led many of them to believe during all the time the pending joint resolution or similar measures have been before the Senate and the House, that we have been talking about the land lying between the low-tide mark and the high-tide mark. The people have thought that the pending joint resolution dealt chiefly with things of that sort. The people little realize that Supreme Court decisions for a century have given to the States not only the land in the tidelands areas, but also the lands beneath the inland bays and the navigable waters.

Mr. President, I wonder how many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent in efforts to frighten the inland States to such an extent as to persuade them to favor the present effort to give away the submerged lands.

In connection with this measure, efforts have been made to frighten the people of the inland States into believing that their rights to the lands beneath the inland rivers were jeopardized, and that unless the submerged lands dealt with by the pending measure were given to the coastal States, the inland States would lose all their rights to the beds of the rivers, and, similarly, that the people of the Great Lake States would lose their rights to the lands beneath those lakes, although many decisions have shown there is no question that, according to all the decisions and precedents, the lands beneath the navigable rivers belong to the States.

So we object to the attempt to stretch the inland waters rule by 3 miles or 10½ miles to sea, in violation of international law and the Constitution and well settled court precedents.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In view of what the Senator from Oklahoma has just said about the desirability of a full and thorough discussion of all the issues involved in this measure, does he now agree with me that it is only fair to announce that there is a determination on the part of a group of us—regardless of the parliamentary strategy of the majority to lay amendments on the table, if they can obtain the votes to do so—to continue to fight in opposition to the pending measure for as many days and weeks as we think necessary in order fully to enlighten the American people about the great threat to their natural resources which we believe inherent in this measure?

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the enlightenment of the people on the issues presented by the joint resolution is very important.

Mr. President, I should like to bring into the discussion a matter which I believe is very much in point.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, before my colleague does that, will he yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. With respect to the administration's legislative program—which, according to the letter recently referred to, is being held up—I wonder whether the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma knows of any pending legislation that seeks to give aid to the farmers, who are being seriously depressed by current farm commodity prices.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know of no pending legislation which would do anything to relieve the present distressed position in which many of the farmers find themselves in connection with the slump in livestock prices and the fall in the price of hay and in the prices of many other agricultural commodities.

The only thing I have seen which might indicate that there is some thinking about this matter on the part of the Department of Agriculture, was a United Press dispatch published on April 23, reading as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Agriculture Department officials indicated today the marginal farmers may come in for some scrutiny within the near future and said farming can no longer be considered a haven for those with "less than average ability."

John W. Davis, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, said "it might be better" to have one type of farm program for the commercial farmers and another type for those who are either "weekend" farmers or who do not have the ability to operate a farm efficiently.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss that point with my friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Meantime I continue to read from the dispatch by the United Press:

He made the comment after Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse said one of the results of the price support program has been to keep inefficient farmers in business and to "fix patterns of production."

The statements were made during new conferences with newspaper farm editors association meeting at Agriculture for 2 days. Morse—

The reference is to Under Secretary of Agriculture Morse, not to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—

said under the "pressure of price supports" there is no "normal, healthy adjustment" which should take place in agriculture. He said the cost price squeeze currently pinching farmers either might force out inefficient farmers or cause them to farm the life out of their farms to pay for the place. A better solution, he suggested, would be to let inefficient farmers get out of farming and let the land grow grass, trees, or other land-saving crops.

In other words, the only suggestion about the agricultural situation that I have understood to come from the administration is this newly proposed Republican agricultural plan, if we may call it that. In the past the Republicans condemned the Democrats for plowing cotton under, but now the Republicans, under the new plan, seem to call for plowing the marginal farmer under. Whereas we Democrats have been worried about disposing of farm surpluses,

the Republicans are trying to dispose of surplus farmers.

I wonder where we shall ever wind up under a philosophy—thank goodness it is not yet legislation—that the farm family, raising American children, and molding American character in them, must be displaced because it is not a satisfactory unit in our big business scheme of things.

Are we going to step from General Motors and General Foods to General Farming, Inc.? Are we going to say that we want to have farming conducted more efficiently and more effectively, and therefore we now have no use for those with less than average ability, and that the way to get them off the farm—if I correctly read the article—is to rig a farm price-support program in such a way as to dispose of the marginal farmer? Otherwise how could these officials justify putting the marginal farmers in the same category as weekend farmers?

I certainly think if this dispatch be true it would be trying to abolish the farm home and the farm family and all the great good they have done throughout our history. I believe this indicates a plan to try to abolish them, in the interest, as alleged, of efficiency and of trying to provide for bigger business in farming.

Such a program, if enacted, certainly would end the great American tradition that has given us the great, strong, and virile leadership—the greatest any nation in the world has ever had—that has come from many of the marginal farm families. I can point to such families in Oklahoma.

For instance, I have in mind a farmer who has six stars in his service flag, and one of those stars is gold. I have followed the activities of that farmer and his sons. He himself is a marginal farmer, operating on an upland farm. He did not inherit rich bottom lands or enough money to be able to go into corporation farming or to be able to buy 50,000 or 100,000 acres of rolling land. But he has produced one of the greatest resources the Nation has. Today one of his sons is a colonel, flying a jet plane in Korea. Another of his sons is the head of a large corporation. Another of his sons is a distinguished doctor. Another is a lawyer. All of his sons have gone to or are in the State university, where they, too, are becoming qualified for useful occupations.

So, Mr. President, if we are going to be so cold-blooded in our consideration of a farm program that will suit big business, then I say we shall be sealing the doom of the American farm, as we have known it, in the great American tradition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was there not a famous novel, Grapes of Wrath, written about similar policies which were followed in the early thirties in relation to the marginal farmers in the State of Oklahoma?

Mr. MONRONEY. There certainly was.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma think a policy such as the one to which he has just referred would result in trampling out the vintage where future grapes of wrath are stored?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would certainly regret to see farmers displaced from their farms, merely in order to provide for efficiency.

My thought is that if there were more family-sized farms, there would be far fewer people crowding the industrial centers.

In any case, who could decide who the efficient farmer was? Would that matter be decided by the Department of Agriculture or by the Secretary of Agriculture or by the Under Secretary of Agriculture or by the local Production and Marketing Administration committees or by the banks? What is to happen to those who would be required to leave the farm? Are we merely going to enact a program strongly in favor of the big farmer, so that the little farmer will be forced, as the senior Senator from Illinois has said, to become the victim of the grapes of wrath?

With respect to those who left Oklahoma during the days of the dust bowl, I may say to the Senator from Illinois that it is interesting to note that there were no price supports in those days. There was no program such as the Democrats put into effect within the past 20 years. In their desperation the stricken people went across the desert into California. It may be interesting to know what happened to those people, who loved the soil, and who migrated in answer to the advertisements which were published for attracting cheap migratory labor.

It may be interesting to note what has happened to those citizens who went across the desert to California. I am told by many Californians in a position to know that they have become the leading citizens in many of the farm communities, where they now own small bits of land, because they love the land, and they love to till the soil. Possibly they would not qualify to become farm owners, possibly they are still marginal farmers, but I will wager that their children are just as fine children as are to be found anywhere.

I think it interesting to consider the children as we fight here today for money for education, in connection with the pending measure. The purpose of the Hill amendment is to devote the royalties from that which Divine Providence has granted us, lying under the marginal sea, to education, in order that more and more children from the marginal farms may have opportunity to get the kind of education necessary to make them leading citizens—the kind of education which some marginal farmers are still working hard to be able to give to their children. I am very glad, indeed, that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has raised his question. Does the Senator have another question?

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his eloquent and able answer to the question I asked. I am prompted to inquire now, what plan is there to dispose of the people regarding whom the Senator has spoken? Is there any administrative program which includes social-security legislation, under consideration by the present great administration, which is being held up? Is there any bill on the calendar for Federal aid to education? Is there any bill on the calendar to give aid to small business, or to provide for the expansion of small business, and to increase employment? Is there any bill on the calendar in the nature of labor legislation? Mr. President, I ask, just what is the plan? What administrative program is being held up?

Mr. MONRONEY. The junior Senator from Oklahoma certainly cannot answer those questions. It may be said that perhaps by the debate we are preventing Senators returning to their home States for the purpose of making speeches, and we do not seem to be doing that. But with our willingness to yield at any time to permit the Senate to take up any legislation the majority leader may consider sufficiently urgent, I fail to see how we can be holding up anything in any way.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I am unable to understand the President's position. All he needed to do, perhaps, was to look at his program for legislation to see whether there were any important legislative proposals yet on the calendars and present them to the Congress for urgent and prompt action. He did not criticize the Republican leadership when, for 3 months, we spun our wheels and passed only 2 bills which no one considered of major importance.

One of those was the extension of the powers of the Executive to reorganize the executive department. That was not new legislation. It had been the law, and that power had expired. The Democrats were certainly found cooperative, because we insisted that the Republicans give to President Eisenhower the same powers we had previously insisted President Truman should have.

It was a Democratic House and the Democratic Members of the Senate who prevented his own party from interfering with those proper powers of reorganization.

The only other bill presented during the first 90 days of the session of major importance was a supplemental appropriation bill, the type of bill which is usually gavelled through without much discussion. On that particular one there was some discussion, because the Republicans, by a sleight-of-hand accounting, were claiming a saving of $1,200,000,000, which was shown on the Senate floor not to be a saving at all, but merely a borrowing of funds previously appropriated by Democratic Congresses for tanks, planes, ships, industrial facilities, and other defense items. I think that measure could well have been debated longer. I believe its proponents and the leadership should have used more time for the purpose of telling us exactly why they felt they should take $1,200,000,000 of the defense funds for hardware for the armed services, and claim that as money saved in the supplemental appropriation bill. It was not a saving at all.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GORE. In view of the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, I wonder whether he would join in another letter of inquiry to the President, as to just what administrative program is being held up, except the giving away of the country's natural resources.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator. I think it would also be important to ask the Chief Executive just what work his Congress has done in the first 90 days of his administration. We have had a number of investigations; indeed, we have set a new record for investigations. In other words, we are giving the new administration a going over—the present administration, as we did the previous administration—and Congress is assuming a new role in substituting its idea of legislative surveillance over a Chief Executive who had a mandate many times greater than that of the legislative Members who are taking such a lead.

I shall return to that later in my speech. But in the letter that we write to the Chief Executive we should not only inquire what legislation is being held up, but should also inquire what legislation would have been held up during the first 90 days, had we not been talking about the pending measure as we have talked about it.

When the distinguished Members of the majority return home, they will find that perhaps we shall have served to supply their only alibi for having a do-nothing 83d Congress because, on their own part, and of themselves, they have not been able to produce a program that would have consumed the time of the Senate more than perhaps 1 or 2 days a week.

We are glad to fill in, if the majority Members need an excuse for not having a legislative program, and for not having done anything. That is their business. I am sure they will find that we want to discuss the pending measure adequately, and to be very helpful about it, when they return emptyhanded from the 83d Congress, having accomplished nothing.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to proceed with that I consider to be a case in point. It has been said many times, by Senators who have spoken against prolonged debate, that nothing new has been brought out. Mr. President, I have listened carefully to most of the debate, and I have not heard recited, at all, the troubles Texas had in extending her northern boundaries. We are here talking about the extension of her southern boundary.

For the benefit of those who may not know their geography, I may disclose that Oklahoma lies immediately north of Texas. We are separated from Texas by the Red River. It is a mile wide and 1 inch deep, usually. That is the border, and was the border under the old Spanish treaty, namely, that the Red River, to the 100th meridian, should serve as the northernmost boundary of Texas. That was well settled for almost a century and a half. That would seem to be plain to almost everyone.

Yet in 1860 Texas, strong, robust, aggressive, expansive, decided that there were a million and a half of fertile acres lying within the southwest section of what is now Oklahoma. It was Federal land. It was land the use of which had been given to the Indians. The title was in the Federal Government, for the purposes of maintenance, protection, and jurisdiction.

In 1860 Texas moved up and established Greer County, north of the Red River, going to what was called the North Fork of the Red River, and attempted to acquire 1½ million acres of land, by the exercise of—shall we say, free enterprise, squatters' rights, or whatever it may be called.

Texas collected taxes and established State and county governments on those acres and held them until 1895.

Then, since the question of title was involved, there was a court case, under the same provision of the Constitution which we have discussed in this debate, namely, the section giving the Supreme Court original jurisdiction and the right to make a determination in conflicts between States or between States and the Federal Government. The case was brought under the same identical section of the Constitution.

The case went to the Supreme Court, and the Court heard all the evidence. It appointed a master to find out and determine the issues. In due time, as almost anyone could have seen by merely tracing the rivers on the map, it was decided that the northern boundary of Texas was not the North Fork of Red River, but was the genuine Red River; the Red River itself.

By the Supreme Court's decision the land later became part of Oklahoma, then the Indian country, and we made three and a half counties out of the area. The Court ruled that Texas had to go back across the river with her State sovereignty. We did not get back the taxes which had been collected during that period.

I cite that bit of history to show that the same point of law was involved in connection with the northern boundary of Texas as is involved in the present cases. Our title rests upon a Supreme Court decision. I wonder whether, under identically the same precedent we are asked to establish today, in deciding that the boundary of certain States extends 3 miles out to sea, or 10½ miles out to sea, Congress would not have the same right to say that the northern boundary of Texas was the Red River, but that for the purposes of the proposed legislation it would be the northernmost branch of Red River and not the main channel of that river.

I outline it because it is clearly in point. The holding of the Supreme Court which we in Oklahoma consider to be incontestable and in absolute finality, can now be jeopardized because Congress, by a cleverly written measure, can define geography, define it with reference to navigable waters and apply the inland rule to the open sea. There is no reason why the Congress, under the same tenuous line of thinking, cannot define the north fork of the Red River as the northern boundary of Texas.

I think it is important, Mr. President, and I think it is something we must realize, that as we go forward with these efforts to tamper with or to set precedents to upset titles to property rights which have long been considered to be final, we shall have a court of later appeal above the Supreme Court.

Thus, under this precedent cases can be brought to Congress by larger States to set aside a case which we thought was well settled by law, where the Supreme Court has acted.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator from Oklahoma familiar with the Allegheny Power Company case in which the Supreme Court literally ruled that any stream down which a toothpick might float is a navigable stream, and, therefore, belongs to the Federal Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not here dealing with navigable waters as such. I am talking about the minerals and other resources under navigable streams. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming knows, I am sure, that there is a long line of undisturbed Supreme Court decisions for over a hundred years which have never questioned the right of the States to submerged minerals under inland waters, streams, bays, and lakes.

I am sure the Senator from Wyoming would not want to make the junior Senator from Oklahoma feel that decisions with reference to the erection of bridges over navigable waters, or the control of floods, would in any degree be controlling in any manner in connection with the cases we are discussing.

Fighting over borders is not new to Oklahoma. It may be new to the Congress, but we have had to watch Texas for years, because she is an expansive State, a wonderful State, and, as we have to live next door, sometimes a problem is presented. As has been said, Texas considers other States as outlying provinces of the State of Texas.

Mr. HUNT. There is something which I have not heard mentioned in any of the speeches, and, for the information of the Senator from Wyoming, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma what was the motivating influence; what was the starting point from which the Secretary of the Interior decided to raise the issue of reclaiming the submerged lands.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the Senator has brought up that question. As I recall, and I think it is pretty well fixed in the hearings, it was unanimously voted by the Senate, and, I believe, almost unanimously by the House, under the Nye resolution, that the Federal Government had the ownership of resources under the open sea.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator not recognize that the real starting point, in contradiction of the 1933 letter

of the Secretary of the Interior, was the action of the Senate of the United States in unanimously passing the Nye resolution which went to the House of Representatives and which might have passed that body had it not been for the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Hatton Sumners, wanted to confine it to California only?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the Senator asked that question, because it helps to clear up minutely what actually happened.

Oklahoma has had several lawsuits involving the State of Texas. We love Texas, only we want her to stay on her side of the river, and we do not want her to take part of our Oklahoma land. As representatives of both our State and the Federal Government, we do not want Texas to take 10½ miles of the open sea, because we think there are resources there which belong to all the people.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator feel that the executive department ought to act in the matter even though the resolution was not adopted by the other House?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do. I am sure the junior Senator from New Mexico knows, that after studying the question, they were bound to bring the cases into court or face what would appear to me to be proper questioning by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a further question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUNT. Let me ask the distinguished Senator if he happens to be familiar with the situation confronting the State of Wyoming, coming up almost simultaneously with the tidelands issue developed by the Secretary of the Interior and presented to the Supreme Court? In order that this may be a matter of record, with the permission of the Senator from Oklahoma, I should like briefly to state the situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I can yield only for a question. I should like to have the statement in the RECORD, and I should like to discuss it with the Senator, but only if the Senator asks unanimous consent to put it in the form of a question. Then I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator from Oklahoma familiar with the fact that in the year 1945, I believe it was, without any preliminary discussion with the State of Wyoming, the Secretary of the Interior presented before the Supreme Court a claim to 2 sections of school land in my State? These were sections 16 and 36, in what is known as the Elk Basin oil fields of Wyoming, land which had been given to my State with a qualification in the act of admission, "Surveyed or unsurveyed." This meant that even if it were developed at a later date, when the land was surveyed, that the land contained oil or mineral-bearing resources, they belonged to the State of Wyoming for educational purposes.

This land was given to the State of Wyoming in 1830. In 1917, the State issued oil leases on the two parcels of land I have referred to. In 1928 production was started. Up until 1948, when the case was argued before the Supreme Court, the State of Wyoming had received $880,000 in oil royalties. Directly after the Supreme Court decision, which the State of Wyoming lost, we were able to come to Congress——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Wyoming is really asking a question, or if he is slightly off the track.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yielded only for a question. I assume that the Senator is coming to the question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Preliminary statements are not a part of a question.

Mr. HUNT. I shall put many questions within this one question, if the distinguished acting majority leader wishes that I do so. I shall be but 2 minutes. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that I think no Senator takes less time on the floor than does the senior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator's statement, but I have stated the rule in connection with filibusters, and we are trying to adhere to the rules, so far as we can.

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to the distinguished acting majority leader that if he wishes to have me ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Wyoming, or if he wishes that the Senator from Wyoming ask unanimous consent that I may yield, since the Senator from Wyoming is on the other side of the question, I should be most happy to yield in order to have the parliamentary situation clarified, according to the strict parliamentary rules to which we who oppose the joint resolution have been subjected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall object to any such request for unanimous consent, because that would only open the door for a quorum call, and I do not desire that any other business be transacted.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator aware of the situation? I shall not repeat my statement, except to say that I see a very great similarity between the action on the part of the Department of the Interior and the action taken in the State of Wyoming. My question simply is this: Is the Senator from Oklahoma familiar enough with the tidelands situation, as I am to some extent, to see a great similarity in the two situations?

Mr. MONRONEY. I cannot see a similarity in the the two cases, because lands lying offshore are unsurveyed, uncharted, and unknown. They are not even above water, so they cannot be seen. I doubt very seriously whether in the Wyoming case any precedent was set, or that it is in any way pertinent to our discussion here.

Mr. President, I began to say that Oklahoma has had other cases with the State of Texas which have involved much oil. There is another Supreme Court ruling on a treaty with Spain going back to the early days of our history. I have already mentioned the Red River, and also the south bank of the Red River.

A big oil field was found north of Wichita Falls. As usual, Texas was alert. The Red River was wide. It was learned that the oil field was practically ready for development and wells were producing, and that leases of oil and mineral rights were being made in that portion of the Red River which was under the land of Oklahoma.

Texas stated that her understanding of the treaty was that the north bank actually was inside her line; that the river had meandered; and Texas was trying to lay claim to untold millions of dollars' worth of oil in that section. So the question was whether the north bank or the south bank of the Red River was actually the dividing line.

The Supreme Court had to rule on this case, and it held in favor of Oklahoma, protecting the northernmost boundary again against invasion by Texas for the purpose of acquiring oil.

After many years, Oklahoma received firm title from the Supreme Court in a decision which held that the south bank of the Red River was the northernmost boundary of Texas.

It is now being said, in support of the pending measure, that if we do not like the decisions of the Supreme Court, we can find language that will, as we say in the oil drilling country, "drill around" the Supreme Court's language. What I believe would happen if the joint resolution were enacted is that we would drill around the Supreme Court decisions and define the marginal seas as inland waters.

It would seem to me that in view of our Constitutional division of powers, we will be skating on thin ice if we here do anything that might even remotely resemble the desire to establish a legislative precedent for overturning Supreme Court decisions on matters dealing with the boundaries of the States and conflict therein with the Federal Government, or thus set a precedent that might someday even be used to interfere with State boundaries and the right heretofore exclusively held by the Supreme Court to handle such matters under the Court's original jurisdiction.

I do not yield to anyone in the Senate in respect for and determination to fight for all the rights and prerogatives given to us as the legislative branch by the Constitution. The Founding Fathers carved out jurisdiction in the legislative field and on the powers of the purse that should give us plenty to do if we fulfill our constitutional duty.

The legislative branch of the Government has patriotism, common sense, loyalty, and a determination to act for the benefit of all the people, but I believe that the executive department and the judiciary are likewise proper guardians of our rights and equally competent to do their duties under the Constitution.

I think we are going more and more afield when we attempt to spread ourselves so thinly that we assume that only the legislative branch has the omniscience requisite to run this country. Surely the executive department, under the overwhelming mandate given to it by the people, is entitled not to be interfered with by carping criticism or unfair investigation. Certainly the Supreme Court, which throughout the years has demonstrated its power and ability to

assure us a nation of law, a government of law and not of men, should not be asked, in a political moment, to stand aside in order that political judgments may be substituted for its decisions.

I do not want the Senate to impose on these sacred divisions of power. I am certain that most of the splendid Senators who advocate the joint resolution do not wish to see such an imposition take place. They, together with the junior Senator from Oklahoma, know that our system of government is built upon the theory of a separation of powers, which is protected by the Constitution. If a decision of the Supreme Court might be overturned by legislative means in behalf of one State as against the Federal Government, or by one State as against another State, or by one citizen as against another, I am certain we would all agree that we would have reached a dangerous posture in our system.

I believe that one of the most effective, if not realistic, reasons for our refusing to pass the joint resolution now before the Senate is the realization that no case has been made or any cogent reason given on the floor of the Senate which would lead us, as trustees of the people of the Nation, of all 48 States, to vote to override, overturn, invalidate, or make ineffective—perhaps ineffective is a better word—three Supreme Court decisions.

These three decisions were squarely in point on an issue never before squarely brought before the Supreme Court. The right to maintain the sovereignty of the Nation below low-water mark is certainly given to the Federal Government, to all the 48 States. I can see nothing in any of the reports or hearings I have read to lead me to believe, even if we were to accept the concept of senatorial review of Supreme Court decisions, that we should quitclaim these valuable lands. I support, instead, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] who feels they should be held in trust for the education not only of the children of the State of Texas or Louisiana, but for the education of all the children of the Nation. These funds should be held in trust to build up the greatest natural asset we can have in America, the education, training, and character of the children of all the 48 States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, first let me warmly commend and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] on the very able and challenging address he has just made. It is one of the ablest and finest presentations that has been made on the subject now pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, quite a bit of business has been transacted since the last quorum call, and therefore no action by the Senate could affect the situation so far as a quorum is concerned.

The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would like to have his name added to the pending amendment as a sponsor. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts be added as one of the sponsors of the pending oil-for-education amendment, and that the RECORD show the addition of his name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry. Has business been transacted since the last quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Routine business has been transacted since the quorum call.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I shall not object, because it would be of no value in preventing another quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the request of the Senator from Alabama is approved. The name of the junior Senator from Massachusetts will be added.

VII. THE ANDERSON SUBSTITUTE BILL AND THE OIL-FOR-EDUCATION AMENDMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I turn now to a discussion of the Anderson substitute and the oil-for-education amendment thereto.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has offered in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 13, a bill to give effect to the three Supreme Court decisions which held that the coastal States do not own, and never did own, the lands underneath the open ocean adjacent to their coasts, but that the Federal Government, by reason of constitutional responsibility for external affairs, has paramount rights in such lands.

No legislation providing for the administration of these areas and the development of their vast oil and gas deposits has been enacted. The Anderson substitute provides the legislative authority for development of these oil and gas reserves by the Federal Government through the Department of the Interior, the agency which has responsibility for oil and gas development on Federal lands within the borders of the States.

The Anderson substitute specifically—

First. Permits immediate resumption of oil and gas development in the ocean-submerged areas under the administration of the Secretary of the Interior, but only in conformance with specific standards set by the Congress.

Second. Gives full and complete protection to all holders of bona fide leases issued by the States or any political subdivision of the States respecting the areas and permits them to continue in accordance with their terms.

Third. Confirms the titles of the States to all lands beneath their rivers, lakes, ports, and harbors—to all lands beneath inland navigable waters; that is, including lands covered by the ebb and flow of the tides, namely, tidelands proper.

Fourth. Grants ownership to a State or its political subdivision of filled-in, reclaimed, or made lands when such work was authorized and undertaken for a public purpose. This applies both to existing areas within that category and also constitutes a grant of future title to the States.

Fifth. Gives the States an unquestioned right to control the development and taking of fish, oysters, sponges, kelp, and the like within their State boundaries.

Sixth. Gives the States a generous share, 37½ percent, of the revenues from oil and gas operations within their State boundaries which, by definition, extend 3 miles from mean low tide.

The oil-for-education amendment deals with the balance of the revenues—62½ percent within the 3-mile limit and 100 percent beyond the 3-mile limit going out to sea.

The amendment offers a two-edged weapon for national defense by providing that during the present emergency the royalties from this offshore oil may be used for the urgent needs of national defense and then it is our proposal that the royalties from this oil should then be used exclusively for educational purposes—primary, secondary, and higher education—in all the 48 States. For we cannot longer neglect the education of our children if we expect as a nation to remain intelligent enough to recognize international danger, continue to fortify and strengthen our democracy, and be able to preserve our freedom.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think that the provision of the Anderson substitute with his amendment is a very fair and generous proposal to the so-called tideland oil States of California, Texas, and Louisiana, in that it gives them, before anything is taken for the rest of the Nation, 37½ percent of the revenues derived from oil in the submerged lands off their coasts? Particularly, does not the Senator think that this is a generous proposal in view of the fact that legally, and under the decisions of the Supreme Court, they are no more entitled to even the 37½ percent than are all the other States?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama certainly thinks this is a generous provision. I am very proud at this time to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the distinguished Senator from Tennesee is one of the authors of the pending amendment, the oil-for-education amendment. In writing that amendment the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators felt that they were doing a very fine and generous thing in providing this gift of 37½ percent to the particular States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama yields for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Even if it should be assumed—and, of course, it cannot be assumed, because the Supreme Court has definitely, seven times, decided the issue the other way—that the land under the sea out from the States is within the boundaries of those States, would not the 37½ percent still be a fair offer, in view of the fact that the Mineral Leasing Act provides that 37½ of the revenue from minerals inside the State goes to the State where the minerals are located.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right. We have followed that generous provision, as the Senator suggests, making a grant of 37½ percent to the particular States.

As the United States Commissioner of Education, Hon. Earl James McGrath, has said:

Life does not stop while we build the Nation's military strength. Children are born and grow up. They go to school and to college. You cannot put a generation into educational cold storage and then later put them into an educational hothouse.

The necessities of the long pull before us are not merely military essentials. There are equally basic essentials in non-military areas. To provide the essentials in all areas is our continuing objective. Only thus can we meet the demands of the long pull which lie before us—a period in which the preparedness of the Nation must be at hitherto undreamed-of-peacetime levels, while at the same time the basic essentials of life and growth must be provided for all our people, including all the children.

As I have said many times before, it may be very difficult, in fact impossible, for the free world to match the Communist world in terms of manpower. Of course, we all pray for the time when, without global war and by peaceful means, we may witness the liberation of those who are held in the bondage of totalitarian communism, but such a day may be long in coming, and as the struggle proceeds for the minds of men we must pit quality against quantity. The basic strength of the free world lies in the fact that free institutions, unlike the institutions of dictatorship, are capable of developing men and women with intelligence, with initiative, with originality, with discrimination, and with inquiring and adventurous minds.

OUR HERITAGE OF EDUCATION

That we have in so many respects outstripped the world technically and managerially is due in large part to our system of free education developed under free institutions. This was the essence of the American dream as it matured in the great creative mind of Thomas Jefferson, and along with it grew and developed the traditional American policy of dedicating the proceeds of our public lands to the cause of education. Thomas Jefferson declared:

That nation which expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization expects that which never was and never will be.

Twenty-two months ago, when we introduced the oil-for-education amendment on the floor of the Senate, I tried to indicate that our precious heritage of education for all our people was in danger of becoming a myth. At that time—and many times since then—I cited the dilapidated condition of our schools, the huge increases in our child population, and the alarming exodus of our inadequately paid teachers from the teaching profession into better paying pursuits.

In connection with its consideration of the oil-for-education amendment, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs heard expert testimony concerning the financial plight of the Nation's grammar schools, high schools, and colleges, and of the unsuccessful efforts of the States and local communities unassisted to catch up with a 20-year lag in school construction, and meet the vastly increased financial needs of our growing school population.

It was demonstrated to the committee that deficiencies in our school system and in the education of our people are having serious effects upon our national defense program and our national security.

THE CRISIS IN EDUCATION

The evidence presented to the committee shows that our educational system today faces a severe crisis. The physical condition of our schools and school plants is in so many ways dilapidated. Our school population is increasing at a rapid, indeed an almost overwhelming rate, and our underpaid teachers are leaving the field of education in order to find jobs that will maintain them and their families at an American standard of living. Today we must sadly admit that the school teachers and and the boys and girls who are studying in our schools are to an alarming degree the forgotten people. We are crowding our children into bursting and obsolete classrooms, into dangerous, inadequate and unsanitary buildings. We are paying our teachers too little and working them too hard. We are failing to train and prepare needed recruits for the teaching profession.

This is not a temporary or short-run condition. The measures which we have taken to meet it are not adequate. Competition with industry and defense-related jobs has taken many of the best teachers from the classrooms. Many communities are scraping the bottom of the barrel to get even inadequately prepared teachers. Schools are not being built fast enough to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding enrollment. More than a million additional children entered the public schools last fall as compared with the year before. This rate of increase will continue for at least for the next 6 years as the 1952 birthrate was the alltime high. The education of 4 million children is being impaired because of inadequate buildings, poorly trained teachers, and double sessions or part-time instruction. Every seventh child in the Nation is being shortchanged in his education—shortchanged in his future strength and worth to his country.

TEACHER SHORTAGE SERIOUS

Observing the teacher shortage in the United States, Dr. McGrath, head of the United States Office of Education, recently had this to say:

A grave threat to our schools is the alarming shortage of fully qualified teachers. Our schools employ the services of the country's largest professional group—more than 1 million persons. It takes a lot of new recruits each year just to replace those who leave the profession through resignation and death. Conservative estimates of the annual need merely to maintain normal ratios between supply and demand of teachers put the figure at about 95,000. In addition, the number of children to be taught swells each year, and by the end of the decade the normal needs for replacement of public school teachers will be 110,000 per year.

Dr. McGrath continues:

For the elementary schools, the number of qualified teachers now available annually is only one-third of the number needed. The result is either the employment of a poorly qualified or unqualified teacher on an emergency certification, or the doubling up of classes and the gross overloading of teachers.

Speaking of rural schools, Dr. McGrath said:

The preponderance of emergency certifications issue of necessity to poorly qualified persons are issued for teachers in our rural schools. It is too great a compliment to the sons and daughters of the farms to say that they can be educated just as well as city children, with less able teachers.

A recent survey of educational needs throughout the country by the New York Times shows just how grave is the situation. Typical of the situation in other States is that in North Carolina. Two thousand new white elementary teachers will be needed this year. The supply from North Carolina colleges last spring was only 536. Here, as elsewhere, the shortage is more acute in rural areas.

South Dakota public schools are employing 1,000 teachers who have less than 1 year of college training and another 1,400 who have less than 2 years. Even a relatively high-income State such as Michigan has 5,500 teachers who have not met the minimum requirements. In New Jersey, another relatively high-income State, 900 classes are on double session and 750 classes are using makeshift classrooms.

The New York Times study shows that the Nation's schools needed this year 100,000 additional qualified elementary teachers, and had just some 30,000 from whom to choose.

This does not include qualified replacements for the 64,000 teachers that are this year teaching with substandard certificates. The number of poorly qualified teachers has reached alarming proportions. When we entered World War I, only 1 public-school teacher in 340 had lower qualifications than those legally prescribed. This year, every 16th teacher in the Nation holds a substandard certificate. Not 1 out of every 340, but 1 out of every 16.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of April 10. It shows the situation in the relatively rich State of New York, and shows how that State is being forced today to put on an intensive recruiting drive in a desperate effort to get teachers who are so desperately needed, even in that great and rich State of New York.

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

STATE GETS "CURE" FOR TEACHER NEED—$2,574,000 PROGRAM URGED TO FILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL POSTS UPSTATE IN NEXT 5 YEARS—RECRUITING DRIVE IS ASKED—INSTRUCTORS' COLLEGES SHOULD RAISE ENROLLMENT BY 50 PERCENT, UNIVERSITY GROUP SAYS

The teachers' colleges of the State University of New York will have to increase their enrollments by one-half to help meet the anticipated demand for elementary-school teachers upstate in the next 5 years, the university's board of trustees was told yesterday.

Referring to estimates by the State Education Department that teaching positions would rise by 10,000 to 42,500 in that period in 1,800 school districts outside this city, a special committee of the board presented four recommendations to increase teacher supply.

The group's report was made at the board's monthly meeting at its offices, 522 Fifth Avenue.

The committee urged that recruitment efforts be intensified immediately and continued over the period to increase elementary department enrollments of State teachers' colleges from 6,611 to 10,000. This, it said, would produce 2,000 graduates annually and increase operating costs by $2,485,500 to $11,517,000.

END OF A SUMMER FEE URGED

The group also recommended that the initial summer session of instruction for new enrollees in the intensified teacher-training program for graduates of other than teachers' colleges be fully State-supported. The 500 graduates completing this program have paid an instruction fee of $100 each. The committee said its proposal would expand the enrollment from 450 last year to 750, at a cost of $75,000.

Special summer session workshops should be provided for teachers serving on emergency licenses to qualify them for permanent licenses, the committee held. The cost was not estimated.

Finally, the group said, student aid in the form of 70 laboratory assistantships paying $200 each would help to keep students of limited financial resources in the teachers' colleges and free professors for professional work.

The committee said the total cost of the program would exceed $2,574,000. It would increase qualified graduates from 2,565 to 3,050 in 1956, a total which, with other graduates, would rise to 3,375, the group estimated. Allowing a 15 percent loss, the committee said the net increase would be from 2,393 to 2,869.

EX-TEACHER POOL CITED

If, it added, about 1,000 former teachers return to service each year and out-of-State sources continue to supply 500 more, the recommended program would produce the remainder needed.

The board gave provisional approval to local sponsorship of each of its institutes in Binghamton, Buffalo, New York City, Utica and White Plains, a step in their transition to 2-year community college status.

The trustees unanimously approved the application of Broome County to take over the State's institute in Binghamton as a community college. They also approved the plan of the Auburn Board of Education to become sponsor of a new community college.

Dr. Lawrence L. Jarvis, executive dean, will meet with groups in Glens Falls on Tuesday and Watertown next Friday to discuss plans for establishing community colleges there.

Dr. William S. Carlson, president of the State University, reported that he expected legal steps in the acquisition of a 347-acre tract in the town of Vestal, Broome County, for a campus for Harpur College to be completed by mid-June.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the distinguished Senator from New York, for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Alabama has made reference to the educational difficulties of New York State. I ask him whether it is not a fact that in New York State, which is a relatively wealthy State, teachers today are grossly underpaid, that classes are much larger than good practice dictates, and whether it is not true that great difficulty is being found in obtaining replacements for teachers and in securing teachers with the training and experience which even the minimum of caution and interest would dictate?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York is familiar with the situation in his own State. He speaks from first-hand knowledge. He brings here the facts as they exist. He gives us the picture as it exists in New York State today. He is absolutely right about it. The deplorable situations in respect to the shortage of teachers, inadequately paid teachers, teachers who are not properly qualified to teach, crowded classrooms, and too many pupils having to be taught by too few teachers exist today not only generally but even in the great and relatively wealthy State of New York. We all look upon New York, if not as the richest State in the Union, certainly as one of the wealthiest States. Yet in that State we find those unfortunate conditions to exist.

We are guilty of shocking neglect of our teachers. We have never given them the recognition, the appreciation and the financial security they deserve. Poorly paid even before World War II, their situation is much worse today. Their earnings have not kept pace with earnings in general. Rising costs of living have forced thousands upon thousands of teachers from the classrooms out of economic necessity, and they are still leaving. The drain as we might expect, is greatest among our best trained teachers.

Teacher-training colleges cannot even begin to meet the huge demand for teachers from the dwindling graduating classes, as young people abandon their teaching ambition in the face of stark economic necessity.

The deplorable state of teacher income is revealed in a recent survey by the National Education Association. The NEA survey shows how we have let our teachers drop to the absolute bottom of the economic ladder. Teachers are now the lowest paid of all employed groups in America.

Last week disturbing evidence came to light to uphold the thesis that superior high school graduates shy away from teaching. The annual report of the Educational Testing Service at Princeton, N. J. presented evidence that men who are preparing to be teachers are, as a group, the poorest students of all those attending colleges and universities.

The Princeton Service, headed by Dr. Henry Chauncey, administers the college entrance examination board tests and most of the recognized examinations on the higher education level. About a year ago the armed services asked the board to give the draft deferment tests to young men in college who are of military age. In 1951–52, the bureau gave more than 400,000 tests as part of its selective service college qualifiation test program. The results are startling, to say the least. It was found that students in education—those men who are preparing to be teachers and will teach our children—did worse on the tests than any other group of students.

As we read these findings, can we fail to comprehend that these are our future teachers, those upon whom we must depend upon to endow our children with knowledge and teach them to think, and help them build their character and to help prepare themselves for American citizenship?

Do we forget that the teacher is the central figure in the education process?

For many hours of the day, we entrust the minds and the character of our most precious resource—our children—to the teacher to mold the children for the responsibilities of manhood and womanhood. Inevitably, the character and influence of the teacher is woven into the character of the entire Nation.

Not only are we losing teachers out of the classrooms. Not only is enrollment in teacher-training classes dwindling rapidly. Not only are we failing to attract the best young brains into teachers' colleges but we are failing to attract the average brains, and, according to the test, even the poorest brains, the subaverage brains, and those below normal. At the same time increasing numbers of our young teacher graduates are failing to take up teaching. This fact is revealed in an article by Dr. Samuel Engle Burr, chairman of the department of education at American University, in Washington, D. C.

Dr. Burr's article was based on his survey of teacher graduates from that institution since the fall of 1947. The survey reveals that only 55 percent of the graduates in education actually hold teaching positions, and that 25 percent are working in some field other than that for which they are especially trained. In short, the survey reveals that 25 percent are working in some other activity, not in the field of teaching, for which they were trained, even though large amounts of funds have been invested in the institution where they were trained to be teachers.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with me that the figures he has cited are not surprising, in view of the fact of the average pay of teachers is less than the average pay of manual workers in the United States, and that in many cases even a college-trained teacher is being paid less than the salary paid to a dog catcher or a garbage collector?

Mr. HILL. Yes—or less than the salary of a comfort-station hostess.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Does not the Senator from Alabama agree with me that under those circumstances it is not surprising that we are losing many of the best trained teachers we have?

Mr. HILL. Certainly. As the Senator from New York has suggested by his question, it is only natural that the teachers, who today constitute the lowest-paid group in our country, have been forced by economic necessity into positions such as those mentioned by the Senator from New York.

The article to which I have just referred lists the following as among the types of employment in which some of

the young men who prepared for the teaching profession are earning their livelihood—public relations counselor, grocer, importer and distributor of books, curios and art materials, magazine sale promotion representative, statistical draftsman, payroll clerk, and music cataloger in a library.

It appears that all these types of employment pay better salaries than does teaching, or offer other advantages, such as greater opportunity for advancement, better working conditions, or employment in a favored locality. Here is demonstrated once again how sadly we have neglected our teachers. We have failed to make teaching the honored, respected, financially secure profession that we expect it to be, and that it must be.

Let Dr. Burr speak:

> It seems a peculiar paradox that young people who want to teach, who are capable of doing good teaching work, and who have taken education courses to prepare themselves for certification as teachers should find it advantageous to enter other fields in an era when there is an acute shortage of teachers.
>
> All the national surveys of education indicate that several thousands of additional teachers are needed today. Teachers' agencies and placement bureaus are begging for the names of people who can qualify for teaching jobs. But one-quarter of the young people whom we prepare for this important work choose other kinds of employment because they can't afford to teach. The need for larger financial income drives them out of teaching and into other fields.

Many other colleges and universities throughout the United States report conditions similar to those among the education graduates of American University.

I want to call attention to the results of a survey by the Beta field chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, as set forth in an article by Mr. Adolph Unruh, published in the Phi Delta Kappan. The question studied was, How many male teachers in the city and county of St. Louis, Mo., find it necessary to supplement their regular income from teaching by doing other kinds of work?

The survey revealed that only 8 percent of the male teachers suported themselves and their families by teaching alone. Ninety-two percent held supplementary jobs, or their wives worked, or they had some income which was independent of their earnings in the field of education.

The survey listed over 100 kinds of employment performed by these male teachers in addition to regular teaching. It is interesting to note the wide range of jobs that these men performed after school was over in the afternoon, for as long as an 8-hour shift. In other words, after teaching all day, they have to work at other jobs for 8 hours in order to be able to provide meat and bread for their families. It would seem that few of the outside jobs bear any real relationship to their specialized work as a teacher or to their specialized training for their profession.

The jobs vary from bowling alley manager to frozen-custard-stand operator to short-order cook. Fifty-two percent reported that they felt the extra hours detracted from their effectiveness in teaching.

This shocking situation in St. Louis is by no means an isolated example. It is not confined to that great and rich city. In community after community we find teachers having to turn to outside work in order to live.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Aside from the St. Louis survey, which deals with the problem in that city do we not find that in many rural areas the teachers are forced to engage in other activities in order to supplement their income from teaching?

Mr. HILL. I am glad the Senator from Tennessee has asked that question. I was coming to it. Of course, the situation in rural areas is even more deplorable than that in the richer communities, such as St. Louis. The situation is indeed a desperate one. It forces the teachers to get other jobs. That desperate situation is even greater in the rural areas than it is in the city and metropolitan areas.

We must not forget that most persons who are engaged in business—for instance, in industry, farming, or other types of employment—look forward to constant improvement in their income. They have a right to look forward to it. I may say that prospect or promise is held out to them, and is realized if they do their jobs well. However, that is not true in the case of teachers. After approximately 12 or 14 years of teaching, they reach their maximum income. No matter how long thereafter they continue to pursue their profession of teaching, their income is not increased; by that time the teacher has come to the end of his financial blind alley.

A recent survey revealed that two-thirds of New York City's 10,000 high-school teachers find it necessary to hold part-time jobs outside of school. More than half of these reported that at least one other member of their family must work, to make ends meet. Fifty-eight percent reported that they had been unable to avoid going into debt during the past few years, and others said that indebtedness for them had been avoided only by exhausting their savings.

Besides the poor pay, there is another important reason why ambitious young teachers are leaving the classrooms.

With the first taste of the lowest-paid job in the United States, a young teacher begins to take stock of future opportunities to better his condition. What does he see ahead? An inadequate and antiquated salary schedule that—try as he may—will permit him only the most meager yearly increases, increases out of all proportion to the rewards in other pursuits and to the contribution he has made.

And how long may he look forward to increased earnings? Well, for only about 12 or 14 years, which will bring him to his prime. Then he will have reached the top of the average teacher pay scale. Beyond that point he cannot go, no matter how deserving he may be. He has come to the end of his financial blind alley.

Deploring the tragedy of this financial trap, Mr. Paul Woodring, professor of psychology at Western Washington College of Education, recently had this to say:

> The simple fact is that most teachers are pretty normal human beings who are living in the same economic environment as businessmen, tradesmen, and laborers. They have the same desire for new automobiles and flyrods as does the man next door. Their wives have the same interest in pretty clothes, attractive homes, labor-saving gadgets as do the wives of the plumbers or the grocers. Their daughters demand the same cashmere sweaters, their sons the same bicycles and baseball gloves as do the businessman's children.
>
> Under the circumstances, the teacher who can renounce worldly goods is a pretty odd character, for all of these things cost money, the same kind of money which is so useful to the businessman. As a result of all these pressures, teachers, particularly the more able teachers, are leaving the classrooms in droves.

Mr. President, the only way that we shall be able to meet the unprecedented demand for teachers and the cry for competency in the classroom is to halt the alarming drift away from the teaching profession, and to train more teachers. This means that we shall have to stop regarding teaching as a second-class or, should we say, a last-class profession, and must pay our teachers adequately. The laborer not only is worthy of his hire, but if we are to obtain the benefit of the services of the laborer, he must be paid a salary which at least in some degree will be comparable to value of the job he does.

SHORTAGE OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS SEVERE

Now, let us look at the facts on the shortage of school buildings. Today the need for schoolhouse construction is without precedent in the history of the Nation. In the 10-year period from 1920 to 1930, the enrollment in public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools increased by slightly more than 5 million, or 5,028,182. In the decade from 1948 to 1958, the increase will be doubled that amount, or 10,152,000. The tide of war-born babies is engulfing the lower grades, and it will move right on up through the elementary and high schools. Classrooms must be provided for these children, and they must be provided now—not next year, not in 10 years or not in 20 years.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. On Saturday, I had the privilege of being in a rural county in Tennessee. I found there a tremendous interest in the Hill amendment, not only because the people are interested in having teachers receive larger salaries, but because in that community the people are confronted with the necessity of building school buildings to the value of $700,000. Those buildings are needed at once. Several persons called to ask me about the prospect of obtaining from submerged oil funds which could be used to help them construct those school buildings.

I desired to ask the Senator whether he did not find that throughout the United States counties were in a similar plight, and that that was the explanation of the fact that not only the school teachers, but also the county officials,

and even the taxpayers themselves, were interested in the adoption of the Hill amendment to the Anderson substitute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I have sought to make clear, this is not an isolated situation. It is not a situation peculiar to any one county, peculiar to any one State, or peculiar to any one section of the United States. The tragic, deplorable situation of which I speak exists throughout the United States. It represents a crisis which faces our public school system, as well as the State universities in the 48 States.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator know of any other measure that is before the Congress which has any possibility of immediately affording assistance not only to teachers, but also to the school-building program, other than the Hill amendment to the Anderson substitute?

Mr. HILL. If there is any other such legislative proposal, I certainly do not know of it. Were there such, I think the Senator from Tennessee and also the Senator from Alabama would be aware of it.

Mr. President, if we had only the population increase to face, the situation would be serious enough; but it is doubly difficult to find room for these new millions of children because for 20 years there was a marked decline in school construction. During the 1930 decade, schoolhouse construction lagged far behind the needs, largely due to a shortage of local funds during the depression years. Even a considerable amount of Federal assistance through public-works programs was not enough to keep pace with the need. During the 1940 decade, the backlog of need continued to grow as the school construction lagged further behind. Throughout the war years, shortages of labor and materials made it difficult to hold to even a normal program of maintenance. For this reason, depreciation was accelerated. School construction remained at a low level until 1948, and it was not until 1950 that the annual rate of expenditure for school construction reached the average for the 1920's. By 1950, it was estimated that the national backlog of need was more than 250,000 classrooms.

The second progress report of the school-facilities survey which is now being made by the Office of Education estimates the total cost of the Nation's school-plants needs as of September 1952, to be $10.7 billion. With the increased enrollments now evident, and taking into consideration regular replacements for obsolescence, it may be estimated that by 1958 a total of 600,000 additional classrooms will be needed, and that the cost will be between eighteen and nineteen billion dollars, in 1951 dollars.

In far too many communities, classrooms are so overcrowded as to make effective teaching almost impossible. School basements, apartment-house basements, empty stores, garages, churches, and even trailers are being utilized to take care of the overflow. In one community, children were found to be attending class in a morgue. What a pleasant memory they will have of their alma mater. Even with the use of such facilities, many communities are having to resort to half-day and even third-day sessions to carry the load.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the classroom were located in a morgue, would not the subjects be somewhat dead?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think that is a very logical conclusion, suggested by the question of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], a great educator himself. I may say that the reference to third-day sessions relates to a class which is in session for but one-third of a day.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, for a question only.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator is familiar with the recent study made by the Federal Security Agency, authorized by title 1 of Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, namely, the school-facilities survey?

Mr. HILL. I am familiar with it, and I know that it is a very excellent survey. Certain of the facts I have been citing in my remarks are to be found in that particular survey, I may say. I repeat, it is a very excellent survey. I commend it to the reading of all Senators.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall that, during the second session of the 81st Congress, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held extensive hearings on the subject matter of school facilities throughout the United States, their shortage and also their inadequacy?

Mr. HILL. I recall it well. I had intended to cite certain figures from those hearings.

Many States have been fighting hard to overcome the shortage of school buildings. For example, the New York Times survey reveals that in the last 4 years North Carolina has spent $181 million on school buildings. Some 6,500 new classrooms and hundreds of auditoriums, gymnasiums, libraries, and other facilities have been constructed. In spite of this effort, the State needs 7,400 new classrooms by next September. Last year 43,000 North Carolina pupils went to school in hallways, basements, auditoriums, and other makeshift quarters. Ten thousand were in churches, lodge halls, and rented quarters. Another 11,000 were in barracks, and 9,000 were on split shifts.

Many States face similar situations. In Minnesota, nearly 100,000 pupils have attended school in buildings which should be abandoned, and in school-owned barracks and similar structures not designed for school use.

Nationwide there is a shortage of 325,000 classrooms and auxiliary facilities.

These words by Dr. Walter Maxwell, executive secretary of the Arizona Education Association, tell the story for community after community:

> Numerous times I have seen children lined up in front of a schoolhouse door, marching in to take their places in the school after the first shift marched out—just like the changing of shifts in factories.

Over a million boys and girls are not getting a full school day. Imagine, if you will, what this does to the morale of the children, the parents, the teachers, and the community. Schooling lost is schooling gone forever, for a child is 6 but once. Students are attending sessions which last but half a day, and, in some instances, but a third of a day.

Mr. President, I am delighted to note that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] honors us by his presence. The Senator from Arkansas made one of the finest, ablest, and most revealing of speeches on the pending measure, particularly with reference to the tragic situation facing our schools, when he recently spoke on the pending measure. It was a magnificent contribution, a challenging presentation of the situation which exists today in the schools of the United States. I certainly appreciated his very kind words.

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

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Arkansas, for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator possibly realize how much I appreciate the kind words he has just spoken regarding me?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Good Book tells us, "Out of the fullness of the heart, the mouth speaketh." I assure the Senator from Arkansas that it was out of the fullness of my heart that I was moved and inspired to say what I did, having had the privilege of being on the floor to hear his magnificent address the other day.

Furthermore, United States Office of Education surveys show that 1 out of 5 schoolhouses now in use should be either abandoned or extensively remodeled. Many of them are fire hazards and fire traps—wholly unsafe for school use. Others are so obsolete in structure and design as to be completely unsuited for today's educational needs. Still others are so lacking in sanitary conveniences as to constitute a health menace. They do not include the hit-or-miss contraptions now used as schools on an emergency basis. I referred earlier to those hit-and-miss contraptions — garages, trailers, and the morgue.

Miss Selma Borchardt, vice president of the American Federation of Teachers, called the plight of the Nation's schools "shocking" and told the committee that:

> Forty-four percent of all elementary school buildings now in use, housing 27 percent of all elementary pupils, are held to be unfit and unsatisfactory for classroom use.

Sanitary facilities are lacking for over a million school children.

Adequate medical facilities are lacking in 85 percent of the schools.

The Nation's public elementary and secondary school population needs additional floor space equal to a 1-story building 52 feet wide extending from New York City to San Francisco, Calif.

This amount of floor space equals the total residential housing space in a city the size of Philadelphia, Pa.

The U. S. News & World Report, in an editorial entitled "School Jamming: Worst Ever," sums up for us the following effects upon our children of the severe classroom and teacher shortages:

Makeshift classrooms—in store buildings and other unsatisfactory structures—for 1.8 million pupils.

Short days—so that two or three classes may use the same room—for more than 1 million.

Fire danger to 6.4 million in buildings that do not meet minimum standards of safety against fire.

"Little red schoolhouse" training for 1.9 million in one-room, one-teacher schools.

Overcrowding for 14 million who find 30 or more classmates in their classrooms. Among them are 800,000 in rooms with 50 or more.

The Educational Policies Commission, representing the National Education Association and the American Council on Education, sees these additional effects:

Overcrowded schools, with their part-time classes, overworked teachers, mass instruction, and watered-down programs produce effects which are not always immediately observable, but are nonetheless serious. Pupils do not learn the things they should, and they master less well the things they do learn.

Relations between home and school are weakened, and the well-balanced development of children is prevented. Ingenious administrative arrangements to utilize every building to the limit are helpful, but they are no substitute for the careful ministrations of a teacher who has time to teach each child well. Fitness for freedom is not mass-produced.

Mr. T. M. Stinnett, executive secretary of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, has called the conditions in our schools a public school scandal. Addressing a conference on that subject, he said, "It is a scandal born of public neglect, public confusion and public fear." Then Mr. Stinnett named these seven neglects around which it centers:

Too few schoolrooms to house children decently; too few teachers, many overworked, overloaded teachers in overflowing classrooms; unsafe, unsanitary, obsolete classrooms, inadequately prepared teachers; too few recruits for teaching; too little money to fulfill basic requirements.

We cannot forget that educational benefits once lost can never be reclaimed. When a child loses a day or a week or a year of his schooling, he has lost it forever. If our schools are forced to continue to resort to such expediences as one-half and one-third day sessions, if we continue to send many of our children to be taught by ill-prepared and incompetent teachers, the damage can never be repaired.

NEEDS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

We are also facing a critical situation in the field of higher education. Contrary to the trend in the elementary and high school—our colleges and universities have suffered a sharp drop in enrollment. Besides the draft and the completion of the GI training of World War II veterans, there is a third reason. Our birth rate in the depression years was, as is always true in depressions, quite low. The depression babies are now entering the colleges. Today, we have a situation in our colleges and universities that is just the opposite of what it will be a few years from now when the tremendous crop of war and post-war babies are ready for their training as our doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, chemists and as leaders in other professions and in business. When that period arrives, we must have colleges ready to receive them. It is our duty to keep alive and in good condition our facilities for college training.

Almost all our 1,900 institutions of higher learning are in financial trouble, whether they are State institutions, land-grant colleges, the large private universities or the small college. The New York Times survey shows that 1 out of every 3 of our liberal arts colleges is operating in the red. The colleges that are hardest hit are the small colleges with enrollments under 500. They may be small colleges for women or city colleges without a campus. These are the kind that too often do not have the endowment of a large private college and, of course, do not have the tax support of the State institutions. But if you will look through Who's Who in America and pick at random the names of the men and women whom you regard as important on the national scene you will be surprised at how many received their educations in these small colleges. I invite you to look at the Congressional Directory and see how many of our colleagues in both Houses of Congress received their education in such institutions.

Income from gifts and endowments is off sharply, as is student enrollment. Faculties have been reduced in many institutions. Some of them have begun to lower academic standards to keep their campuses open. Tuition rates have risen to new peaks.

The financial difficulties of higher education have been caused by 5 pressures according to a 3-year study by the Commission on Higher Education, whose work was carried on under grants from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. These five pressures are:

First. Inflation, which in little over one decade has reduced the purchasing power of the educational dollar by almost one-half.

Second. The expansion of educational services demanded by the increasing complexity of our knowledge, by the need for more research, by improvement in instructional methods, and by expanded personnel and advisory services.

Third. Fluctuation of student enrollment which was reduced by the Second World War, greatly enlarged by the flood of veterans, reduced as this flood receded, and then again threatened by the manpower requirements of the Armed Forces.

Fourth. Needs for enlarged and modernized capital plant.

Fifth. Uncertain sources of income from gifts, endowments and government with which to meet all these complicated situations.

I spoke earlier about New York State. I do not desire to pick on New York State. I have a tremendous regard for the State of New York. Nearly everyone looks upon it as a wealthy State, and it is, relatively speaking.

Dr. Louis A. Wilson, New York State Commissioner of Education, declares that the colleges and universities in the Empire State, in common with those in the rest of the country, have critical financial problems, with inflation throwing out of balance the economic basis upon which they have operated. He declares, further, a substantial number of our institutions are facing the most severe crisis of their entire history.

Dean Rusk, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, told 900 college faculty leaders and administrators meeting in Chicago last month that the Nation's colleges and universities need between three and four hundred million dollars a year of new money not now available and stressed that endowments and foundations could not supply that kind of money.

Tuition rates have gone so high that the board of trustees of New York State University last month called for a downward revision in tuition and other fees at the State institutions to prevent forcing many young men and women out of school.

In citing the need for an equitable tuition and fee policy, the trustees had this to say:

Behind State University of New York is a conviction that there must be broad opportunities for higher education.

The opportunities should be available to every young man and woman capable of benefiting from a high order of intellectual and technical disciplines. One of State University's duties is to open doors for able young people who, in the absence of such a public university, could not take advantage of opportunities of higher learning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article from the New York Times of April 5, 1953.

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

The article is as follows:

MEDICAL SCHOOL NEEDS—GREATER COMMUNITY ROLE CALLS FOR MORE OPERATING FUNDS

American medical schools need an average of $250,000 more each year in order to do a first-rate job, according to Dr. Ward Darley, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges and dean of the department of medicine at the University of Colorado.

The chief cause of the financial crisis, writes Dr. Darley in the Journal of Medical Education, is the 500-percent increase in operating costs of the medical schools over the past 30 years.

Aside from the increased costs of educating medical students, the medical schools are also called upon to help in the instruction of many kinds of health personnel other than future doctors, furnish medical services to the community, and support extensive research activities in order to keep pace with the constantly advancing field of medical science.

ENDOWMENT INTEREST DECREASE

Our changing economy also has a part in contributing to the difficulties of the schools, observes Dr. Darley. Although in 1941 35 percent of the schools' income came from endowment interest, this percentage dropped to 20 percent in 1948 despite a 21-percent increase in endowment capital.

While not recommending any single course of action, Dr. Darley summarizes the various ways in which medical schools can brighten their financial picture. These include selling medical and hospital services, increasing

community support for operation of teaching hospitals and clinics, recovering the actual costs involved in research programs, receiving larger city and State appropriations, soliciting more and larger gifts, increasing tuition, and accepting Federal subsidy.

Mr. HILL. Think of it, Mr. President—a 500-percent increase in operating costs of medical schools over the past 30 years. That means, if I understand arithmetic, that where it used to cost $1 for a certain item, it now costs $5.

The tuition rates have gone so high that the board of trustees last month called for a downward revision to prevent forcing many young men and young women out of school who are now attending school.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article from the New York Times of April 5, 1953, referring to the high cost of learning not only in New York, but in many other State colleges, as well.

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

AROUND THE NATION'S CAMPUSES—HIGH COST OF LEARNING

Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., will increase its tuition, room, and board by $100, beginning with the 1953–54 academic year. Yearly tuition will be $650. Scholarships will be adjusted to cover the new fee.

Wheaton College, Norton, Mass., will raise its charges for tuition, room, and board from $1,650 to $1,750. Most of the additional revenue is to be used for higher faculty and staff salaries and for increased scholarship aid.

Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., will increase its tuition from $600 to $800 for the academic year, beginning next fall. Financial aid to students will be adjusted to help able students of limited means to meet the increase.

Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass., will increase undergraduate tuition from $600 to $800. Thereafter the total charge, including room, board, tuition, and health fees will be $1,867 for students occupying single rooms in dormitories.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question only.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not a fact that aside from the great increase in costs, there is simply no place for students who want to study? In my own State there are about 10 persons who wish to go to medical school but who cannot enter regardless of the cost. Is not that a fact?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. I think the Senator finds himself in the same situation as I find myself in connection with the State of Alabama. Day after day I receive a letter from some constituent asking me to help him get his boy into a medical school. There is a serious shortage of physicians in the United States, and, although many fine, able, splendid, ambitious young men want to become physicians, there is no school for them to attend, no place for them to enter in order to prepare themselves for the practice of medicine.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator also appreciate the fact that although the shortage of medical facilities is very great, the real shortage is in basic scientists?

Mr. HILL. I so understand, and I shall speak about that at a later time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee received testimony only last Friday to the effect that in number for the first time Russian-trained scientists have surpassed those who are under training in this country.

Mr. HILL. I intended to give those very figures to the Senate.

Mr. President, we all know Mr. Roger Babson. I think he is well esteemed in all circles, whether they be conservative, safe, sane, or otherwise. He recently issued a most interesting paper with reference to the financial stress of our colleges, in which he had this to say:

To help relieve their financial stress, colleges have raised tuition costs, increased class size, trimmed faculties and raised board and room rent. The result: The old larger colleges now cost parents $2,000 per year. Add to this clothing, transportation and amusement and Dad is lucky if he gets out of it for $2,500 per year.

How many fathers can afford $2,500 per year for 4 years when the top 27 percent of our population holds 93 percent of our total net savings. This leaves the bottom 80 percent with but 7 percent of our national savings. Add to this the fact that the average annual earnings for full-time employees in the United States are around $3,250 and you begin to think that the old colleges and universities may be pricing themselves out of the market.

Should present trends continue, I am afraid that Harvard, Yale, Princeton and other famous institutions will be for only the privileged few who can afford their education, rather than for those who most deserve it. Democracy needs the best character and brains of its citizenry, irrespective of their families' wealth.

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

Mr. HILL. Yes. I want to move on, but I shall be delighted to yield to my friend from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator agree that small average earnings have contributed to the amount of illiteracy in this country, and that there is no opportunity for those who wish to attend schools?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. There is no opportunity for boys and girls to get the education which they seek.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They do not have the money.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Completely aside from the question of the necessity for preparing our young men and women to be good citizens and to earn a livelihood, we are here posed with the question of providing for the future military security of our Nation, and the crisis in our educational system is already imperiling that security.

EDUCATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

No Member of the Senate is unaware of the enormous rate of rejection of men under selective service for educational deficiencies during World War II. Seven hundred and fifty thousand men were found unfit to serve because of illiteracy or educational deficiency. That is the equivalent of 40 divisions. The figure becomes all the more startling when we consider that it is equal to almost half the total strength of the Army at the peak of mobilization and is more than all the men who fought in combat divisions in the entire Pacific area.

But that was not the only price we were to pay for the neglect of our youth. As the pace of mobilization quickened, we soon hit the bottom of our educated manpower barrel. It is significant to note that, despite the great emphasis which we as a Nation have always placed on public education, there were at the outbreak of World War II still 1½ million young men of draft age totally illiterate or barely able to read and write.

We were forced to take into the armed services some 435,000 illiterates, and at huge cost in money and previous time to undertake—

First. To teach the men to read at least at a fourth-grade level so that they would be able to comprehend bulletins, written orders and directives, and basic Army publications.

Second. To give the men sufficient language skill so that they would be able to use and understand the everyday oral and written language necessary for getting along with officers and men.

Third. To teach the men to do number work at a fourth-grade level, so that they could understand their pay accounts and laundry bills, conduct their business in the PX, and perform in other situations requiring arithmetic skill.

These handicaps that resulted from the induction of these illiterates and poorly educated is summed up for us in the following revealing remarks of the Navy's Director of Training:

1. It took approximately four times as long to train an illiterate to perform an average Navy job as it did to train one who could read.

2. A training program which did not depend on the use of printed matter would have been both difficult and expensive. Experience showed that it was simpler and more economical to teach men to read than to devise other training materials.

3. The establishment of a smooth administrative routine was greatly complicated by the presence of nonreaders. A system for the rapid handling of records was a virtual impossibility where men could not fill out information blanks, pay receipts, beneficiary forms, etc.

4. Sufficient education to read safety precautions was essential for men working with machinery, high explosives, and heavy cargoes. Serious accidents were traced directly to the inability of men to read warnings and study safety instructions.

5. A serious social barrier was found to exist between literate and illiterate personnel.

6. The administrative dualism entailed by grouping literates and illiterates together caused much confusion. Literates tended to resent the long oral directions which were given for the sake of the illiterates in their number.

7. A large number of minor disciplinary problems were direct outgrowths of misunderstandings caused by the inability to read station orders, watch bills, leave and liberty regulations, and safety precautions.

8. The inability to read and write letters constituted a serious morale problem and a consequent obstacle to satisfactory adjustments to naval life.

Thousands of the illiterate and poorly educated inductees were so deficient and

such slow learners that they could not absorb the concentrated doses of first-, second-, third,- and fourth-grade fundamentals offered in the special-training classes, and had finally to be discharged.

Gentlemen, this is a partial picture of the sad situation in which we found ourselves military manpowerwise under full mobilization.

Even under the present partial mobilization, educational deficiency has caused more rejections than all other disqualifying factors combined. In the first year following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, we saw over 300,000 men rejected for illiteracy and educational deficiency. And since that time the number has climbed much higher.

I do not know whether the Senators from Kentucky saw a recent article in the New York Times reporting that 1 out of every 3 of their fellow Kentuckians called up for military service has been turned down for illiteracy. And, incidentally, Miss Ethel Dupont, president of the Kentucky Federation of Teachers, that strongly supports the oil-for-education amendment, advises me that in the year 1953—midway of the 20th century—Kentucky still has 3,400 one-room schoolhouses.

The cold fact is that all the people in the United States are but 6 percent of the world population, and we cannot afford to neglect the education of a single person who is capable of receiving an education.

We need to increase our pool of trained manpower to the absolute maximum degree. By that, I do not mean just the provisions of enough education to enable a man to bear arms if need be. But to provide an opportunity for every American boy and girl to develop to the fullest extent of his or her capabilities.

EDUCATION AND MOBILIZATION

The plain fact is that we need more specialists of every kind—more scientists, more chemists, more physicists, more doctors, more professional and business leaders, more agriculturists, and more engineers and skilled workers. The shortage of engineers and scientists is a source of growing anxiety for defense-mobilization officials.

Defense officials have declared that to bring the United States to maximum military strength, there must be a tremendous acceleration in the training of scientists and engineers. They point out that a speedup in research and industrial technology is an integral part of the defense program and that, therefore, scientific development which normally would have been spread over a decade has had to be telescoped into less than half that time.

The Director of Defense Mobilization reports that—

> Acute shortages are continuing among highly skilled professional, scientific, and technical workers needed in defense and essential civilian industries. Under full mobilization, the lack of such workers would be critical. There are now 61 occupations on the critical list for which demand is greater than supply. The numbers now enrolled in college courses or taking other types of training are not sufficient to meet future needs.

The editors of Steelways, official organ of the American Iron and Steel Institute, put their finger on the secret of America's industrial genius when in the current issue they declared:

> One significant distinction between America and much of the rest of the world is our ever-increasing reliance on skilled manpower.
>
> Tremendously outnumbered as we are today by potential aggressors, we must continue to rely more and more on the quality rather than the quantity of our work force. We need highly skilled men in our industrial plants.

Writing on the critical manpower shortage, in the same issue of the magazine, Maj. George Fielding Eliot declared:

> Manpower is our country's most valuable asset—and one that until recently we have taken for granted.
>
> Our new military needs have complicated our manpower situation in two ways: directly, in terms of men for the service; and indirectly, in terms of workers to supply food, equipment, and arms for the fighting men.
>
> Secondary manpower demands, too, are growing. The need for workers in transportation, communications, administration, sales, public relations, and finance is steadily increasing.

Interpreting for us the meaning of these shortages in terms of what the Nation must do about it, Major Eliot declared:

> It means more education. We need more scientists. We need more engineers to translate their discoveries into processes and machines. We need more trained technicians to carry out the processes; trained operators to control the machines; trained foremen and supervisors to keep operations moving efficiently, and trained administrators to integrate the various parts of the business or factory and key it in with the economy as a whole.

The Engineering Manpower Commission of the Engineers Joint Council warned last month that industrial production and expansion, which the council said had been hampered for the past 2 years by a serious shortage of engineers and scientists, will continue to be held back this year from attaining full output of civilian and defense materials because of a serious shortages of engineers and scientists.

Voicing the same concern over the shortage of engineers, Mr. Maynard M. Boring, personnel manager of the General Electric Co. and a member of the American Society for Engineering Education, recently told an Armed Forces conference that, if the shortage in industry continues, defense contracts might have to be extended or canceled entirely.

He said that a survey group in studying demands had questioned 357 industrial companies and Government agencies and found that the country was short about 40,000 engineers. To understand this matter, to have it come right home to us, think of this: We remember that the bomber which was used for most of the bombing in World War II was the B–17. To manufacture that bomber required 350,000 engineering man-hours. Of course, every Senator knows that today we have a better bomber than even the B–36, but the B–36 requires not 350,000 enginering man-hours, but 10 times as many engineering man-hours—3,500,000.

Based on a comprehensive survey of the Nation's scientific and professional manpower resources, the National Manpower Council reports that—

> One of our most dangerous shortages may come to be a shortage of brains at the frontiers of human knowledge.

The Council found that only 1 in 4 Americans of college age have any college education, ranging from 1 in 10 for South Carolina to 1 in 2 for Utah. The principal reasons for the low utilization of college training were found to be poor high schools and a lack of finances.

I see sitting before me the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. I wish I had the time to discourse with him a little upon how times have changed since Daniel Boone took his rifle in his hands, and with cap on his head, went forth into the area now comprised in the State of Kentucky and also into sections of the Northwest. How everything has changed since then.

The same deep concern over our waste of manpower was expressed to the committee by Dr. John K. Norton, head of the department of educational administration, Columbia University, and former Chairman of the Educational Policies Commission when President Eisenhower and Dr. Conant, of Harvard, were members of the Commission. Dr. Norton declared that—

> We have about a 50 percent educational system in the products it turns out and in the support it receives today.

He continued:

> More than half of the children who enter at the first grade fail to finish high school. Perhaps even more important in terms of its effects upon our preparedness is the fact that only half of our top talent, those who get high marks in high school, who pass intelligence tests, who it is generally agreed could do college work and do it well, actually do so.
>
> We are wasting one-half of our top talent in terms of giving them substantial professional, technical or vocational training.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not the intention of the Senator from Alabama by his amendment to get, from the off-shore oil and gas, funds which could be used as scholarships for poor and able students, so that they might attend institutions of higher learning?

Mr. HILL. That would certainly be one educational deficit that might well and properly be taken care of under the amendment, namely, by devoting to educational purposes the funds received from oil.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the system of making available to deserving and able students scholarships which could be used in any qualified institution meet one of the present difficulties regarding public and private education?

Mr. HILL. Certainly. We have a fine example before us. We have the experience gained under the GI bill of rights. The objective the Senator has mentioned was accomplished under the GI bill of rights, passed by Congress.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not the purpose of the Hill amendment to make available to all 48 States of the Union, to 159 million people in the United States, upon a per capita basis, the revenues which would come from the valuable mineral resources, so that Mississippi, Arizona, New Mexico, Alabama, Illinois, California, and Massachusetts would be placed exactly on the same basis as any of the other States of the Union?

Mr. HILL. It is certainly the purpose of the authors of this amendment that every one of the 48 States shall benefit under the amendment.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Has the Senator from Alabama made an estimate of how much it would cost to provide, even in rich States like New York, as well as in poor States, for the construction of a sufficient number of schools to enable all children who are eligible to go to lower and higher schools; to enable all boys and girls who wish to go to medical schools, to go to medical schools; to enable all young men and women who are eligible mentally for advanced scientific work, to go to advanced scientific schools; and to provide for all the programs which all of us consider desirable? Has the Senator ever made an estimate of the cost to provide all those facilities which are considered desirable?

Mr. HILL. No; I have not made such an estimation, but I have what I believe to be reliable figures on the subject from reliable sources, such as the National Education Association, the New York Times, and other such agencies. The figures run into billions of dollars.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would not the Senator say that, considering the difficulty we are now having in balancing the budget, unless we get an extraordinary fund such as would be derived from these resources, it is doubtful whether these things, which are highly desirable, could be accomplished. In fact, we should be somewhat ashamed if they could not be done. Without such a fund as this, would it not be doubtful whether they could be done within a reasonable time?

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator has placed his finger on one of the most important matters facing the Senate today. Unless we take steps by this amendment to make funds available, we shall probably find that nothing adequate will be done.

While we are being reminded of our failure to capitalize half the talent of our youth, our intelligence sources tell us that Russia and her satellites have been since the end of the war—I remind Senators that that was 8 years ago—working feverishly to train large numbers of scientists, engineers, technicians, and skilled workers, instructed by highly trained teachers taken out of East Germany since the war's end.

The masters of the Kremlin know all too well that their chances in their cold war, or an all-out hot war, or in the long-range struggle for world markets, depend upon maximum efficiency in production.

The lessons of history are as clear to them as to us—or they should be clear to us—that intellectual and scientific competence, not sheer numbers of people or vast natural resources, is the key to supremacy.

We see many areas around the world where whole populations live in poverty, admidst tremendous wealth in natural resources. We see other nations that have used their limited natural resources to produce high-level economies, through education and scientific and technical development of their people.

Russia is not blind to what we have done here in this country. She is not blind to the fact that in the past we have put education and vast natural resources together to produce the highest standard of living in all the world.

What we have done for education throughout the life of our country has been a very great thing indeed. No one disputes that. We are all proud of it. But are we content to rest on our laurels? Have we begun to falter? The facts show that we have. We all know it, or should know it, but apparently are afraid to admit it, even to ourselves.

Whether Russia knows it or not, her propaganda mills cover the earth with streams of propaganda telling of across-the-board educational advancement and educational opportunities in her own country, and the lack of them in non-Communist nations, including our own.

Let me read from one of Russia's propaganda pieces—the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin, published right here in the United States:

> Workers in plants and factories in the Soviet Union are given every opportunity to advance themselves to better jobs and higher skills through plant institutes, night schools, or correspondence courses.
>
> The institute gives employee-students the equivalent of a complete technical-college education. The capitalist countries, whose governments, while expending huge sums on the preparation of new wars, at the same time allocate miserly sums for public education.

Doubtless the extent of the Red educational effort is subject to the usual discounting, but Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, has warned the House Appropriations Committee that Russia is outstripping us in the training of scientists and engineers. Dr. Waterman told the committee that—

> In the year 1955 the estimate is that 50,000 engineering graduates will be produced in the Soviet Union, compared to some 17,000 in the United States. A similar situation exists in the United States with respect to the production of trained scientists of all types.

Dr. Waterman told the committee that—

> Our output of young scientists and engineers is now dropping to nearly one-third of the output in 1950, at a time when our research and development effort has approximately trebled.

The appalling waste of our human resources because of poor education or none at all is graphically pictured in a current progress report of Columbia University's great research project known as The Conservation of Human Resources. Motivated by his wartime experience with manpower wastage in World War II, President Eisenhower initiated the project shortly after he became president of Columbia University.

The current report is based on an exhaustive study of the poorly educated in military and civilian life.

Let me read from the report:

> From the viewpoint of public policy, one general conclusion is unmistakable. If the United States wants to strengthen its military arm, if it desires to contribute to the heightened productivity of the economy, if it wants to buttress the foundations of American democracy, then it is incumbent upon the country to work for the eradication of illiteracy among the population. Its major attack must be directed toward the source which means the strengthening of elementary education, particularly in the poorer States.

The report then makes this observation:

> There runs throughout our history evidence of the conviction that a man should have access to education so that he could develop his potentialities to the full. We did much to establish and expand an educational system from kindergarten to professional training, supported by public funds and available to all. But we saw no special urgency to train our human resources potential as quickly and as completely as possible. With enough people available most of the time to meet most of the needs of agriculture and industry, the rate of progress in expanding our educational and training facilities appeared unimportant.

The report concludes with this serious challenge to the Nation:

> Only recently have we seen the problem for what it is. In the struggle in which the United States and the other free nations are currently engaged to maintain their way of life, our strength lies in the quality of our human resources—in the competence, imagination and dedication of the population—not in sheer numbers. We can no longer ignore the wastage of our human resources which results either from our failure to develop all latent potentials to the full or our failure to utilize them fully after they have been developed. For the welfare and security of the United States, in fact of the free world, have come to depend upon granting every individual citizen the opportunity for the full development and utilization of his human potentialities.

Despite the record amount spent for schools this year, in terms of 1952 dollars, the percentage of national income that goes for public elementary and secondary schools is considerably lower than it was 20 years ago.

Although the mounting expense of running the public school system is criticized in some quarters, education does not get so much of the national income as do some of the luxury items.

It is interesting to note that in 1951 we spent $6¾ billion for public schools. In the same year of 1951 we spent $8 billion for alcoholic beverages; almost $5 billion for tobacco, $11 billion for amusements and recreation—almost four times as much for luxuries as we did for education.

Can we honestly say our pride in education, our respect for the teaching profession, our concern for our children, our zeal to preserve our freedom are all we claim?

VIII. THE HISTORIC PRECEDENT FOR THE OIL-FOR-EDUCATION AMENDMENT

Mr. President, I now turn to a discussion of our oil-for-education amendment and the historic precedent which it follows. While it, like other legislation, is not a panacea, it will go far toward curing the financial crisis in today's education without placing a further burden on the back of the taxpayer. I should like to answer some of the questions on the purpose of this amendment which have been raised by other Senators and by educators, parents, teachers, and citizens in every State in the Union.

I want to emphasize that the oil-for-education amendment proposes no new departure into uncharted seas. It is simply a continuation of one of our oldest and wisest national policies—the use of public lands and the revenues therefrom for educational purposes, for the benefit of the whole Nation.

From earliest beginnings in colonial times, many of the Colonies earmarked public lands for the establishment and support of schools. The earliest case was in Virginia in 1618. Colleges started with the aid of land grants in the various Colonies include Harvard in Massachusetts, William and Mary in Virginia, Yale in Connecticut, Princeton in New Jersey, and others in South Carolina and Georgia.

After the American Revolution, we were faced with a situation which was similar in some respects to the present demands of the three coastal States for the national property in the submerged lands lying beyond the low-tide mark. Individual States laid claim to the territories west of the Appalachians. But Congress wisely withstood these claims of the few and, in 1780, passed a resolution containing a pledge that these western lands would be disposed of for the benefit of all the people.

In 1785 and 1787, ordinances were passed by the Congress which specifically set aside every sixteenth section of the public lands west of the mountains for the establishment and maintenance of schools. In speaking of the ordinance of 1787, Daniel Webster declared:

> I doubt whether one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked and lasting character than the ordinance of 1787 * * * it set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty of the Government to support schools and advance the means of education.

In certain contracts for the sale of public lands in 1787 and 1788, the Congress again designated lands to be used for the establishment and support of schools and universities.

In 1802, the Congress took action in continuation of the national policy of support for education initiated 17 years earlier. With the admission of Ohio to the Union in that year, the Congress set aside lands in townships for school support. As other States formed from the public domain were admitted, the land grants for schools were continued. New States as well as old States received lands for the endowment of universities. Many of our great State universities like the University of Alabama, were started with the aid of such handsome grants of public lands.

It is interesting to note in that connection that in those public lands lay rich coal and iron ore deposits. So those lands have turned out to be perhaps even more beneficial to the State university than the Federal Government realized at the time the lands were being granted.

In 1848 the land grants to new States for school purposes were increased to 2 sections in each township, and in 1896 the grants were increased to 4 sections in each township.

Congress also made other grants of land, such as saline and swamp land, for various purposes, including education. States were permitted and, in some cases directed, to use for schools a part or all of the funds derived from these grants.

All of these actions by Congress clearly reflected the declared policy that the public lands were a public trust to be used in the national interest.

The schools that were established benefited not alone the States in which they were located but the whole Nation as well.

Furthermore, the funds derived from the sale of public lands by the National Government went into the general funds of the Treasury and served the whole population. In the early days such revenues constituted a large part of the income of the National Government. In further support of the view that revenues from public lands were common treasure the Congress in 1837 distributed among all the States over $28 million of surplus funds in the Treasury. The surplus was largely derived from land sales. The States utilized a considerable portion of the money for schools.

In 1841 the Congress passed an internal improvement act and provided for the distribution of the proceeds from the sale of public lands among the several States and Territories. Here again portions of the money were used for schools.

THE MORRILL ACT AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

In 1862 Congress passed the historic Morrill Land Grant College Act, signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln, granting to each State 30,000 acres of land or land scrip for each Senator or Representative in Congress to which the State was entitled for the establishment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agricultural and mechanic arts. Every State in the Union has shared in these grants.

I do not have to remind the Senate of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act. It is interesting to remember that when that act was first passed it was vetoed by the then President of the United States, President Buchanan. However, when it was passed the second time there was a far wiser President sitting in the White House, who knew of the struggle and the hardship of trying to get an education. He signed the Morrill Act, and it became law. Every State in the Union has its land-grant college which was established by that act. We need look only to Cornell University in New York, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Massachusetts, the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, and other schools in every State of the Union.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. In the opinion of the Senator from Alabama, have those land-grant colleges in any way jeopardized the right of any State to maintain and control the educational policy of the State?

Mr. HILL. I am very glad the Senator from Oregon has asked that question, because the record is without a blemish. The record is that the Federal Government has not in any way whatever attempted to interfere with, or in any way tried to control, or in any way to dab in, as we might say, in the administration of the land-grant colleges. The full authority, the full jurisdiction, the full control, and the full administration of those colleges has always been in the States.

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

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with me that as the result of the passage of the Morrill Act, we have been able to give scientific training and educational training to large numbers of scientists, physicists, chemists, and engineers, as well as in the whole gamut of sciences, which we would not have been able to do if the act had not been passed, and that many thousands of boys and girls would not have had such education made available to them otherwise, and therefore could not have gone to college?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oregon is right. Many thousands of boys and girls were afforded an opportunity to go to college by the establishment of the land-grant colleges. They would not have been able to go to college but for the wise action of Congress in passing the Morrill Land-Grant Act, providing for the establishment of land-grant colleges.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with me that we must stay ahead of Russia in the training of American brain power because we cannot stay ahead of her so far as the quantity of manpower is concerned?

Mr. HILL. I brought out a few moments ago that the entire population of the United States—and we think of it as being a large population—is only 6 percent of the world's population. The great resources of manpower, as we know, are outside the United States, and much of that manpower is under the dominion and control of Communist Russia.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Oregon for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Alabama agree that there can be no question about the fact that if the Hill amendment should become the law of the land the funds which would be available under it would result in the training, in the high schools and colleges, of many thousands of American boys in the decades immediately ahead, the training of whom would be of great help to the defense of our country, to its economic welfare, to its culture, and to its general health?

Mr. HILL. The Senator confirms and ratifies by his question what the Senator from Alabama has been trying to say. The Senator from Alabama sought to bring out the cost of sending a boy or girl to college today, and how that cost is prohibitive to what might be called the average full-time employee, so far as sending his boy or girl to college is concerned. The Senator from Alabama quoted from the statement of Dr. Waterman, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and from other scientists and scientific institutions as to the shortage of engineers, scientists, and trained technicians, indicating how we are failing to meet the demands for the defense of our country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a final question?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with me that one of the primary reasons for the little band of liberals—at the head of whom is the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], as our leaders in the opposition to the joint resolution—fighting the joint resolution and urging a prolonged debate for some time yet in the future is because we want the American people to have the time to understand the relationship between the joint resolution and their own welfare in the natural resources of the country, of which the oil reserve is only a part?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. President, the land-grant colleges are an integral part of the public higher educational system in the South and West. It is possible that easterners have too easily forgotten that land-grant support from the Federal Government is also given to their most prized educational institutions. Do we not recall, for example, that the great Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Mass., which this Nation has long regarded as a pinnacle of engineering and scientific teaching and to which Washington turns when we need scientists to lead our scientific defense effort, is a beneficiary under the Morrill Act?

And the people of New York well know that Cornell University at Ithaca, where my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] once taught and which is a pioneer of scientific agriculture in this country, is a land-grant college receiving aid from the Federal Government through the Morrill Act.

After the land-grant colleges had become fairly well established throughout the Nation with the assistance provided by the land grants under the Morrill Act, many of the States experience difficulty in supporting these colleges. In a number of subsequent acts, Congress provided for the further endowment, support, and extension of the services of these institutions with funds derived from public lands.

Among these were the Hatch Act of 1887 for the establishment and support of agricultural experiment stations at land-grant colleges and the second Morrill Act of 1890 for the permanent endowment and support of land-grant colleges.

The Homestead Act of 1900 provided that in case the annual sales of public lands were not sufficient to cover the Federal payments to the land-grant colleges and experiment stations, the deficiency should be made up from other Federal funds.

THE ENDOWMENT MAGNIFICENT

Benefits accruing to the Nation from this fruitful and farsighted policy of educational endowment have been great beyond measure. The grant of 175 million acres for primary, secondary, and higher education has been called the endowment magnificent.

Indeed, it has given us the intellectual and scientific competence by which our Nation solves its productive problems to a degree never approached by any other nation.

Dr. Norton, of Columbia University, told the committee that the land grants constituted "the greatest gift to the development of education in the history of the whole world." This statement by one of the Nation's foremost authorities on education, who served as Chairman of the Educational Policies Commission when President Eisenhower and Dr. Conant, of Harvard, were members, was followed by his estimate that enactment of legislation of the type proposed by the oil-for-education amendment would represent an exhibition of statesmanship equivalent to what was done in 1785, 1787, 1862, and the other great landmarks in the leadership of the Federal Government in developing education in this country.

ADOPT OIL-FOR-EDUCATION AMENDMENT

We do not suggest that the oil-for-education proposal will prove a cure-all for every ill and every need that vexes our educational institutions, but we do feel that the revenues which will eventuate from the development of these resources can contribute importantly to meeting the needs—to giving to our 50-percent school system a degree of perfection hitherto undreamed of.

Here is a windfall for easing the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools, for providing more and better-paid and better-trained teachers, and for building desperately needed classrooms.

Here is a bonanza for relieving the agonizing difficulties of colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools, technological schools, and research institutions with scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. The possibilities challenge the imagination.

Let us recall the words of that great Frenchman, L'Enfant, whose genius turned a swamp into the most beautiful of all American cities—the city of Washington. We remember that he said, "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood."

The use of public-lands resources set us on the road to realizing the dream of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, and other statesmen of our early history of a great system for the dissemination of knowledge such as we have today. The challenge to this generation and to this Congress is that we have the wisdom to use similar resources to give to that system the high standards of quality that our Founding Fathers envisioned.

Let us not be less wise and foresighted than those early statesmen who seized similar opportunities to dedicate great national resources for education to the benefit of our country and of succeeding generations, including our own.

If there are among us any who are disposed to take our educational system for granted, I would remind them of the vision of that great educator and theologian, Bishop George Washington Doane, who in 1838—over a hundred years ago, when our American system of free education was but a dream—gave us this stirring challenge:

> Look to your schoolhouses. See that they are convenient of access, that they are comfortable, that they are neat and tasteful.
>
> Look to the teachers. See that they are taught themselves and apt to teach—men that fear God and love their country. See that they are well accommodated, well treated, well remunerated. Respect them and they will respect themselves, and your children will respect them.
>
> Look well to the scholars. Remember you are to grow old among them. Remember you are to die and leave your country in their hands.

All of us shall pass.

But here we have a magnificent opportunity to carry on the great American tradition of providing for the education of our children, of strengthening the wellsprings of our democracy, of following the policy established by the Founding Fathers, of dedicating great natural resources for the development of our precious human resources, the children of the Nation.

Yet, Mr. President, instead of agreeing to this amendment, we are faced with a proposal to lay the amendment on the table. It is proposed to follow an extraordinary and most unusual procedure for the Senate, namely, to put an end to debate on the amendment and to kill it by laying it on the table.

I wonder whether some Senators who are opposed to limitation of debate realize what a motion to lay on the table means and the precedent it sets and the door it opens and what may be the consequences if it is followed to its logical conclusion. Once we begin to indulge in motions to lay on the table, then, in effect, we are doing what another body does when it adopts the previous question. In short, then we are putting an end to debate, we are cutting off speeches, we are requiring an immediate vote. I know of no better way to impose cloture than by means of a motion to lay on the table. I know of no way that will bring a vote more immediately or will put an end to debate more immediately or will stop all speeches more immediately than a motion to lay on the table. In short, a motion to lay on the table is a cloture procedure.

So when Senators vote on the motion to lay on the table, I hope they will fully realize what they are doing. I hope they will realize that when a bill was under consideration on the floor, if the majority saw fit to do so, a motion could

be made to lay on the table each amendment and each motion which might be offered in connection with the bill; and in that way the minority could be stifled, and would not have an opportunity to debate or to speak or to be heard, and the proposed legislation would be rammed through without debate and without speeches.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it was a week ago that I gave full notice. So the minority has had an entire week to debate the Hill amendment. Is not that true?

Mr. HILL. It makes no difference when the Senator from Ohio gave notice. The fact is that a motion to lay on the table is a motion of cloture, a motion that ends debate, a motion that puts a padlock on the mouths of Senators. Such a motion means that Senators no longer can speak or be heard; such a motion is a motion of cloture.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator from Alabama agree with me that if we could obtain a vote on the Hill amendment, on its merits, there would be a much larger vote for the Hill amendment than would be reflected in a vote to lay the amendment on the table?

Mr. HILL. I agree with my friend. At this time I ask the majority leader to give us an opportunity to vote on the amendment for oil for education. This amendment bears the names of 23 Members of the Senate, who are its sponsors. In other words, there are 23 authors of the amendment in the Senate. The amendment has the support of some 40 great organizations, including farm organizations, educational organizations, labor organizations. All kinds of organizations support the amendment.

So I appeal to the Senator from Ohio to let us have a straight vote—a vote of either "yes" or "no" —on this amendment. If my friend, the Senator from Ohio, will agree to that, I will sit down now, and will let the vote on the amendment be taken.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I may point out to the Senator from Alabama that at any time during the last 4 weeks, whenever the Senator from Alabama and his friends chose to stop talking, there would have been a vote on the Hill amendment, if the Senator from Alabama had wanted it.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further to me?

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. TAFT. The present proposal is to attach the Hill amendment to the Anderson amendment in the nature of a substitute. I do not think any Member of the Senate thinks the Anderson substitute amendment will be adopted by the Senate; there does not seem to be a chance in the world that it will be adopted by the Senate.

Therefore, the present undertaking in connection with the Hill amendment is a purely futile gesture; it accomplishes nothing.

If we come to the question of the Continental Shelf, and at that time if the Senator from Alabama wishes to submit a bona fide amendment, calling for the use for educational purposes of some of the funds coming from the resources in the Continental Shelf, that will be different. I myself have been in favor of Federal aid to education.

On the other hand, in the present case the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] can agree to accept the Hill amendment as a modification of his amendment in the nature of a substitute or he can refuse to do so. I do not care what happens to the Hill amendment, because I know it is a completely futile gesture.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have been associated with my good friend, the Senator from Ohio, in our battles for Federal aid to education. At this time I am appealing to him, on the basis of his past record in favor of Federal aid to education, to give us an opportunity to vote this amendment either up or down. If the Senator from Ohio will agree to have that done, I will sit down at once, and the clerk can begin the call of the roll, so that we may vote on this amendment for Federal aid to education.

Will the Senator from Ohio agree to let us vote on the amendment?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with me that if this amendment is such a futile amendment, as the majority leader has said, then it is impossible to imagine any reason at all why the majority leader should not wish to let us proceed to vote on the merits of the amendment, and thus let Senators be counted "yes" or "no" on the amendment?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oregon is entirely correct. If this amendment be a futile one, if it be a gesture, why are Senators afraid to meet the issure squarely? Are they afraid of this amendment? Dare they not face the question? Dare they not meet the test presented by this amendment?

How easy it will be to let the clerk call the roll on the question of agreeing to the amendment. Are there Senators who dare not meet the test? Are they afraid of it?

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield first to my friend, the Senator from New York, who was first on his feet. Thereafter, I shall yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the Hill amendment is offered as an appendage to the Anderson substitute, or as an amendment to it?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Under those circumstances, how can the Senate, even as a matter of parliamentary procedure, shortcircuit the Hill amendment? Does not the Senate have to vote on the Hill amendment before it votes on the other amendment?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York knows that the regular procedure in the Senate would be to vote on the pending amendment, which in this case is the education amendment. That is the regular procedure. Not to vote on the amendment would be to follow an unusual, an extraordinary, and an almost unprecedented procedure, at least during the 15 years I have been a Member of the Senate.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that during the debate we have been told that we have to speak on the pending Hill amendment, and that we could not speak more than twice on it?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. No Senator has spoken on the other amendments. [Laughter.]

Senators have proceeded in the belief and the certainty that the Hill amendment would be voted on first, in accordance with the customary procedure. I ask the Senator from Alabama if my understanding is not absolutely correct.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York is entirely correct. No Senator has had a chance to speak on the Anderson amendment.

Mr. President, I see my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], sitting in the Chamber. If the distinguished majority leader will give us an opportunity to vote on the pending Hill amendment, I think there will be no disposition on the part of the Senator from New Mexico to delay a vote on the Anderson substitute amendment. Is that correct? I think it is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from California, to whom I certainly wish to extend every courtesy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama, in view of the statement he has just made, in a plea for a vote on the so-called Hill amendment, and for a vote on the Anderson substitute, whether he is prepared immediately to permit a vote on the submerged-lands joint resolution on the same day when we get a vote on those amendments?

Mr. HILL. No; I would not think the Senate would be prepared to do that, in view of the fact that other Senators have amendments to offer. The distinguished Senator from Florida has an amendment, I understand. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has an amendment. There are other amendments. I may say I am prepared to go ahead to consider the amendments in any logical, reasonable, and fair way.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from California, for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would not the distinguished Senator from Alabama admit that the purpose of the filibuster, in and of itself, is to prevent a majority of the Senate from expressing itself on a matter of public policy? We have now had 5 weeks of discussion on the submerged-lands measure, and all we are asking is to have the Senate given an opportunity to vote on it. Is not the distinguished Senator from Alabama depriving the Senate of an opportunity to so vote?

Mr. HILL. No, not at all, Mr. President. On the contrary, I am standing on the floor of the Senate begging the Senator from Ohio and his associates, including my good friend, the Senator from California, to allow us to vote now on the pending amendment, and as soon as that amendment is disposed of, the question will come immediately on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from New Mexico. I think I can assure the Senate there will be no effort on this side to delay a vote on the Anderson substitute. What I am pleading for is that we may vote on the pending amendment.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan, for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that there could have been a vote on the pending amendment an hour ago?

Mr. HILL. No. We might have had a vote, but certainly there would have been a quorum call. Senators would have had to come to the Senate floor. My distinguished friend, the majority leader, advised Senators the vote would come at 3 o'clock. In view of that advice and that notice, I doubt whether the Senate would have felt that it could vote an hour or so earlier than 3 o'clock. Undoubtedly there are Senators who have not been present, but who have been attending to important business elsewhere. They were relying upon the notice that the vote would come at approximately 3 o'clock. I therefore question whether we could have had a vote an hour ago.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that, had the Senator quit talking, we could have voted Saturday? [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. No. Theoretically, it might have been possible to vote on Saturday, but I say again that the distinguished majority leader, for the purpose of accommodating all Senators, announced that the vote would come this afternoon about 3 o'clock. That was notice to Members of the Senate, and such notices are given time and time again with reference to anticipated votes. The purpose of the notice was to enable Senators who were busy with other matters, who had business to attend to more compelling, as they saw it, than remaining on the Senate floor, might attend to those other matters. Under those circumstances, the Senator from Alabama would not be disposed to vote other than in accordance with the notice previously given by the distinguished majority leader.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there not always one way of getting a vote in the Senate; namely, by ceasing to talk? When Senators quit talking, they vote.

Mr. HILL. I have said—and I say again, again, and again [laughter]—that I will quit talking now if my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Ohio, will allow us to vote on the pending amendment. I have been merely taking an extra minute or two in which to appeal to him to allow us to vote on the amendment.

Mr. President, Napoleon Bonaparte, speaking of Marshal Ney, said:

> Every time I see him, I feel braver.

Every since I have known the Senator from Ohio, I have felt that he was always willing to meet an issue, that he was always willing to stand up and face a question squarely. All I am asking now is that the roll be called on the pending educational amendment, so that Senators may be given an opportunity to face the issue, to measure up to the question. That is all we are asking.

As I have said before, I am unable to think that there are Members of this distinguished body who have any qualms or fears, and who dare not vote directly and immediately on the pending question. As the Senator from Illinois suggests, it must be voted on. Surely, if the procedure suggested by the Senator from Ohio is followed, there will be a vote, and it will be a test. It will be a test as to whether we are going to give away the property involved in the pending measure, property which the Supreme Court, in 3 decisions, has held to be the property of all the people. The question is whether, as trustees, the Federal Government is to use the property for the benefit of all the people, or whether we, in our role as trustees of the people, are to give away the property. That is the issue. That will be the issue when the vote is taken on the Anderson substitute.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Florida, for a question only.

Mr. HOLLAND. A provision of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Alabama reads as follows:

> During the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide, the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine.

Is it not true that under that provision of his amendment there is no assurance at all as to when any money will ever be available for schools?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not a fact there would be no assurance as to when it would be available?

Mr. HILL. No. The Senator has evidently forgotten his history. He knows that we are at war today. We are at war in Korea with Communist China and with North Korea. The Senator knows that we entertain the hope, at least, that that war will end soon. When it ends, that will be the end of the present emergency. I am sure there is no Senator who would not concede that, when we are at war, every resource must be applied first to the defense of our country. That is the story.

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

Mr. HILL. I may say I do not mind yielding to the Senator from Florida, but I told him, and I also told the distinguished majority leader, that I was not going to try to prevent a vote. I did not mean to include the answering of questions. I merely want the Senator to know, in a way, that this affects his time, not mine.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Having in mind the fact that the revenues from offshore oil and gas deposits in 2 of the 3 States are now going to the schools of those States, is it not true that, if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama became applicable, it would really have the effect of taking money away from the schools and applying it to other things?

Mr. HILL. No. We know that the great bulk of the money which is going to the schools in the States that are using the funds for the schools is coming from the oil obtained from the uplands, from the dry lands, and is not coming from the submerged lands at all. We also know that what we are asking is only that each State shall have its fair share—that the State of Florida shall have its fair share; that Texas shall have its fair share; that Louisiana shall have its fair share; that California shall have its fair share; and that all the other States shall receive their fair shares.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Florida, for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Having in mind the fact that the Congress of the United States has previously refused to pass a measure for Federal aid to education, because of the arguments about States' control of education, about the participation of religious and private schools in the distribution, about segregation, and other kindred subjects, is the Senator prepared to say that there is any better chance of passing a bill for Federal aid to education now, or at any foreseeable time in the future, than there has been in the past, since we know that previous efforts have failed completely?

Mr. HILL. Again, Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has forgotten his history. It is well known that within the past few years the Senate, by overwhelming votes, has passed two bills for Federal aid to education. The fact that those bills may have encountered certain delays or troubles in the House should not deter us from doing our duty, and should not deter us from doing all we can to correct the deplorable and tragic situation which is facing our schools and facing the education of the youth of America today. So, Mr. President, I make my final appeal to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio, that he allow us to vote now on the pending amendment. Let us face the issue; let us meet the test. Never

let it be indicated, never let it be intimated, that there are those who are afraid to face the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand that if the majority leader does not accede to the Senator's request, we shall be denied the privilege of voting on the so-called Hill amendment?

Mr. HILL. We shall have no opportunity to vote on the Hill amendment. The Hill amendment will be lumped in with the Anderson substitute. Although I favor the Anderson proposal, it contains many things which are not contained in the so-called Hill amendment.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator know that there have been literally thousands of resolutions, petitions, and communications received from parent-teacher associations, city councils, farm bureau organizations, farmers union groups, and other groups, asking for a vote on the Hill amendment?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. I tried to say that there are many great national organizations, such as farmers organizations, educational organizations, labor organizations, and other organizations of all kinds asking the Senate, appealing to the Senate, to vote on the Hill amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the majority leader has said he thought that when we voted upon the Anderson amendment it would be defeated; in other words, that it would be buried in an early grave?

Mr. HILL. I am aware of that fact; and I have said before—and I want to reiterate—that if we can have a vote now on the pending amendment there will be no disposition on the part of anyone who favors the Anderson amendment to delay a vote on that amendment.

We can call the roll on the Hill amendment, and as soon as the result is announced, we can proceed to vote on the Anderson amendment, and thereby demonstrate to the country that we are facing these questions, and then and there we shall escape the proposition of imposing cloture on the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that not only does the majority leader wish to put the Anderson amendment in its legislative grave, but he also wishes to put the Hill amendment in its legislative grave, and also in the same coffin—2 burials in 1 coffin?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. I am glad he asked the question because I have a very deep affection and a tremendous regard for the Senator from New Mexico, but, if I am to be buried, I am entitled to my own little 6 feet of ground.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question. But, first, let me say, what are we going to do on resurrection day? The Senator and I will be in such a hurry to come out of that coffin that we might have a collision. Surely I am entitled to my own little plot. If the Senate votes to kill the amendment and to bury me with the amendment, surely this one last request is a reasonable one and should be granted—that I may have my little 6 feet of ground.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama this question: Is my recollection correct that the Senator from Alabama made the statement that he does not recall, in his 16 years of service in the Senate, a single instance in which an amendment to a bill or a substitute bill which had not been accepted by the author of the bill was laid aside without a vote?

Mr. HILL. I know of no instance of a Senator being required to be buried in the same grave with another Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the very able majority leader advocates using the guillotine by a motion to lay on the table, is not the Senator from Alabama doing him the favor of permitting him to use the guillotine twice, once on the Hill amendment and then on the Anderson amendment?

Mr. HILL. He would have an opportunity to use it twice, if he wanted to resort to the use of the guillotine. But I have appealed to the Senator to let us have a vote on the Hill amendment and then a vote on the Anderson substitute, because, as I have said, I want to give solemn warning today to Senators that a motion to lay on the table is cloture, and it may well come back to plague and haunt those who become a party to it by voting for such a motion.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator from Delaware must decide whether he wants to be buried with the Senator from Alabama, and therefore he would like to pose this question: The Senator from Alabama stated that this body had on one or two previous occasions voted Federal aid to education in one manner or another, and that it did not get past the other body and was not sent to the President, and therefore did not become law. I ask the Senator from Alabama if he would object to the same stipulation on the Federal-aid-to-education amendment as was contained in the bill that passed this body?

Mr. HILL. I would not object, but we are not trying by amendment to write out the stipulations and the details. The funds would be applied to education in all the 48 States, including Delaware, and then Congress would pass a law setting forth the provisions and the stipulations for the disbursement of the funds in the various States.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. FREAR. Would the Senator be willing, if there were any funds available by reason of his amendment, to permit the States to expend the money after the Federal Government had granted it?

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my friend that if he had studied the Federal-aid-to-education bills a little bit he would know that the bills which the Senate has twice passed and to which I have referred earlier in my remarks were like those which were passed beginning away back in the time of the Continental Congress. In each and every one of the bills the entire jurisdiction, the full control, and the full administration of the funds were left in the hands of the States. The two Federal-aid bills which the Senate passed only recently used the strongest kind of language to insure that the States would have full and complete control, jurisdiction, and administration over the funds.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator now contend that his amendment to the Anderson proposal so provides?

Mr. HILL. I do not make that contention, because I have stated that all the amendment does is to dedicate the funds to education, and then Congress will have to act further. It will have to pass a bill. I think the Senator knows from past experience that the Congress will adhere to the policy which has been established for more than 175 years, of giving the funds to the States to be expended entirely under the jurisdiction, the authority, and the administration of the States.

Mr. FREAR. Then, is it the opinion of the Senator from Alabama that there will be attached to any Federal aid to States for educational purposes a provision that the State boards of education will have full and complete control of any Federal moneys expended?

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator that I would fight to the bitter end to give to the States what they have always been given in all past legislation. If the Senator had found it possible to be here—I understand that he has been busy on other important matters—he would have heard me cite many acts of Congress. In all those acts, the full administration and control of funds were placed in the hands of the States. The Senator from Alabama would fight to the bitter end——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have been most lenient toward the Senator from Alabama. On condition that I would not seek to obtain the floor at the beginning of today's session, it was agreed that I should have the floor at half past two. I have now sat by for a half hour, partly because my friends were questioning the Senator from Alabama, and partly be-

cause his friends were questioning the Senator.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Ohio has been most courteous, in that he has given me a reprieve of 30 minutes. I wish to thank him and tell him how much I appreciate his extending me that courtesy. Of course, we all know that what has delayed the Senator from Alabama has not been his own remarks, but the fact that so many other Senators have seen fit to ask questions. The Senator from Ohio knows that I wish to be courteous and considerate to my fellow Senators.

As the Senator from Ohio will recall, some of the questions came from the distinguished author of the Holland joint resolution.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. In the Hill amendment we really decide that this money shall be devoted to education; is not that correct? We do not make determination whether it should be used to build schools, or to supplement the salaries of teachers, or decide in exactly what method the funds shall be distributed.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. All that is provided in the amendment is that the funds shall be devoted to education. Then the question would be left to future acts of Congress, and the wisdom, good sense, and judgment of Congress, as to how to make disbursements of the funds.

As I have said time and again, there are all kinds of precedents for such action. The law has been well established over a period of 175 years, that such funds shall go to the States without any Federal strings tied to them, to be spent by the States under the full control, authority, jurisdiction, and administration of the States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota wishes to make a parliamentary inquiry. Ordinarily, any Senator may address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

I should like to submit a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be necessary for the Senator from Alabama to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota may be permitted to make a parliamentary inquiry? Would the Senator from Alabama have to ask unanimous consent that that may be done? The Senator from Minnesota desires to make a parliamentary inquiry, and I do not desire to cut him off from doing so. However, the only way in which I could accede to his request would be either to yield the floor or to ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to propound his parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama to yield to the Senator from Minnesota for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Minnesota to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TAFT. No; I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My parliamentary inquiry is very simple. Will the Chair please state what is pending before the Senate? In other words, what amendment is it the Senate is to vote upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At this time the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama, commonly called the Hill amendment, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it the understanding of the Presiding Officer that the question before the Senate, to which we shall direct our attention, and upon which we shall cast our votes, is singularly and solely the Hill amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the present time, that is the case. Of course, a motion to table may be directed against the Hill amendment or against the Anderson substitute, depending upon the desire of the Senator making the motion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Presiding Officer permit me a further inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, as matters now stand, the question before the Senate for the purpose of decision or vote is the Hill amendment, and solely the Hill amendment, without any other amendment or encumbrances?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If a vote were to be taken at this time, the vote would be upon the Hill amendment to the Anderson substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the regular procedure of the United States Senate would be to proceed to vote on the Hill amendment. I am appealing once more to the distinguished majority leader to let us meet the issue, face the question, and vote upon the Hill amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it was last Monday that I gave notice that on last Tuesday I would make a motion to lay the Anderson amendment on the table. At any time since then the distinguished Senator from Alabama could have had a vote on the Hill amendment, if he and other Senators had stopped talking. They have chosen, by deliberate filibuster, to prevent the Senate from voting, although they had the power, if they had liked, to decide what we should vote on first and what we should vote on second. Now they have chosen the other course. They have chosen the course of demanding that there shall be no vote at all, and have refused today to agree to any date upon which this joint resolution may be voted upon.

Consequently, under the procedure of the Senate, it is for the mover of a motion to lay on the table to determine which vote shall be taken first. It seems to be perfectly clear that the only reason for proceeding to vote on the Anderson amendment is that it is the substantial issue before the Senate. The Hill amendment is a side issue. What would we gain by voting on the Hill amendment? If after a vote on the Hill amendment, we lay the Anderson amendment on the table, the Hill amendment, whatever vote might be cast for it, even if we adopted it, is gone. If we decide not to lay the Anderson amendment on the table, the Hill amendment is still before the Senate, and we can vote on the Hill amendment.

So far as the great issue before the Senate is concerned, the Hill amendment is merely a side issue.

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

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that, at best, the Hill amendment is merely a gesture.

I have favored Federal aid to education. I have favored bills which would have provided Federal aid to education. I have supported them in their passage through the Senate. It requires a very complete, technical study to determine the form such aid should take in order to protect the States against Federal interference.

The Hill amendment, if Senators will read it, provides that:

> During the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide—

Leaving the matter entirely up to Congress—

> the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

Whether Senators favor Federal aid to education or do not, the whole question will be determined when we come to consider whether we want to give Federal aid to education. Do we want to determine that question in a prior bill, a bill which does not provide for 1 cent of Federal aid to education for all time to come? Congress need not provide that this money go to education. Under the terms of the Hill amendment, it is clearly stated that such funds shall first be given to "such urgent developments essential to the national defense."

In my opinion, for many years we shall be spending many more billions of dollars for national defense than we could possibly derive from the submerged lands, or probably from taxes which could be collected from the people of the United States.

So, as I have said, the Hill amendment is merely a gesture. If Senators would like to vote in favor of education—and I am in favor of education—I do not regard the question as in any sense a basic matter as affecting the Anderson amendment.

I am interested in the fact that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has refused to accept the Hill amendment as an amendment to his bill. This morning I offered him an opportunity to permit that to be done. He could have done so anyway without my permission. Therefore, I refused to regard the Hill amendment as a serious issue. Certainly, at this late date, it is not an issue, and it seems to me it has

no entitlement to priority after the proponents of the amendment have refused to stop talking and have refused to permit the Senate to vote, even on the Hill amendment. We could have voted at any time during the past 3 weeks, if the advocates of the amendment had been in good faith in trying to secure a vote on the Hill amendment as soon as possible.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me 10 minutes before he makes his motion to lay on the table?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the joint resolution itself briefly. However, before I do so, I have agreed to yield not to exceed 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico because he, like myself, was delayed by the brilliant oratory of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. It was understood that he was to have 10 minutes after the distinguished Senator from Alabama concluded.

I ask unanimous consent that, without losing the floor, I may yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who wishes to say a few words in behalf of his amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Minnesota wants to know what the regular order is. Are we about to vote on the Hill amendment, or are we to be sidetracked to the Anderson amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my intention is, as soon as I have completed what I have to say, to move to lay on the table the Anderson substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Still reserving the right to object, what will happen to the Hill amendment, which is the pending question?

Mr. TAFT. The Hill amendment would be carried with the Anderson amendment to the table, since it is an amendment to the Anderson amendment. If the Anderson amendment is tabled, it will carry with it the Hill amendment, because obviously we cannot have an amendment to nothing.

However, the Hill amendment could then be offered to the joint resolution itself. It could be offered to the measure which deals with the Federal money from the Continental Shelf, money which everyone admits is Federal money. The Hill amendment can be offered to provide that the money coming from the Continental Shelf to the Federal Government shall be used for aid to education. The Senator is entirely free to reoffer his amendment in any manner he sees fit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Still reserving the right to object, does not the procedure of the Senate call for the regular order with respect to amendments? Is there any power on the part of the Presiding Officer or the majority leader to set aside the pending question, and thereby to call up, according to his personal preference, some particular amendment which he may want to bring up at a particular hour?

Mr. President, are we to follow the regular order, or the will of the majority leader?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Minnesota directing the question to the Chair as a parliamentary inquiry, or merely as a rhetorical question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I submit it as a parliamentary inquiry. Are we to follow the will of the majority leader or the regular order of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. It is a rhetorical question. The Chair has already stated the rule. Under the rule, if the proponents of the Hill amendment had desired a vote on the Hill amendment, as the Senator from Ohio has stated, they could have had a vote on that amendment. Under the rule a motion may be made to table, and it may be directed against the Hill amendment, or against the Anderson substitute, or, for that matter, against the joint resolution itself. The Senator from Ohio or any other Member of the Senate has the prerogative of making such a motion to table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I recognize that a motion to table may lie against the Anderson amendment or the Hill amendment. The point the Senator raises is this: What is the sequence? Can a motion to table be used to hop, skip, and jump from the Hill amendment, or must the motion to table apply to the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has answered that inquiry previously. The sequence is determined by the Senator making the motion. The motion to table may be directed against the Hill amendment, the Anderson substitute, or the joint resolution itself. The Senator from Ohio will make his motion in due time, and will determine the sequence. The same privilege is reserved to all other Members of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I realize that the same privilege is reserved to all Members of the Senate. The question about which the Senator from Minnesota is deeply concerned is this: How can we set aside the pending question by a motion to table, by skipping the pending question, and moving up to any one of the numerous amendments which lie on the table?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I call for the regular order. It seems to me that the parliamentary inquiry has been propounded and answered on three different occasions. I do not believe that under a reservation to object a Senator can carry on a debate on the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order has been requested.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that he may, without losing his right to the floor, be permitted to yield not to exceed 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPRHEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I regret the fact that I am unable under the circumstances to give to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico the right to make the speech which he could have made at any time during the past week, but which I would have been very glad to have him make at this time if he wished to do so.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator realizes that I would not object to the Senator from Ohio being granted permission to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico. But if other Senators are to speak under a reservation of objection in a parliamentary maneuver, then, of course, some Senator should object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I again ask unanimous consent that I be allowed, without losing the floor, to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Ohio for yielding this time to me.

The inference is left that we have been engaging in filibustering for the past 4 days and refusing to vote on the pending question. I desire to call attention to the fact that on Tuesday the distinguished majority leader stated that he wished to vote on his motion at 7:30 Wednesday evening. On Tuesday night in the Senate he served notice of his intention to make the motion at 7:30 o'clock on Wednesday evening.

The next day he stated that several Senators who were out of the city had telephoned or telegraphed him that he had not given them adequate notice. He said, "There are also 3 or 4 Senators who have felt that there should be some additional debate." The Senator from Ohio stated that they were Senators who favored the joint resolution. That should show they were not supporting the substitute. The majority leader, therefore, announced his intention of voting on Monday, saying that that was a fitting and proper time, and would allow adequate debate. "At that time," he said, "every Senator will have a chance to be present and every Senator will feel there has been adequate debate."

We have tried to follow his plan strictly in approaching this discussion. If there has been a filibuster since Wednesday, it was not our fault. However, I believe that before we vote we need to realize a few things with reference to this type of legislation.

First of all, the substitute which is now before the Senate deals with the Continental Shelf. I ask Senators to recall the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior—not a previous Secretary of the Interior, although the testimony of previous Secretaries would have been similar, but the present Secretary of the Interior in the Eisenhower administration—who appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Af-

fairs. His testimony will be found at page 512. He said:

I believe that the national defense—

Not any political cause—

will be best served by getting more active production from these submerged lands and that it is equally important, therefore, that the Congress should in the same legislation establish a procedure by which development may go forward on all of the lands on the Continental Shelf outside of a line marking the historical boundaries of the several States with all of the revenues to go to the Nation as a whole.

I call attention to the fact that that is the exact testimony of the Secretary of the Interior. He stated that in the same legislation we should deal with the Continental Shelf, with all the revenues to go to the Nation as a whole. There should be no extraction tax, no severance tax. All the revenues should go to the Nation as a whole.

I call attention to the fact that in the hearings at page 926 the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, in his testimony, suggested that "any statute combine a program (a) authorizing the States to administer and develop the natural resources from the submerged lands within a line marking their historic boundaries with (b) specific authorization to the executive branch of the Federal Government to develop the lands outside of that line, with the income therefrom going to the entire Nation. The statutes also should reserve to the United States its powers to regulate navigation, conduct the national defense, and conduct international relations in the so-called State areas."

I ask why the proponents of the legislation, particularly those who seek to support the administration, try to bury two of the administration leaders in the same grave with the Senator from Alabama and the junior Senator from New Mexico.

They are willing to take the recommendations of the Attorney General and junk them. Mr. President, they are even willing to take the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, and junk them. They want to pay no attention at all to the recommendations of the Members of the Eisenhower Cabinet who have been testifying on this subject.

Therefore, I point out that my substitute, which it is proposed to lay upon the table, does provide for the development of the Continental Shelf, and does provide for all of the revenues to go to the entire Nation, just as previous administrations have recommended, and as the present administration has recommended through its spokesmen.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have only a few minutes. I decline to yield.

Secondly, we come now to the question of the 3-mile boundary. The Attorney General, in his testimony, again at page 926, suggested that a line be drawn, so as to eliminate certain international problems that might otherwise arise if territorial ownership claims are asserted in the States or Federal Government beyond their historic 3-mile limit.

I call attention to the fact that my substitute, which it is attempted to put into the grave, does try to follow the 3-mile limit to which the Attorney General has referred, whereas the Holland joint resolution does not do so. Instead, the joint resolution sets a line as far as 10½ miles off the shore.

If Senators wish to follow the recommendation of the Attorney General they must be against the Holland joint resolution, and they must not lay on the table my substitute measure.

I call attention to the testimony of the representative of the Secretary of State, appearing in the printed hearings at page 1057. The reading of his testimony will show that it would be a dangerous precedent for the United States or any State of the Union to claim as a boundary a distance of more than 3 miles.

Nevertheless, Senators would bury the Secretary of the State in the same grave. He realizes the problem that we face.

My bill provides for a 3-mile limit. It does not go beyond such 3-mile limit. It does not bring the State Department into trouble all over the earth. It recognizes that the State Department is disputing the claim of Russia to a limit of 12 miles. Nevertheless, the Senate, while asking our diplomats to resist the claims of Russia, would put them in the position of the claiming that our boundary is 10½ miles off the shores of Texas and Florida. What would happen then to our diplomatic representatives in their efforts to resist the claims of Russia, or any other claims? They would become the laughing stock of the world.

Mr. President, we should not do it. We should not adopt the Holland substitute. I suggest that the substitute which I have offered does not cause our State Department trouble and will not.

Finally, the Attorney General suggested the drawing of a line marking off the boundaries of all States. The Holland joint resolution does not do it. My bill makes it unnecessary to draw such a line. Therefore, apparently another recommendation of the present administration must be tossed into the grave.

If Senators will concede anything, they will concede that the Holland joint resolution carries a cold, studied disdain for almost every recommendation of the Eisenhower Cabinet. It carries with it disdain for the Supreme Court and its decisions, and for the executive departments and their recommendations. Certainly that is a dangerous precedent to establish. Why should we ignore the Executive, and why should we reverse the Supreme Court?

Years ago Bob La Follette stood on the floor of the Senate with his plan of overriding the decisions of the Supreme Court. At the time it was referred to as a Bolshevik idea. It was called a drastic and unreasonable plan to override the decisions of the Supreme Court. Nevertheless the attempt now is being made to follow that attempt and make that effort our accepted policy.

My substitute bill does not override the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. President, if the Senate wishes to give California, Texas, and Louisiana 100 percent of the revenue from the oil lying within 3 miles of their shores, all that the Senate need do is to take up my substitute and cross out the provision giving 37½ percent of royalties to the States and insert in lieu thereof 100 percent. In that way we would not slap the face of the Secretary of State, we would not slap the face of the Secretary of the Interior, and we would not slap the Attorney General three times across the mouth. The Attorney General tried hard to make it plain to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs just what ought to be done. He tried hard to make the committee understand that we must not plunge the State Department into trouble all over the world. Yet the Senate is about to decide that we should ignore the advice of the Eisenhower Cabinet.

Mr. President, I am not surprised that some Democratic Senators should not care about ignoring or repudiating the administration, but I cannot understand why the Republican majority should wish to ignore what the Eisenhower administration has testified with respect to what should be done. Instead, we will apparently override the Supreme Court, the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior, and pay no attention whatever to their recommendations.

Why should we plow under every third Cabinet officer just to be able to give something to three individual States? If we want to give the oil away, why do we not try to confine it to what can be, as clearly indicated by the Attorney General, a proper and constitutional method? Why does not a Republican Senator who wishes to support Republican Cabinet officers move to strike out the 37½ percent of royalties provision in my amendment and insert 100 percent in lieu thereof? Then the Senate would at least be proceeding along the lines recommended by officials of the Government to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and would act in accordance with what has been going on for many years?

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion of this issue. There has been a great deal of time devoted to its study. Many men have sat in the committees, day after day, trying to find a solution of the problem.

I do not understand why we should pass a bill which is certain to face a constitutional test, which is certain to be again brought before the same Supreme Court, the same Supreme Court which we are asked to override now?

Why do we not proceed with a method that is entirely proper and constitutional, and which the Attorney General has suggested as a possible means of avoiding conflicts? The adoption of my substitute makes that possible.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will insist on passing my substitute.

I note that my time has about expired. In order to accommodate the desires of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—although I have thus far refused to be a sponsor of the Hill amendment, and have thus far refused

to allow his amendment to be tied to my substitute—and in order to permit him to have at least one vote on his amendment, I modify my amendment by adding to it the Hill amendment for education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have sat here a good many days listening to the arguments made against the Holland joint resolution. The latest count shows that up to Friday night the proponents of the joint resolution had spoken 190,526 words, and that the opponents had spoken 708,155 words, or 3½ times as many words as the proponents.

There cannot be much doubt in anyone's mind—and there is not any doubt in the minds of the press—that a filibuster is being conducted.

I may say that 900,000 words, the approximate number of words spoken up to Friday night, represent the content of 6 books of good substantial size; 150,000 words are usually considered to represent a very good sized book.

While these words have been spoken, I have kept quiet. I have personally never had a tremendous direct interest in the joint resolution. However, I do wish to say a few words as to why I have always been in favor of State ownership of the lands under the marginal seas, along the coasts of those States.

A vote on the Anderson amendment is substantially a vote on the main issue before us. The Anderson amendment merely provides that the Federal Government shall have the right to the money from the leasing of those lands. The Holland joint resolution provides that the States shall have the lands and that right.

It is a clear issue between the States and the Federal Government.

Of course, I do not think the Anderson amendment is a very fair amendment. The Anderson amendment gives title to the Great Lakes States to approximately 38 million acres of land lying in the Great Lakes well beyond the 3-mile limit. It also acknowledges title in the inland States to 27 million acres lying under inland waters. However, it provides that the 17 million acres along the coast, within a 3-mile limit, shall go to the Federal Government, not to the States. That does not seem to me to be very fair treatment.

Of course, I recognize the inducement that is made to those of us who come from Great Lakes States. However, I do not understand how that in any way affects the basic principles upon which we should base our decision.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I should like first to conclude my remarks. Then I shall be glad to yield for questions.

Several times before Congress has determined that the States should be the real owners of the submerged lands within their historic boundaries. They approved such ownership in 1946 before the Supreme Court opinion, and they approved it after the Supreme Court opinion.

Mr. President, it is not a new issue. It has been considered by previous Congresses, and the previous Congresses have repeatedly reaffirmed the belief that these lands belong to and should belong to the States.

The prolonged debate and filibuster this year appears even more unreasonable when we consider that the whole matter has been before Congress ever since 1946.

The measure which is before us today has been urged by the governors of nearly all the States, and by the attorneys general of nearly all the States during this period.

The Republican platform of 1952 clearly stated:

> We favor restoration to the States of their rights to all lands and resources beneath navigable inland and offshore waters within their historic boundaries.

In the campaign General Eisenhower endorsed that plank, and stated even more clearly his belief that the States are entitled to the lands within their historic boundaries, and that in that connection the Texas historic boundaries amounted to 3 marine leagues, by reason of the annexation agreement in the case of Texas.

The President has, therefore, written to us a letter—only called for by the demand of Senators on the other side that he state his position—in which he states his belief in favor of this joint resolution as a part of his general program.

Mr. President, for weeks there has been a discussion of the value of the oil under the submerged lands. I have not gone into the figures involved, but we have heard figures of millions of dollars and billions of dollars bandied about, and others have disputed those claims. That matter can go into history, so far as I am concerned, for it seems to me that all that argument completely ignores the real issue, which is the simple question, Who really owns, or should own, the submerged lands—the States or the Federal Government? Whether millions or billions of dollars are involved, should not affect the result.

I am quite certain that all the States are anxious that the rights of other States be fairly determined, even if they themselves may indirectly lose some revenue from the result. The value of the lands in dispute has no bearing whatever on the merits of our determination to do justice in this case, in spite of the efforts of the opponents to make this a demagogic political issue.

I have always supported the claims of the States to ownership of these lands, for the simple reason that it seemed perfectly clear to me at all times that the States were the real owners of these lands, and that the Supreme Court opinions were clearly wrong. I have read those opinions. I read them when they first came out, and at that time I simply could not understand the logic of the opinions. I cannot understand it now, and I could not understand it when the opinions were first called to my attention. It has always seemed perfectly clear to me that the Thirteen Original Colonies owned these lands. If they did own them, there is absolutely nothing in the Constitution which can possibly be construed as a transfer by the States to the Federal Government of the ownership they—the States—held. The Constitution does not mention the subject, either directly or impliedly. If the States owned the lands before the adoption of the Constitution, they certainly owned those lands afterward.

So far as the other, newer States were concerned, they were established and were taken into the Union on the same conditions as those applying to the Original Thirteen States, and therefore had exactly the same right to ownership of the lands within their historic boundaries as did the Original Thirteen States. The case of Texas is special, because there was an express understanding that Texas should retain the lands she owned within her historic boundaries. However, it seems to me that that does not and should not in any way reflect on the ownership of other States, such as California, which had no such express agreement.

The ownership of these lands was always considered to be in the States—always, by every authority—by the opinions, by the executive, by the judges—until the Supreme Court's opinion in the California case on June 23, 1947. Even in that case the Court specifically stated that "this Court" had in previous decisions many times "used languages strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction whether inland or not."

In the California case, the Supreme Court admitted it was reversing the opinion of every Supreme Court Justice who preceded them.

Whether the particular facts of each case covered lands beyond low tide is not always clear in the various cases; but the rule of law was clear, and no one ever seems to have considered that the so-called low-tide mark had the slightest significance in determining where the State boundaries were or where the State ownership ended.

In the case of *Pollard* v. *Hagen* (3 Howard 212, 230), Mr. Justice McKinley said:

> First, the shores of navigable waters and the soils under them were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively. Secondly, the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over the subject as the original States.

That particular statement, whether bearing directly on the facts or merely considered as a dictum, has been repeatedly approved by the Supreme Court and by many important Justices of the Supreme Court since that time, and particularly in a case following that one, which I think clearly explained the position which was the law of this continent for many years before the 1947 case in the Supreme Court.

In the case of Mumford against Wardwell, Mr. Justice Clifford said:

> Settled rule of law in this court is that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the several

States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders.

When the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution.

As pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], every administrative ruling of the Federal Government, every opinion of every court until 1947, assumed that the States owned the submerged lands within the State boundaries.

The Supreme Court in 1947, to support its opinion, suggests that there was no express understanding of a 3-mile limit in 1776, and that is probably true. But it is also true that many international law authorities long before that time spoke clearly of the ownership by each state or nation of the submerged lands beyond their tidal waters. Every authority agreed on such ownership in fact, and the only point on which the Court was right was that 3 miles was not generally accepted as the limitation of their ownership. Going back to the international law which prevailed long before 1776: In 1670, Matthew Hale, the Lord Chief Justice of England, said:

The narrow sea, adjoining the coast of England, is part of the wast and demesnes and dominions of the King of England, whether it lie within the body of any country or not. * * *

In this sea the King of England hath a double right, viz: a right of jurisdiction. * * * and a right of property or ownership. * * *

And besides, the soil itself under the water is actually the King's.

That was in 1670, more than 100 years before the formulation of the Constitution of the United States.

Samuel Pufendorf, who is recognized as one of the great German writers on international law, said in 1688:

For upon this consideration the sea becomes a portion, as it were, of the land, like trenches, or even as the adjoining marshes and swamps are held to be a part of a city. * * * Just as in the occupancy of immobile objects there is no need to touch each part with the body, but when one part has been touched, that act is understood to bring the entire thing of which it is a part under the right of ownership.

Sir Philip Medows, of England, said in 1689:

And yet 'tis a thing undoubted, and never brought into question by any; but that every Prince, whose Country adjoyns to the Sea, * * * has some portion of the Sea belonging to him in property, as an accession of the Land, or appendant to it.

Mr. President, I do not need to quote further from the authorities and opinions, although there are four more leading international law authorities, who wrote prior to 1776, who asserted without question that the countries have ownership in the lands known as the marginal seas.

Certainly, however, no State ever admitted that its ownership stopped at the low-tide mark. No one ever made that distinction until the Supreme Court did in 1947. The States were uncertain how far their dominion extended into the open sea, but certainly it was a dominion which extended far beyond the low-tide line. The States built docks and piers far outside the low-tide mark, and no one ever questioned the right of the States to that land. The States filled in lands which had been submerged far outside of the low-tide mark. They assumed the jurisdiction over fishing rights within easy distance from the shore. No one ever suggested that this admitted ownership and interest in the waters off the shores of the various States, and nations were limited by the low-tide mark.

It is claimed that Thomas Jefferson, in 1793, was the first to insist on a 3-mile limit, and that therefore title was acquired by the Federal Government. However, if we read the letter which Mr. Jefferson wrote—as that letter is set forth on page 318 of the hearings—we see that he never had any doubt that the Government had and that the States had, at all times, a distinct ownership over some distance from the coastline. His letter is rather one to cut down that ownership to 3 miles, than it is to extend it to 3 miles; and the letter was written to indicate that the United States would not claim jurisdiction for 5 miles from land, and that therefore the United States would release the British brig *Fannie*, which had been captured at a distance of 5 miles from the shore.

However, in its 1947 opinion, the Supreme Court simply ignored international law and ignored, in an astonishing way, I think, the arguments presented by the various States.

I do not know what happened, Mr. President, but apparently the States started to develop all the lands in question, and then some persons got the idea that they could file Federal claims, and raise the question. Finally, in 1937, they persuaded Mr. Ickes to change his mind. They found some bright young man in the roaring thirties who decided that the United States Government should undertake to assert a claim to something it never had any right to, and he set out to persuade the Court. He was acting in a period when the general philosophy was in favor of the expansion of the power of and regulation by the Federal Government, and he seems to have found a sympathetic point of view in that philosophy from the then Supreme Court. I do not believe the members of the Supreme Court would deny that they were in effect reversing the accepted opinion of all previous Supreme Courts in order to effect the result which they brought about.

Some of the opponents of the pending measure have repeatedly asserted that Congress cannot possibly reverse an opinion of the Supreme Court. There is nothing in the Constitution which gives the Supreme Court the final right to determine the meaning of the Constitution, or the laws, or the meaning of other questions of a political nature like that of ownership of the submerged lands. In the California case itself the Court clearly says "that the Constitution invests in Congress power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," so that, even assuming the Supreme Court is right, we have full power to write the law differently for the future, and the Supreme Court, itself, admits it. The opinion goes on to say:

We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation; thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power.

The Court said again:

But beyond all this, we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such a way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

It seems perfectly clear, therefore, that Congress may return these lands in order that justice shall be done to States, if they feel that injustice has been done by the Supreme Court opinions. That is certainly what I feel, and have felt, for 6 years. I am confirmed in my opinion by the fact that Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Frankfurter evidently disagreed with the opinion of the majority, and dissented from its opinions. At least Mr. Justice Reed dissented from both, and I think Mr. Justice Frankfurter dissented, certainly from the ideas expressed in those opinions.

As to whether Congress is justified in reversing the Supreme Court, one may ask with equal force whether the Supreme Court was justified in reversing the Supreme Court, since that is what it did in 1947. I notice that the gentlemen who are called by the distinguished Senator from Oregon "the little band of liberals," were very violently opposed to the Supreme Court in the days when the Supreme Court was conservative, and did not hesitate by law after law to circumvent the opinions of that Court and gradually by change in the character of the Court bring about a reversal of its previous opinion.

Congressmen have not only a right but a duty to interpret the Constitution as they consider it should be interpreted. They are not bound by opinions of the Supreme Court on that subject, and have an independent obligation to see that the Constitution is not violated. They are particularly justified in doing it at this time because the people of the United States had the issue before them clearly stated in 1952, and decided the issue from the point of view of popular opinion. The Republican candidate took a clear position in favor of the ownership by the States of submerged lands. The Democratic candidate took a clear position against that ownership and in favor of the ownership as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. The majority was more than 6 million votes for the man who advocated ownership by the States of the submerged lands.

Therefore, Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, I urge upon you the passage of the pending measure, and, as a first step toward that result, I urge the elimination of the substitute, which attempts to proceed upon the theory that the submerged lands shall be considered

hereafter the property of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, in the nature of substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by me with reference to the pending joint resolution, the statement to follow the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF MARYLAND

Sifting the voluminous testimony and the ebullient oratory with respect to the submerged lands issue—sometimes described as the tidelands issue—if one can eliminate the emotion and passion of partisanship and sectionalism, there remains only the fundamental question of Federal ownership or States' rights.

For many years now, we have observed the manifestations of a growing centralization of power in the Federal Government, the ramifications of which are multifarious. This philosophy of government erroneous and ill-conceived as it may be, has been fostered by the proponents of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and other socialistic programs. These theories, through more than 20 years of application, or should I say mis-application, have engendered a following of persons who must be awakened to the fallaciousness of the continued and increased concentration of power in the hands of the Federal Government, a power which constitutionally, inherently, traditionally and historically rests with the States of the Union.

This great Nation has been predicated and nurtured on the concept of a decentralized government, insofar as possible. Under this concept, our renowned free enterprise system has developed to the point that world leadership has befallen to us. This fundamental principle of States rights must be cherished and preserved within the framework of our traditional Government.

We are now at an important crossroad in history. The record of the last 20 years can hardly be cited as an example of States' rights, and many people have been deeply repulsed by the malignancy of Federal power. The free world, and I strongly suspect the Communist dominated world, is viewing our deliberations here as an indication of whether or not we will travel further along the road toward greater governmental interference and domination in the affairs of our States.

To my mind, this debate can be resolved only on the basis of States' rights versus additional Federal controls, whether they be direct or indirect. It is worthy of note that the Federal Government already owns approximately 24 percent of the land within the continental limits of these United States, and this does not include the so-called tidelands. This one observation should forcefully illustrate the need for a delineation of Federal ownership.

In this regard, a portion of President Eisenhower's speech in New Orleans, La., on October 13, 1952, I think, is especially significant and deserving of repetition at this time:

"First, I deplore and I will always resist Federal encroachments upon the rights and affairs of the States. Second, I am gravely concerned over the threat to the States inherent in the growth of this power-hungry movement. Third, the resources of these submerged areas, though still owned by the States, will be available for America's defense in time of emergency. Fourth, the orderly development of these resources under the States need not interfere with any valid Federal function. Fifth, I believe that the law twice passed by Congress which would recognize these State titles is in keeping with basic principles of honest dealing and fair play. These things are important, they are vital, in governmental affairs as well as in private dealings."

This viewpoint, in my opinion, reflects the present attitude of the greater majority of the people of this country.

It is indeed unfortunate that the subject of oil has been introduced into this discussion, thereby creating an erroneous impression that there are no other resources, of even greater potential value, involved. A great deal of emotionalism has resulted from this aspect which is but a small part of a far reaching question of control and jurisdiction of natural resources. Right to our natural resources would place in the hands of the Federal Government, the absolute control of our economic policies, and ultimately complete dominance of the economic life of this great Nation, including the economic life of our States. Nothing could be more contrary to the basic principle of government as understood by the American public and as evidenced by our great heritage.

It is my considered conviction that the passage of legislation conveying to the States the rights to these submerged lands, exclusive of the Continental Shelf which extends beyond the historic boundaries of the States, would be completely consistent with the best possible plan for the continued development of the land and its resources and in keeping with the ideals on which our country was founded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In view of the acceptance of the Hill educational amendment by the Senator from New Mexico, is a vote to table the Anderson substitute, in fact, a vote against the Hill educational amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. The question is on the motion to table the Anderson substitute, as modified by the Hill amendment. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in the nature of a substitute, as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The amendment proposed by Mr. ANDERSON, as modified, is to insert the following in lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment:

That (a) the provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State): *Provided*—

(1) That such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this joint resolution, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

(2) That such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this joint resolution in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

(3) That within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents, and the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

(4) That except as otherwise provided in section 3 thereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this joint resolution, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this joint resolution shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided;

(5) That the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this joint resolution;

(6) That such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

(7) That such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

(8) That such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

(9) That such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this joint resolution in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

(10) That the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal, or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease: *Provided, however,* That if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on or before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof, equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee, on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (b) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (c) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (d) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

SEC. 3. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 1 of this joint resolution, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the State, its political subdivision or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this joint resolution. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 1 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged land of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he has not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 1 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 1 (b) shall govern such lease. The following stipulations and authorizations are hereby approved and confirmed: (i) The stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to certain bays and harbors in the State of California; (ii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to the continuance of oil and gas operations in the submerged lands within the boundaries of the State of California and herein referred to as the operating stipulation; (iii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against the State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated July 28, 1948, extending the term of said operating stipulation; (iv) the stipulation entered into in the case of the United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California dated August 2, 1949, further extending the term of said operating stipulation; (v) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated August 21, 1950, further extending and revising said operating stipulation ; (vi) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California, dated September 4, 1951, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vii) the notice concerning "Oil and Gas Operations in the Submerged Coastal Lands of the Gulf of Mexico," issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 11, 1950 (15 F. R. 8835), as amended by the notice dated January 26, 1951 (16 F. R. 953), and as supplemented by the notices dated February 2, 1951 (16 F. R. 1203), March 5, 1951 (16 F. R. 2195), April 23, 1951 (16 F. R. 3623), June 25, 1951 (16 F. R. 6404), August 22, 1951 (16 F. R. 8720), October 24, 1951 (16 F. R. 10998), and December 21, 1951 (17 F. R. 43), respectively.

SEC. 4. (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, pending the enactment of further legislation on the subject, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 1 of this joint resolution.

(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secertary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ per centum, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided.

(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section 4 of this joint resolution, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands pursuant to section 2 of this joint resolution, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath navigable inland waters.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section—

(1) thirty-seven and one-half percent of all moneys received as bonus payments, rents, royalties and other sums payable with respect to operations in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to such State within 90 days after the expiration of each fiscal year.

(2) All other moneys received under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be held in a special account in the Treasury during the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide, the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

(3) It shall be the duty of every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof having issued any mineral lease or grant, or leases or grants, covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf to file with the Attorney General of the United States on or before December 31, 1953, a statement of the moneys or other things of value received by such State or political subdivision or grantee from or on account of such lease or grant, or leases or grants, since January 1, 1940, and the Attorney General shall submit the statements so received to the Congress not later than February 1, 1954.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

(c) If and whenever the United States shall take and receive in kind all or any part of the royalty under a lease maintained or issued under the provisions of this joint resolution and covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, the value of such royalty so taken in kind shall, for the purpose of subsection (a) (1) of this section, be deemed to be the prevailing market price thereof at the time and place of production, and there shall be paid to the State entitled

thereto 37½ percent of the value of such royalty.

SEC. 6. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands covered by this joint resolution.

(c) All leases issued under this joint resolution, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this joint resolution, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this joint resolution, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just compensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated.

SEC. 7. Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this joint resolution and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this joint resolution or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained.

SEC. 8. The United States consents that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law.

SEC. 9. The United States hereby asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, but that all such right, title, and interest are vested in the several States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, or the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority.

SEC. 10. Section 9 of this joint resolution shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (1) which have been lawfully accrued by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (2) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (3) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (4) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians. This joint resolution shall not apply to waterpower, or to the use of water for the production of power, or to any right to develop water power which has been or may be expressly reserved by the United States for its own benefit or for the benefit of its licensees or permittees under any law of the United States.

SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this joint resolution by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder for recreation or other public purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

SEC. 12. Nothing in section 11 of this joint resolution shall be construed as confirming or recognizing any right with respect to oil, gas, or other minerals in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf; or as confirming or recognizing any interest in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf other than that essential to the right to construct, maintain, use, and occupy the structures enumerated in that section, or to the use and occupancy of the surface of filled-in or reclaimed land.

SEC. 13. The structures enumerated in section 11, above, shall not be construed as including derricks, wells, or other installations in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf employed in the exploration, development, extraction, and production of oil and gas or other minerals, or as including necessary structures for the development of waterpower.

SEC. 14. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to repeal, limit, or affect in any way any provision of law relating to the national defense, the control of navigation, or the improvement, protection, and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States; or to repeal, limit, or affect any provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted pursuant to the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

SEC. 15. Any person seeking the authorization of the United States to use or occupy any submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for the construction of, or additions to, installations of the type enumerated in section 11 of this joint resolution, shall apply therefor to the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, who shall have authority to issue such authorization, upon such terms and conditions as in his discretion may seem appropriate.

SEC. 16. Within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the use and occupancy of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf for installations of the type enumerated in section 11 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 17. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this joint resolution.

SEC. 18. When used in this joint resolution, (a) the term "tidelands" means lands situated between the lines of mean high tide and mean low tide; (b) the term "navigable" means navigable at the time of the admission of a State into the Union under the laws of the United States; (c) the term "inland waters" includes the waters of lakes (including Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario to the extent that they are within the boundaries of a State of the United States), bays, rivers, ports, and harbors which are landward of the ocean; and lands beneath navigable inland waters include filled-in or reclaimed lands which formerly were within that category; (d) the term "submerged lands of the Continental Shelf" means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the open ocean, situated seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters, and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (e) the term "seaward boundary of a State" means a line 3 nautical miles seaward from the points on the coast of a State at which the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf begin; (f) the term "mineral lease" means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; and (g) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay." If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

I announce further that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—56

Barrett	Bridges	Byrd
Beall	Bush	Capehart
Bennett	Butler, Md.	Carlson
Bricker	Butler, Nebr.	Clements

Cordon	Ives	Purtell
Daniel	Jenner	Robertson
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Knowland	Schoeppel
Ellender	Kuchel	Smathers
Ferguson	Long	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Martin	Smith, N. J.
George	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Goldwater	McCarran	Stennis
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Taft
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Watkins
Hoey	Mundt	Welker
Holland	Payne	Williams
Hunt	Potter	

NAYS—33

Aiken	Hennings	Mansfield
Anderson	Hill	McClellan
Case	Humphrey	Monroney
Cooper	Jackson	Morse
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Frear	Kefauver	Neely
Fulbright	Kennedy	Pastore
Gillette	Kilgore	Sparkman
Gore	Langer	Symington
Griswold	Lehman	Tobey
Hayden	Magnuson	Young

NOT VOTING—7

Chavez	Kerr	Wiley
Eastland	Malone	
Green	Thye	

So Mr. TAFT's motion to lay on the table the Anderson substitute, as modified by the Hill amendment, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1419) to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the committee substitute, which is open to amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment dated April 8, 1953.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 17, before the period in line 2, to insert the following: "or in the case of the Great Lakes, to the international boundary."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, this is an amendment to section 4 of Senate Joint Resolution 13 to provide that the boundary of each original coastal State, in the case of the Great Lakes, is approved and confirmed to the international boundary line. My own State of New York is the only original coastal State which would be affected by this amendment.

It is my understanding that the amendment is consistent with a decision of the United States Supreme Court which held that the bed of Lake Ontario lying within the boundary of the State of New York belongs to the State of New York to the international boundary line. I refer to the case of *Massachusetts* v. *New York* (271 U. S. 65), decided in 1926.

Therefore, I submit this amendment for the purpose of assuring the continued recognition of the boundary of New York State in the bed of Lake Ontario, to the international boundary line.

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

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. While the acting chairman of the committee has no authority from the committee with respect to the amendment of the senior Senator from New York, speaking for myself, I desire to say that the amendment is consonant with the philosophy of the joint resolution, and might well be accepted and made a part of it. The State of New York, being one of the Thirteen Original States, has boundaries confirmed on its seaward side, but the committee completely overlooked the fact that New York is bounded also by one of the Great Lakes. So the boundary on the Great Lakes side might as well be confirmed as that on the seaward side.

Mr. President, I would hope that the amendment of the Senator from New York might be agreed to.

Mr. IVES. It was my understanding that that was the situation. That is why the amendment is being offered.

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

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I understand correctly that the amendment does not apply to any other State bordering on the Great Lakes?

Mr. IVES. It is applicable solely to the State of New York.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from New York did not wish to question the title of any other State to the international boundary by offering his amendment merely with respect to the State of New York?

Mr. IVES. No other State is involved in this matter, nor could it possibly be, because the State of New York is the only one of the Thirteen Original States affected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The first sentence in section 4, under the heading "Seaward Boundaries," was inserted at the request of the distinguished Senator from New York, based upon a request by the Attorney General of the State of New York, and clearly confirmed the boundaries of the Thirteen Original States. At that time the attention of the Attorney General had not been drawn to the fact that New York, as one of the Thirteen Original States, also had boundaries in the Great Lakes, since there were on the other side of the State areas of the Dominion of Canada.

I believe the amendment suggested by the senior Senator from New York makes complete the suggestion made by the Attorney General of New York. Certainly I have no objection to the inclusion of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senate has previously passed S. 1409, to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia.

This afternoon, the House of Representatives considered the Senate bill, struck out all after the enacting clause, and inserted a paragraph which is substantially identical with the final paragraph of the bill as it passed the Senate. It would confer upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia as a yearly matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be immediately considered and the amendment of the House concurred in, in order that the bill may go to the White House forthwith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I object.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the committee substitute, which is open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee substitute.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON), as follows:

On page 10, beginning with "and to the" in line 21, strike out all through "miles" in line 3 on page 11.

On page 11, beginning with "as they" in line 9, strike out all through "Congress, or" in line 11.

On page 11, line 17, strike out "The" and insert in lieu therof "In title II the."

On page 12, insert after line 23 the following:

"(i) The term 'submerged lands of the Continental Shelf' means the lands (including the natural resources therein) underlying the open ocean, situated seaward of lands beneath navigable waters, and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf;

"(j) The term 'mineral lease' means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; and

"(k) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

On page 17, beginning with the comma after "confirmed" in line 11 strike out all to the period in line 18.

On page 20, beginning with line 9, strike out all through line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III

"SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

"SEC. 9. All natural resources within the submerged lands of the Continenal Shelf shall appertain to the United States and be subject to its jurisdiction and control as provided for in this title.

"SEC. 10. (a) The provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State): *Provided*—

"(1) That such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this joint resolution, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

"(2) That such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this joint resolution in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

"(3) That within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents, and the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect.

"(4) That except as otherwise provided in section 3 hereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this joint resolution, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this joint resolution shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided:

"(5) That the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this joint resolution;

"(6) That such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

"(7) That such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

"(8) That such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

"(9) That such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this joint resolution in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

"(10) That the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease: *Provided, however,* That if oil or gas was not being produced from such leases on or before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

"(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

"(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 11. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee, on lands beneath navigable waters vested and assigned to such State under title II of this joint resolution, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the natural resources within them.

"SEC. 12. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 10 of this joint resolution, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the State, its political subdivision or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this joint resolution. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 10 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he has not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 10 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 10 (b) shall govern such lease.

"SEC. 13. (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, pending the enactment of further legislation on the subject, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 10 of this joint resolution.

"(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

"(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided.

"(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any lands beneath navigable waters pursuant to section 11 of this joint resolution, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is land beneath navigable waters.

"SEC. 14. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, all moneys received under the provisions of this title shall be held in a special account in the Treasury during the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide, the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 12 of this joint resolution pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

"SEC. 15. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased submerged lands of the

Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

"(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.

"(c) All leases issued under this title, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this title, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this joint resolution, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just compensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated.

"SEC. 16. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this title."

On page 20, line 17, strike out "SEC. 10." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 17."

On page 20, line 22, strike out "SEC. 11." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC 18."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of such lands and resources, and to confirm and provide for the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to have his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do, Mr. President.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 13, that beginning on Tuesday, April 28, the Senate proceed to the consideration of further amendments to the joint resolution, and that no Senator shall speak more than once or more than 1 hour on any such amendment, or amendments thereof or any appeal, that no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 1 hour on the bill, and that if debate is not sooner concluded then the Senate shall vote finally at 5 p. m. on May 5 on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto, that all time on May 5 be divided equally between advocates of the joint resolution, and opponents of the joint resolution — including proposers of amendments—the time of the advocates of the joint resolution to be controlled by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and of the opponents by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Amendments filed after the making of this agreement to be germane to the subject of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. I object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, all of the opponents of the joint resolution have stated repeatedly that they are not trying to prevent a final vote on it. I thought May 5 was a pretty generous date to set. I wonder, if May 5 is not satisfactory, whether any other date is satisfactory to the opponents of the joint resolution, and whether any one of them is willing to agree upon a final date for a vote on the pending joint resolution. Mr. President, I wonder whether they are in good faith in their statement that they are not trying to prevent a final vote on the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is in good faith. The Senator from Oregon is not ready yet to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement. The time will come when we will vote on the joint resolution, but we are not ready as yet to do so. We are not ready today to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement, because we are still holding conferences. Our little group is still holding conferences, and we have another conference set for tomorrow. In due course of time we shall come to some conclusion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Oregon, in the 22 hours and a half of his magnificent show of strength, covered every possible item that could be covered in connection with the joint resolution. Therefore, I did not expect any objection from him to a unanimous-consent agreement. I thought that perhaps there might be a reasonable request for additional time on the part of one of the other Senators.

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

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether any other Senator has any objection to the setting of the date of May 5 as the date for a vote on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state that he heard no other objection.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say that in my 22-hour speech I did not cover very many amendments. There are a great many amendments I have not commented on, and I expect to discuss them at some length.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will remember that they are the guests of the Senate, and will abide by the Senate rules. The galleries will be in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I expect to bring to the attention of the country the fact that, although a filibuster is being conducted, we are not in any way trying to limit the debate, but are perfectly willing to give sufficient time for debate. We are willing to make the date May 15, so far as we are concerned.

It seems to me that the time has come when it is reasonable to ask unanimous consent that the Senate fix a date when the debate may be terminated. I cannot interpret the refusal to give such consent other than as a determination to continue the filibuster.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

We shall remain in session this evening until 10 o'clock. Perhaps tomorrow night we shall continue through the entire night. Senators should be prepared accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state that a rule of the Senate provides that there shall be no demonstrations on the part of the occupants of the galleries. The Chair hopes the good folks who are visiting us today will abide by that rule.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it was the intention of the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to offer the amendment which has been read. Because of his unfortunate illness, following his very remarkable speech, it has fallen upon the Senator from Illinois to present the amendment, which otherwise the Senator from New Mexico would have offered.

By defeating the Anderson substitute and apparently confirming the intention of the Senate to pass the Holland joint resolution, we have given away to the coastal States, particularly to the States of California, Texas, Louisiana, and possibly Florida——

(At this point Mr. DOUGLAS yielded to Mr. BYRD, who asked and obtained consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him entitled "Balancing the Budget." His statement appears in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I was saying, Mr. President, by the defeat of the Anderson substitute and the apparent determination to pass the Holland joint resolution, it seems that we shall be giving to California, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark on their coasts.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I should like to have a chance to complete my statement; and then the Senator from Louisiana can make his statement.

Mr. President, we are doing this not only (a) for all coastal States, out to 3 miles from the coast, but (b) in the cases of Florida and Texas for 9 nautical miles, and (c) in the opinion of many of us, we are creating an open end——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please be in order. Will the Senator from Illinois please suspend until the Senate is in order?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (after a pause). Now the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois. The Chair hopes there will be order from now on.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or, Mr. President, (c) we are also creating the possibility that under obscure laws passed in the past or surreptitious actions taken in the future, State claims to property in the submerged lands beyond the 9-mile limit may be recognized. Therefore, we are opening the way to the taking by the coastal States of the entire Continental Shelf.

I wish to say very frankly that I am opposed to having the coastal States take or be granted submerged lands out even to the 3-mile limit. I think that is wrong. However, this amendment is an attempt to limit and reduce the possible damage and loss to the 48 States of resources which the Supreme Court has held belong to all the people.

The amendment says, in effect, "If the Senate insists upon giving to the coastal States, and particularly to these 3 or 4 States, the submerged lands out to the 3-mile limit, at least let us save for the Federal Government the submerged lands beyond the 3-mile limit."

So the amendment would cut off the surrender to coastal States at the 3-mile limit and vest in the Federal Government the power to grant leases and encourage development of resources beyond the 3-mile limit, and it would give to the Federal Government all revenue derived from lands beyond the 3-mile limit. Then the amendment also provides that these revenues shall be distributed according to the Hill amendment, namely, that during the period of the present national emergency they shall be used for defense purposes, and that after the period of the national emergency has ended, they shall be used for education.

In other words, we are saying, "We have been beaten in the case of the lands inside the 3-mile limit, so at least we shall try to save for the United States the submerged lands beyond the 3-mile limit and the great resources under them."

Of course, in practice this would give to the State of California about all she wants, because there is no Continental Shelf, or very little Continental Shelf, beyond the 3-mile limit, off the coast of California; but the amendment would save most of the land under the Gulf of Mexico and would save the great revenues from the land under the Gulf of Mexico. As the United States Geological Survey has said, probably the major part of the oil, gas, and other mineral resources is in land beyond the 3-mile limit.

The sponsors of the Holland joint resolution have said it is not their intention to push their claims or the possibilities of claims under their measure beyond the 3-mile limit, or at least beyond the 9-mile limit in 2 cases, Texas and the west coast of Florida. We are taking them up on that statement of purpose, and we are proposing to vest in the Federal Government the power to develop the lands beyond the 3-mile limit and to receive the revenues from the lands beyond the 3-mile limit, and to use those revenues, as I have said, during the present national emergency, for the purposes of defense, and after the emergency is over, for the purposes of education.

I should like to point out that this amendment avoids some of the international complications which are present in the case of the Holland joint resolution, because the amendment provides that the States' ownership shall not extend beyond that part of the marginal sea, which Jefferson recognized was the property and responsibility of the Federal Government and which international law has come to accept as the limit of our territorial waters; and the amendment provides that to the degree to which oil or gas may be developed in the lands beyond that point, the oil or gas shall be in the hands of the Federal Government and the revenues from those resources shall go to the Federal Government. Of course, it is the Federal Government, not the States, which can deal in international affairs with foreign governments which may file contrary claims.

Mr. President, I hope we may have some discussion of the amendment, and may have a yea-and-nay vote upon it.

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Virginia ask me to yield for the purpose of making an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With the understanding that I do not lose my rights to the floor and that the insertion will be printed at the end of my remarks, I shall yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with that understanding, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement entitled "Balancing the Budget," prepared by me.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD—BALANCING THE BUDGET

I disagree with current defeatist talk to the effect that the budget cannot be balanced in the next fiscal year. It can be done if there is a will to do it.

It is true that the present administration last January inherited a Truman budget for fiscal year 1954, beginning July 1 this year, calling for $78.6 billion in expenditures, providing for only $68,700,000,000 in revenue, and piling $9.9 billion of deficit spending on top of a Federal debt which is now nearly $265 billion.

It must be conceded that reductions in the Truman expenditure budget are doubly difficult because nearly half of it is for commitments made by the Truman administration out of appropriations previously enacted under the Truman administration. My analysis of the more than 800 items in the budget indicates that Truman expenditure estimates can be cut by $6.8 billion to $71.8 billion without reduction in either major military procurement or armed force strength. Under present conditions it is doubtful whether the country would accept reductions in these two items without assurance that they would not impair defense security, and this assurance must come from President Eisenhower himself, in whose military judgment there is implicit confidence.

Expenditure reductions of this magnitude would still leave a deficit of $3.1 billion on the basis of Truman revenue estimates. Here also the new administration is working under an inherited handicap. Under the 1951 revenue act, automatic tax expirations in the coming year will reduce revenue by $2.1 billion. Excessive taxes have been a cruel burden on the taxpayers of this country for many years. They must be reduced as soon as practicable, but under existing circumstances restoration of Federal fiscal responsibility is vital, and if these expirations were postponed to July 1, 1954, the Truman receipts estimate would be increased to $70.8 billion.

The expenditure reductions of $6.8 billion, and the postponement of tax expirations totaling $2.1 billion just described would reduce the deficit to $1 billion. Examination of financial reports of Government corporations and other agencies engaged in business-type activities leaves little doubt that at least this much could be recaptured from them in time to balance the 1954 budget. It is indicated also that additional sums, in the form of Treasury receipts, could be salvaged from this source in subsequent years. In short:

Byrd budget compared with Truman estimates

[In billions]

	Truman request	Byrd budget
Expenditures	$78.6	$71.8
Revenue	[1] 68.7	[2] 71.8
Deficit	9.9	

[1] Reduced by $2.1 billion in automatic tax expirations.
[2] With postponement of automatic tax expirations to July 1, 1954, and $1 billion of previously paid taxes recaptured from Government corporations and business-type agencies.

There may be other ways to balance the new budget which are better. If they are produced, I shall support them. It is too much to expect a perfect approach at this time. The new administration needs a full year in which to prepare and present its policies coordinated with both expenditure and tax reductions. At this time it must exercise extreme care to avoid premature action on both sides of the budget, and, at the same time, avoiding further deficit financing is urgent.

DEFICITS, DEBT, AND INTEREST

The Federal budget has been balanced in only 3 of the last 23 years. A whole genera-

tion of Americans has come of age under a deficit-financed Government. If we were to pay Federal taxes for the next 23 years at a rate in excess of $10 billion a year more than the Government spends, we would not reduce the Federal debt to where it was when this generation of young Americans was born. In these 23 years Federal deficits have totaled $241.7 billion.

We are paying interest on this debt at the rate of approximately $6.5 billion a year. The deficit in the current fiscal year ending June 30 may run as high as $7 billion (a billion more than the Truman budget estimate); so we are borrowing money, which will cost us more interest to pay interest on the public debt. This compounds the interest. We are paying interest twice—first, on the debt, and then on money borrowed to pay interest on the debt.

There is no yardstick by which the solvency of such a Government as ours can be measured, but it is obvious to all who think about it that Federal deficits must stop if national solvency is to be preserved.

Loss of revenue resulting from the 1951 Revenue Act schedule of tax expirations will continue for 3 years. Expenditure commitments already made by the previous administration against unexpended balances in previously enacted appropriations will substantially affect expenditure budgets for at least 3 years. When these 2 factors, along with expenditure-rate testimony by Assistant Secretary of Defense McNeil and Assistant Budget Director Staats, are taken into consideration, the Truman budget projected for 3 years would develop deficits approaching $15 billion a year. The statutory debt limit would have to be raised within a year, and in the third year the Federal debt would be around $300 billion.

Truman budget projected 3 years

[In billions]

	Fiscal year 1954	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956	Total
Expenditures	$78.6	$75.0	$75.0	$228.6
Receipts (based on tax expirations as scheduled in 1951 Revenue Act)	68.7	60.8	60.4	189.9
Deficit	9.9	14.2	14.6	38.7

Chronic deficit spending always breeds such evils as inflationary tendencies, which have already cut the purchasing power of the American dollar in half since 1940; tendencies toward fiscal irresponsibility exemplified by the frequent contention that a few hundred million dollars more of deficit spending is inconsequential if the budget is already out of balance; piling up the Federal debt, and piling up interest costs which are paid out of the Treasury, so that before the debt is paid, if it ever is, total interest probably will exceed the principal several times over; an impaired fiscal system which, through cheapening the purchasing power of the dollar, will lead to the destruction of our solvency and ultimate disaster.

NEW OBSTACLES TO OVERCOME

Under the conditions we have inherited it will not suffice to resort to trick phrases such as "balancing the cash budget." It will not suffice to depend on delayed expenditures which merely stretch out deficit financing from one year to another while the revenue continues to decline. To delay balancing the real budget in terms of real budget expenditures and real budget revenue will only make it more difficult as time goes by and raise new obstacles. It must be balanced now despite two great hitherto unexperienced obstacles which already have developed in too much delay.

The first new obstacle is in the form of automatic tax reduction, becoming effective in the fiscal year beginning July 1, which next year will reduce revenue by $2.1 billion, which in the second year will reduce revenue by $7.9 billion, and which in the third year will reduce revenue by $8.3 billion. The second new obstacle is in the form of nearly $100 billion already available for virtually uncontrollable expenditure from unexpended balances in previously enacted appropriations.

Automatic tax reductions

The automatic tax reductions will become effective under existing law, inherited from the previous administration, unless positive action is taken to extend present rates. Best available estimates at this time on how and when the reductions will take form follow:

1951 Revenue Act schedule of tax expiration

[In billions]

Tax reductions which will become effective under existing law	Effect in fiscal year 1954 (beginning July 1, 1953)	Effect in fiscal year 1955 (beginning July 1, 1954)	Effect in fiscal year 1956 (beginning July 1, 1955)
The 30-percent excess profits tax scheduled to expire June 30, 1953	$0.8	$2.3	$2.3
The increase of 5 percentage points in the corporate normal tax provided by the Revenue Act of 1951 and scheduled to expire as of Mar. 31, 1954	----------	1.5	1.9
The increase of approximately 11 percent in individual income taxes provided by the Revenue Act of 1951, and scheduled to terminate as of Dec. 31, 1953	1.1	3.1	3.1
The excise tax rate increases provided by the Revenue Act of 1951 and scheduled to terminate as of Mar. 31, 1954	0.2	1.0	1.0
Total	2.1	7.9	8.3

Unexpended balances

As of June 30, unexpended balances in previous appropriations to regular and special fund accounts will total more than $81 billion, and unexpended balances in revolving and management fund authorizations will total more than $21 billion. Appropriations enacted in the current session of Congress will be in addition. These unexpended appropriations hanging over from the Truman administration are largely—but not entirely—an accumulation of funds, requested and provided in the name of the Korean war and the Russian threat, far in excess of end-item production expenditures which have not kept pace with the rate of authorization.

The Truman budget estimates for the coming year showed that $37 billion would be expended from these hangover appropriations, and $42 billion would be from appropriations currently before Congress. By the same token, of the $73 billion of new appropriations requested in the Truman budget $42 billion, as just indicated, would be for expenditure in the coming fiscal year and $31 billion would be for expenditure in some future year.

Thus it is seen that there may be a vast difference between expenditures in a given year and current appropriations for expenditure in that year. Reductions in current appropriation bills are in terms of appropriations—not next year's expenditures. The extent to which these reductions will affect 1954 expenditures can be determined only when it is indicated whether they apply to that part of the new appropriation which is for expenditure in the coming year or to that part which is for expenditure in some subsequent year. Limiting next year's expenditures from unexpended balances in old appropriations is equally difficult.

This obstacle in the way of balancing the budget is formidable because present legislative processes do not facilitate action by Congress to control annual expenditures from either current multiyear appropriations now under consideration or those enacted in previous years. However, if Congress desires to exercise such control, it can do so in substantial degree. In addition, if he chooses, the President by Executive order can exercise further expenditure control.

EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

Expenditure reductions totaling $6.8 billion will not come easily, but they can be accomplished with—

1. Action by Congress, so far as it can under present legislative procedures, to limit expenditures from prior appropriations and authorizations;

2. Action by Congress to reduce expenditures in fiscal year 1954 from new appropriations now before it;

3. Action by the President, through Executive order, to accomplish further reductions to hold expenditures to an aggregate not exceeding receipts;

4. A cooperative attitude, and constructive assistance, by all administrative officials of the executive branch toward fulfillment of the administration's promise to balance the budget and reduce taxes.

With such action and attitude, expenditures in fiscal year 1954 can be reduced to $71.8 billion by—

1. Holding military expenditures to the current year's level now estimated at $43 billion, with no reductions in estimated expenditures for major military procurement or uniformed strength (this year's expenditures will be the greatest in history, short of all-out world war);

2. Holding domestic-civilian expenditures to this year's level now estimated at $24 billion, without reneging on any legal or moral commitments under statutory programs, etc.;

3. Holding foreign military assistance expenditures to this year's level now estimated at $4 billion; and

4. Eliminating new commitments for foreign economic aid, and confining expenditures to commitments already under contract, and essential war relief and occupation costs, not exceeding $700 million.

Budget expenditures

[In billions]

Category	Fiscal year 1953 (revised estimates)	Fiscal year 1954		
		Truman estimate	Byrd budget	Decrease in expenditures
Military	$42.9	$45.4	$42.9	$2.5
Domestic-civilian [1]	24.2	25.6	24.2	1.4
Foreign:				
Economic	1.7	2.5	.7	1.8
Military	4.0	5.1	4.0	1.1
Total	72.8	78.6	71.8	6.8

[1] Includes defense-related items, such as atomic energy, for which large commitments have been made previously.

Current and prior money

To accomplish these reductions, as already explained, it will be necessary to restrict expenditures out of both current and prior appropriations. The Truman budget proposed expenditures out of current appropriations totaling $42 billion and expenditures out of prior-year appropriations total-

ing $37 billion. I propose expenditures from current appropriations of $37.5 billion. This is a reduction of $4.5 billion or approximately 10 percent under the Truman request. And I propose expenditures from appropriations enacted in prior years totaling $34.3 billion. This is a reduction of $2.3 billion or about 6 percent.

Overall, my proposed reduction of $6.8 billion represents cuts of less than 10 percent.

In summary, and in comparison with the Truman requests, the reductions I propose—by departments and agencies, and as between expenditures from current and prior appropriations—follow:

Suggested expenditure reductions by departments and agencies (showing estimated unexpended balances)

[In millions of dollars]

Executive departments and agencies	Estimated unexpended balances, June 30, 1953	Truman expenditure request			Byrd budget expenditures			Reductions		
		From prior year appropriations	From current year appropriations	Total	From prior year appropriations	From current year appropriations	Total	From prior year appropriations	From current year appropriations	Total
Executive Office of the President	1	1	7	8	1	7	8			
Independent offices	10,461	2,179	6,607	8,786	2,146	6,217	8,363	33	391	424
Federal Security Agency	624	266	1,638	1,904	263	1,604	1,867	3	34	37
General Services Administration	1,750	806	320	1,126	798	270	1,068	8	50	58
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4,931	255	125	380	243	105	348	12	20	32
Agriculture Department	6,226	1,152	879	2,031	1,152	759	1,911		120	120
Commerce Department	178	99	933	1,032	80	895	975	19	38	57
Defense Department (civil functions)	587	252	388	640	177	275	452	75	113	188
Interior Department	304	211	449	660	183	376	559	28	73	101
Justice Department	28	17	167	184	16	164	180	1	3	4
Labor Department	16	8	313	321	7	277	284	1	36	37
Post Office Department			669	669		500	500		169	169
State Department	105	70	246	316	63	219	282	7	27	34
Treasury Department	2,639	157	7,021	7,178	156	7,009	7,165	1	12	13
Federal payment to District of Columbia			12	12		11	11		1	1
President's emergency funds	1,559	212	47	259	100	1	101	112	46	158
Legislative, Judiciary, and contingent funds	11	6	121	127	6	121	127			
Total, domestic-civilian	29,420	5,689	19,943	25,633	5,389	18,811	24,200	300	1,133	1,433
Department of Defense, military functions	62,319	25,419	19,976	45,395	24,300	18,600	42,900	1,119	1,376	2,495
Foreign assistance	10,525	5,493	2,066	7,559	4,648	52	4,700	845	2,014	2,859
Total	102,264	36,601	41,985	78,587	34,337	37,463	71,800	2,264	4,523	6,787

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and do not necessarily add to totals.

PAYROLL AND PUBLIC WORKS

Of the $6.8 billion expenditure reduction approximately $1 billion would be in civilian payrolls and approximately $1.1 billion would be in public works.

Exclusive of millions of dollars in unbudgeted payroll money being used this year to meet United States Government civilian payrolls abroad, the cost of Federal civilian employment in the current year is estimated at $10.2 billion. For the coming year President Truman requested $10.5 billion. These reductions would allow $9.5 billion.

Exclusive of foreign nationals employed abroad with local currencies available in payments to the Federal Government and other funds not specifically appropriated for personal service, hitherto unbudgeted, the average number of civilians employed by the Federal Government this year is estimated at 2,576,400. President Truman requested an average for the coming year of 2,648,500, an increase of 72,000. These reductions would allow for an average of 2,403,000, a decrease of 245,500 under the Truman request and 173,000 under this year's average.

Of this reduction, 105,000 would be in civilian employment by the Defense Department where Secretary of Defense Wilson has already found 40,000 unnecessary jobs. In addition, sharp employment reductions should result from liquidation or curtailment of programs under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Defense Production Act and foreign economic assistance.

Federal civilian employment and payroll

	1953 estimate		1954 estimate			
			Truman request		Byrd budget	
	Employment	Pay (in millions)	Employment	Pay (in millions)	Employment	Pay (in millions)
Domestic	1,220,700	$5,082	1,252,800	$5,271	1,166,000	$4,825
Military	1,307,200	4,932	1,347,200	4,997	1,202,000	4,480
Foreign assistance	48,500	212	48,500	212	35,000	160
Total	2,576,400	10,226	2,648,500	10,480	2,403,000	9,465
Foreign nationals [1]	280,060	177	126,058	103	99,800	84
Total	2,856,460	10,403	2,774,558	10,583	2,502,800	9,549

[1] Not included in budget prior to 1954.

Reductions in expenditures for new Federal real estate acquisition and public works construction are split about evenly between military and civilian projects. They total approximately a half billion dollars in each category.

No reductions are suggested which would impede efficient and economical construction of Air Force bases at home or abroad necessary to the defense effort.

The reductions do contemplate abandonment of all new nonessential civilian real estate acquisition and public-works construction.

RECEIPTS

In order to meet $71.8 billion in expenditures with the same amount of receipts it would be folly at this time to allow revenue reductions by default. It would be reckless to increase the deficit by still further revenue reductions as proposed in legislation now pending in Congress. No one has worked more than I to hold down taxes through reduction in expenditures. This has not been done. For years we have thrown to the winds Federal fiscal responsibility and economic management, and now the Government of the United States must meet its obligations and at the same time balance its budget. If austerity is required, then austerity it should be. The British and the Canadians have proved that budgets can be balanced and taxes reduced even in these critical years.

I do not propose additional taxes, but it is necessary to maintain the current rate of revenue until further expenditure reductions on the basis of a complete new appraisal can be made by the new administration. This will require immediate positive action by Congress. Such action will not be forthcoming without strong administration influence. Even this would produce tax revenue short of balanced budget requirements.

With this in view I have searched the financial reports of Government corporations and other business-type agencies, into which we previously have dumped billions of taxpayers' money, to determine whether they are now in a position to give up some of these funds in the form of additional miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury to offset deficit spending.

There is no doubt that at least $1 billion could be recaptured from them in the coming fiscal year to achieve a balanced budget in combination with maintaining other revenue and reducing expenditures.

Liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which I have proposed in a bill now pending in the Senate, would go a long way toward producing this billion dollars. This Corporation alone has assets totaling $1.3 billion. Disposal of some of its subsidiary plants is advocated by the President. Government corporations and business-type agencies have assets totaling $41 billion.

CONCLUSIONS

In the current circumstances vast expenditures for military preparedness are absolutely essential and I yield to no one in my desire for a strong national defense as invincible against the threat of Russian aggression as we can make it.

My record in the Senate as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee is proof that throughout my service in Congress I have recognized the importance of making this country militarily strong and that I have done all I could to achieve this objective.

At the same time I have continuously urged the elimination of the terrible waste and inefficiency which has characterized the administration of our Military Establishment for years. But this waste and inefficiency still exists and, as the ammunition shortage investigation has proved, it is now so flagrant that drastic measures must be taken to nail down responsibility, eliminate red tape, and simplify procedure, and enforce efficiency. If this can be accomplished we shall have better defense at a reduction in cost which would run into billions of dollars.

I believe that all of the expenditure reductions I have proposed can be accomplished through efficiency, economy, and elimination of nonessentials; that at least $1 billion can be recovered from Government corporations and business-type agencies without disturbing necessary functions of government; that the people of this Nation are willing to have the current tax rates temporarily maintained to assure natural solvency; and that the Federal budget of the United States for fiscal year 1954 can be balanced.

Balancing the Federal budget is the foremost domestic problem of the Eisenhower administration and it is competent of fulfilling its promise to the Nation if it will act now with resolution and courage.

For the first time in many long years those advising the President are individuals successfully experienced in business and in progress through efficiency and economy. Above all, the President of the United States is pledged to a balanced budget, and I know he means it. To assist him in keeping this pledge he has enlisted the services of Mr. Joseph M. Dodge, a man preeminently qualified to direct the Federal budget, who has dedicated himself to this vital task.

To change Federal administration from unconscionable waste to frugality and efficiency is, of course, difficult. But it should challenge this administration, not discourage it.

It means ripping up profligate policies which have become ingrained and entrenched throughout the land in the so-called national economy. It necessarily will involve withdrawal of Federal support from those things which the people themselves properly should support without Washington meddling. We must not be deterred by the grumblings of a few. We must be encouraged by the knowledge that the people understand fiscal soundness is essential to their security.

The people know this, and they want the national solvency preserved. They have indicated this desire, not only in the presidential election but also in the Gallup and other polls which have developed overwhelming majorities for a balanced budget before tax reduction.

In addition to other recommendations, in the interest of sound fiscal policies and procedures, I would further propose:

1. The return to State and localities of Federal programs which properly should be administered and paid for by them; this subject has been referred by the President to a special commission for study;

2. Reevaluation, on the basis of thorough and complete review, of all of the obligations against unexpended balances, rescission of those which are not firm commitments for essential programs and projects, and the return, as nearly as possible, to a budget based on annual appropriations to meet annual expenditures;

3. Adoption by Congress of the so-called single appropriation bill procedure for enacting Federal appropriations, such as I have introduced in the Senate, whereby the country and the Congress may easily see appropriations as a whole, whereby Congress will regain control over Federal obligations, and under which current estimates of receipts would be set forth in appropriation bills along with appropriations to be enacted and commitments to be made; and

4. Congressional action authorizing the President to exercise the item veto against nonessential appropriations.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio, for a question only.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, merely for the information of the Senate, is it the intention of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota to seek a vote on the pending amendment this afternoon? Many Senators have asked me. They are anxious to be in committee, or are otherwise engaged. I am quite prepared to vote, but I did not know what the Senators had in mind.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that the author of the amendment be permitted to reply. I assume, then, I would immediately resume my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may yield to the Senator from Illinois for the purpose of a reply, without losing the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope we may proceed to vote very speedily on this amendment, after its contents are understood and have been discussed. It is neither the intention of the Senator from Illinois nor the intention of any one of us to delay action. We are ready to stay here all night long, and, if necessary, until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, in order to present amendment after amendment. Mr. President, before the Senate votes to give away $300 billion, Senators had better know what they are doing; and they should also reduce the size of the giveaway, if possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand the technique suggested by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, it is that he is going to present one amendment here after another, and ask for a vote on the various amendments. That is entirely agreeable to me. I have no intention whatever of moving to lay on the table an amendment I have not even seen and have been unable to read, up to the present moment. But I thoroughly approve, if the Senator wishes to present amendment after amendment, and to take vote after vote. That procedure is entirely agreeable to me, and Senators are advised that they had better be prepared for such votes from time to time. I may say my own intention is to have the Senate remain in session until about 10 o'clock, and then to recess for the night.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question, without prejudice to my right to the floor.

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

Mr. MORSE. I desire to ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to make a half-minute statement, without in any way jeopardizing the rights of the Senator from Minnesota. I think the majority leader is entitled, in view of his comment, to have that half-minute statement from me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Senator from Oregon be permitted to speak for 2 minutes, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that I have some constituents in my office, I would inquire how long, after the 2 minutes allotted to the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Minnesota intends to speak.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not too long, I may say. I have no prepared script.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Would the Senator say that would be about 2 or 3 hours?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, less than that, I would say. I think the Senator from Virginia will be able to see his constituents and to entertain them with good southern hospitality.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand from the Senator from Illinois that the votes are to be merely a part of an educational process, a process which has already lasted a little more than 3 weeks. I did not know how much we were going to be educated on this new basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that we are trying to ascertain, in view of the arithmetical proportions which the majority leader gave us a while ago as to the number of words which have been spoken, how much a word will cost in terms of the great giveaway which is sought to be consummated here. It will require a little time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia is becoming somewhat disturbed by the reiteration of the statement that $300 billion is going to be given away. If repeated often enough, someone is going to believe it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is a possibility of that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon, under the request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will not need 2 minutes. I think the Senator from Minnesota is quite correct. We have before us now a very long and complicated amendment. We need time to study it. I do not see how we can possibly get to a vote on it by 10 o'clock tonight. It needs to be discussed, and I think the discussion will take until 10 o'clock tonight, so that we will have the amendment in condition to enable us to know whether we want to vote on it tomorrow. I would not want to give the impression that we are going to have an early vote on the amendment, this evening, because we can very well discuss it until 10 o'clock.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Do I correctly understand that we will not reach a vote tonight?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would not want to make a prediction as to what the Senate is going to do.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was asking for the Senator's understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to be most courteous and charitable to the Senator from South Carolina, who is a man whom I very much admire.

Mr. MAYBANK. I also have some constituents awaiting me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say to the Senator that he will have plenty of time to talk with his constituents.

Mr. MAYBANK. And then come back?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I cannot predict what other Senators are going to do. I do not intend to discuss the amendment until 10 o'clock, but I do intend to discuss the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

As I understand it, it will leave the 3-mile limit originally applied in the territorial seas under the jurisdiction of the respective States, but all areas beyond the 3-mile limit, generally known as the Continental Shelf, will be under the complete authority, ownership, and jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and all royalties, bonuses, or revenues thereof——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Minnesota please suspend until we have order in the Senate? Let there be order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was saying that all royalties, revenues, and bonuses will be within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. In other words, those revenues will be dedicated to a trust fund as outlined under the general purview and purposes of the Hill amendment.

So, Mr. President, what we have before us in the Douglas amendment is a recognition of the 3-mile limit as being under the title and ownership of the respective States, and the Continental Shelf as being under the complete jurisdiction, ownership, and control of the Federal Government.

The provision referring to the Continental Shelf, Mr. President, is what the Attorney General asked to have included in the measure, but it was not included. The Attorney General asked for specific, precise, and unmistakable language as to the rights and prerogatives of the Federal Government in what is known as the Continental Shelf, or beyond the 3-mile limit.

I want to make it crystal clear, also, Mr. President, that the Douglas amendment does not recognize the alleged historic boundaries of Texas and Florida. It does not include 3 leagues. It limits itself to 3 miles.

That is a very definite point of difference between many of us in the Senate. There are those who believe that the so-called historic boundaries should be fully recognized and accepted. There are others who believe that the 3-mile limit is the most that any State could possibly claim under the law. There are still others of us who believe that the 3-mile limit is under control of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, it is my intention during the period of my discussion of the amendment to analyze some of the debate which has taken place this afternoon and to direct it to the objectives which have been outlined by the Senator from Illinois.

First of all, I was very much surprised at the debate this afternoon by the majority leader. I listened attentively as the majority leader replied to our distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I have great regard for the majority leader as a lawyer, and I regret to say—and I say it in all respect for his attributes, his qualities, his integrity, and his knowledge of the law—that the majority leader either has not studied the measure and what it indicates and what it provides for within its confines, or, if he has studied it, he has not studied the law which pertains to legislation concerning submerged lands or court decisions concerning submerged lands. He made very sweeping statements. He talked about confirming the rights of the States in the areas of submerged lands. He talked about the fact that there are a number of Supreme Court cases which indicate beyond all doubt that the States do have rights in the submerged lands under the sea. He said that had been a continuing doctrine of the Supreme Court, and he said it was a decision of the Supreme Court in 1907 that overruled the decisions of prior years.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that the majority leader used the expression "navigable waters" to mean any navigable waters, which could extend all the way to Europe?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Arkansas is correct. The Senator from Ohio used the terms "submerged lands" and "navigable waters," indicating that the term "navigable waters" is synonymous with the term "territorial seas"; that the term "submerged lands" is identical with and analogous to submerged lands under the territorial seas.

One who has studied the court decisions, legal precedents, and the history of our Nation knows that that is not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that to use the language "navigable waters" without any regard whatever to the 3-mile limit, which has been the historic boundary from the days of Thomas Jefferson, if not before, would leave the proposed legislation wide open, and would indicate that the majority leader approves of that situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would be my general understanding. What is more, Mr. President, it is my intention, as soon as some of my documentation arrives which I worked out some time ago, to discuss the majority leader's analysis of the history of the 3-mile limit and its application to States and to show that his analysis was based on either a figment of the imagination or on prejudice, because when he used the words interchangeably in the same paragraph and quoted from great international jurists, he knew the word "states" referred to nation states and did not refer to provinces or States as we know them within the Union.

Mr. President, I am shocked, amazed, and alarmed that the majority leader should know no more about the system of our Government than to make the statements which he made. In all my life I never heard a worse argument. I have never heard one versed in the law who so completely confused the issues. I sat here in amazement and wondered as I listened to one of the distinguished law-

yers of the country recite not the law but give a political speech, a continuation of a campaign. We are not talking about an election and we are not saying to the Supreme Court that it should listen to the result of an election. If the courts of the United States are to listen to the results of elections, then I fear that justice as America knows it is through. The courts are supposed to be above elections; they are not supposed to be listening to the results of the ballot box. When I heard the Senator from Ohio say that this question had been settled in the election, it amounted, in my opinion, to a denial of justice, because one of the reasons for a judicial system is to protect the rights of the people. One of the reasons for a judicial system such as we have is to see that justice prevails and not simply that election results prevail.

I was amazed to observe the kind of doctrine being enunciated in the United States Senate as justification for the passage of the joint resolution. It is my intention to go through the majority leader's speech word by word. I shall not indulge in fiction, nor shall I indulge in legend or myth. I shall state the law and the cases. I shall recite from the record of international law. I shall submit to the majority leader for his study—and I submit they need some study—the facts in relation to the equal-footing clause.

For example, I remember the majority leader said that the resolution of admission of Texas gave Texas some special rights. It did not. The Senator from Illinois discussed, hour upon hour, the resolution of admission of Texas. The Senator from Illinois pointed out that the resolution of admission of Texas permitted Texas to enter the Union on an equal footing with the original 13 States.

I was amazed also to hear the Senator from Ohio state that the Thirteen Original States had the 3-mile limit. Has he not read Justice Story's Commentaries? Has he not read the decision of Justice Sutherland in the case of United States against Curtiss-Wright? What kind of law is it the majority leader recites? It was not law; it was nothing more than politics which I heard from the majority leader this afternoon. As a lawyer, he knows that Justice Story's Commentaries on the Constitution gives not one bit of backing to the claim he made on the floor of the Senate.

Furthermore, he knows that the leading case on the subject of the great sovereign power of the Federal Republic, United States against Curtiss Wright, vests in the sovereign absolute sovereignty, so far as foreign affairs are concerned, and so far as activities upon the seas are concerned. The sovereignty is not in the States, but it is in the Nation.

What is more, the Senator from Ohio knows that, according to great international jurists and historians, the States at the time of the Continental Congress did not come into the Federation of States separately. They came in, as Justice Story said, as a whole, as an entirety, or as an entity, and that the Continental Congress from its very beginning proclaimed sovereignty as the chief body of government over "these United States."

The Declaration of Independence proclaims "these United States."

The United States is an entity, a whole, an entirety, as a concept of sovereign power.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that when the Constitution was adopted, Rhode Island by almost a year was the last State to ratify the Constitution and that Congress in the meantime passed a law to permit Rhode Island to bring its goods duty free into the United States for a limited period of time, with the understanding that that law would expire, and that thereafter Rhode Island would be treated as a foreign power, unless Rhode Island decided she wanted to join the Union?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am aware of the fact. I am also aware of the fact that Rhode Island came into the Union on an equal footing with the Thirteen Original States.

Since apparently very few Senators heard my original statement, I shall again review the whole background of equal footing from the time of the constitutional convention up to the present day.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Then I take it that the Senator, if not agreeing with those facts, does not believe Rhode Island was an independent nation until she decided she was going to join the United States of America?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Rhode Island was never recognized as an independent nation. She was recognized as one of the members of the Continental Congress and recognized as one of the members of the Confederation under the Articles of Confederation. When Rhode Island came into the Union in 1790, one year after the 12th State to ratify the Constitution, she was required, under the Constitution, to come in with no more rights, privileges, or opportunities than were accorded any other State of the Union. She came into the Union on an equal footing. Rhode Island was never recognized by any of the nations on earth as a sovereign nation. She never proclaimed her independence; she never proclaimed that she had sovereign power; she never insisted on the exchange of ambassadors.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. In the course of the Senator's argument, will he be so kind as to refer to the tenth amendment of the United States Constitution and to the second article of the Articles of Confederation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall refer to the tenth amendment of the Constitution, commonly known as the great Federal system amendment. I do not recall the exact words, but, in effect, it provides that all powers not herein delegated to the National, or Federal, Government, are reserved to the States and the people thereof. That is what the great tenth amendment to the Constitution provides.

However, when I read from the Federalist Papers of Alexander Hamilton, I pointed out that article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which creates the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, when it relates to cases between the States and the Federal Government, was the article and was the provision which set up a judiciary to protect the integrity of the Federal system, to see to it that such matters did not become political questions, but that they became matters which were subject to adjudication in court.

As Alexander Hamilton pointed out, the great power struggle continued among the States during the period of the Revolutionary War, and during the time of the Articles of Confederation. The purpose of the Constitution was to put an end to the power struggle and to grant equal rights and privileges to the States and the Federal Government by the establishment of a Federal judiciary, with original jurisdiction vested in a Supreme Court to protect the integrity of the Federal Government.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. The language of the 10th amendment to the Constitution reads:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

In light of that language, how does the Senator argue that the Federal Government has powers other than those which were delegated by the Constitution?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall tell the Senator why. It is by reason of the fact that the Government of the United States is a sovereign power, as I believe Justice Sutherland pointed out. I shall have my cases here in a moment. Justice Sutherland pointed out that even had there been no Constitution, even had there been no Declaration of Independence, the fact that there was an intention of action carried with it attributes of sovereignty, carried with it sovereign power, which was not at any time ever to be deeded away or given away, insofar as the foreign relations, the carrying on of war, the power to negotiate treaties, to conduct business, and to have jurisdiction over the general territorial security of the United States, were concerned. That was the purpose of establishing the 3-mile limit.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that whatever may be the argument concerning control over the waters inside the 3-mile limit, beyond the 3-mile limit is the international domain, where individual States do not have the power to deal with foreign nations, but where only the United States, as such, can deal with foreign nations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. That was one of the main purposes of the Constitution. We know that at the time of the Annapolis convention and the Mount Vernon conference, prior to the meeting in Philadelphia for the purpose of holding a constitutional convention, the separate States were beginning to make separate deals with foreign powers. We know that there were trade wars among the States. Tariff barriers were being established. What does the Constitution do, above all things? It establishes the dominant jurisdiction of the Central Government, the Federal Government, insofar as interstate commerce is concerned, and it proclaims the jurisdiction of the Federal Government insofar as the negotiation of treaties and, as we generally term it, the conduct of our foreign affairs, are concerned.

Mr. President, I shall point out, now that I have my documentation before me, that there is no Member of the Senate, nor is there any jurist of any credibility, who has ever denied that this country is a nation; that it has what are known as sovereign powers insofar as external matters are concerned.

It is always questionable if any power has jurisdiction over the seas, but if any power has, it is the Federal Government, or the Central Government, which represents the entire Nation; it is not its separate parts.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator mean to argue that there is a law superior to the Constitution of the United States, even in connection with the power of the United States as a sovereign?

Does not the Senator know that there is an early case in the Supreme Court of the United States in which it was expressly held, in answer to an argument similar to that advanced by the Senator from Minnesota, that there was no superior law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not say to my good friend from Mississippi that there was any superior law. What the Senator from Minnesota was discussing was the philosophical or legal basis of what we call sovereign power so far as external matters are concerned. What do we mean by sovereign power? What is the concept of sovereignty of a central government? Great jurists and international lawyers have said that even if it were never mentioned in the Constitution, the fact is that a nation does have sovereign power, so far as the law between the nations is concerned.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield further, perhaps that would be covered by the established clauses in the Constitution with relation to implied powers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I ask if the Senator from Mississippi is asking a question or making a comment.

Mr. STENNIS. I intend to ask a question. The Senator yielded only for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator does not make the argument, then, that there is a superior law, or that there are superior powers, over and beyond the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator does not make such an argument, I will not challenge him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. The Senator from Minnesota was trying to trace—and I shall do it in a moment—what he considered to be the concept of sovereignty and sovereign power which the Federal Government exercises in the territorial and marginal seas.

I have before me some of the remarks made this afternoon by the majority leader. I note first of all that the majority leader attributes to those of us who oppose Senate Joint Resolution 13 900,000 words. He says that is the approximate number of words spoken up to Friday night, and represents the equivalent of the contents of six books of substantial size. He goes on to say that 150,000 words are usually considered to represent a pretty good sized book. He also makes note of the fact that those who have supported Senate Joint Resolution 13 have spoken 190,526 words.

Let me correct the RECORD by pointing out that those who oppose the joint resolution have spoken 708,855 words. What that means, I do not know, except to say that someone has apparently spent the money of the Government and taken the time to count the number of words spoken. If that is supposed to be a germane argument as to the merits of the respective cases, I fail to see it.

The truth is that not enough words have been spoken on this subject, because if enough words had been spoken on the subject, knowing that the Members who constitute the Senate are persons of reason, persons who will listen and make decisions on the basis of facts, I know that if the facts were presented to all the Members of the Senate, there is no doubt in my mind that those facts would lead to the conclusion that, at the very minimum, our decision should be in favor of the Douglas amendment. Basically the Anderson amendment is what our position should be.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator think it would be fair to include in the words spoken by the proponents of the joint resolution all the words spoken during the last political campaign? They were the words which really carried weight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not only were they words which carried weight, but they were words which were carried over nationwide television shows. They were words which were carried over the radio. They were words which were carried in the press of the country. They were words which had been repeated during the previous 7, 8, or 9 years. They were words which had been editorialized, words which had been used in journalistic media, in radio, and in television. They were words which had been used in person-to-person, and organization-to-organization campaigns of propaganda.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would not the Senator agree, if it is significant, that on balance he would estimate that certainly more words had been spoken in favor of the joint resolution, to confuse the public, than had been spoken here in explanation of it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say that is correct. I point out to the Senator from Arkansas that little or nothing was printed about this great issue until charges were made of filibustering in the Senate. I thank the majority leader for making the charge, because once he charged us with filibustering, then, at least, something appeared in the newspapers. Finally the people heard that something was going on. This has been the biggest hush-hush project in Washington. Talk about the Iron Curtain. What about the paper curtain, which kept the news away from the American people, news that something was happening down here which would fundamentally alter the American policy which has been followed over the past 175 years?

According to the State Department, when we alter the 3-mile limit we alter a basic policy of the Government of the United States. When we extent the boundaries of this country beyond 3 miles, according to the State Department, we are involving the Government of the United States in great international troubles and difficulties.

Let us see what else has been said here. The majority leader went on to chastise us for having taken so much time to speak so many words. Let me chastise the majority leader for being a party to a policy and a program for giving away the birthright of the American people today, and of unborn generations of Americans. What we are talking about here is not how many words have been spoken, but how many billions of dollars of natural resources are to be turned over to a handful of people, as compared with 160 million American people. The majority leader can talk all day and all night about how many words were spoken, but he is not going to hush anyone until we make it crystal clear that the burden for the responsibility of turning over these fabulous resources of the submerged lands rests squarely on the back of the majority leader and those who follow him.

Make no mistake about it. I have just returned from a 2-day visit to my home State. I regret that I must remain here tonight. Tonight I should be present at a gathering where 1,500 parents and teachers are meeting, in a suburb of the city of Minneapolis. I was ready to board a plane at 5 o'clock, and canceled my reservation at the last minute, because I felt that my responsibility was

here. A minimum of 1,500 people are meeting in that community tonight. I was told that 2,500 would be present, but I cut it down to 1,500 to be safe, and on the conservative side.

For what purpose are they meeting? They are there to support the Hill amendment, upon which we never had a chance to vote in the Senate, because of a clever parliamentary maneuver.

Cleverness may have its place in parliamentary halls but the American people are not asking for cuteness and cleverness. They are asking today for forthright decisions.

I submit that what the American people want today is a crusade. That was what we were told. This is a fine crusade. This crusade stopped dead short when it reached the Senate. We never even had an opportunity to vote upon an issue which some of us thought represented a crusade—funds for education for American children.

I am very much perturbed. The budget of the Office of Education comes to us with no money in it for school construction. Yet the state-of-the-Union message talked about the importance of school construction. Here is an amendment which would provide large sums of money for school construction, and we are not even permitted to vote on it. We are told that we cannot vote upon it because the rules make it possible to evade a vote.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator realize that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] accepted the Hill amendment to the Anderson amendment prior to the time the vote occurred, and that therefore the vote on the Anderson amendment included the Hill amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I realize exactly what the Senator from New Mexico did. He did it just about as willingly as someone behind the iron curtain signs a confession. What choice did he have? He was told that that was it. He was told that, whether he liked it or not, that was the way it was going to be done. He was told, "We are not going to vote on the Hill amendment." That is what the Senator from Alabama was told repeatedly this afternoon. He was told, "If you want a vote on the Hill amendment, put it in with the Anderson amendment."

There were Senators who did not go all the way down the line with the Anderson amendment. There were some who did not like every aspect of the Hill amendment. So we bundled them together in one package, and were told "Now vote." I submit that although that may be legal, and many things are legal——

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

What is legal is what the law says is legal, but that does not necessarily mean that it is ethical, and it does not necessarily mean that that is the way we ought to conduct the business of the Senate. I say that if the administration is to be moved by a great desire for a crusade, the best place to start it is right here in the legislative chambers.

We did not do much crusading this afternoon. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not absolutely correct to say that if the Hill amendment had been adopted by a separate vote and made a part of the Anderson substitute, rather than made a part of it by the act of the Senator from New Mexico himself in accepting it, the next vote would have been a vote on the Anderson amendment, as amended, by the addition of the Hill amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is right.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the fact of the matter is that the vote we have just had is a vote which we would have reached after a separate expression on the Hill amendment, which was made unnecessary by the acceptance of the Hill amendment by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] as a modification of his own substitute is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; that is not right. I may say to my friend the Senator from Florida that he may have added it up arithmetically and statistically and on the basis of logic, and thus made it seem right. It seems to me that the psychological significance of having a separate vote on the Hill amendment was very important. There are a number of Senators who would have liked to vote on the Hill amendment, because they would have had an opportunity to cast a vote for the principle of dedicating funds derived from natural resources to education throughout the 48 States.

It was an issue on its own. It was an issue that had been brought to the attention of the American people. It is an issue that was discussed over the radio, in the press, in pamphlets, and in magazines. But we never had a chance to vote on it.

Perhaps the vote would not have been much different, but in view of the strength revealed by the test vote—and apparently that strength was known by the majority leader before the vote, because he knew the amendment would be defeated—the least that we should have done was to proceed in an orderly manner.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Minnesota realize that he would have had an opportunity to vote on the Hill amendment exactly the way he wanted to vote on it, if he and the other proponents of the Hill amendment had stopped talking at any time within the past 2 weeks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There was no unanimous-consent agreement arrived at to the effect that we would vote at 3 o'clock today. There was a sort of gentlemen's understanding that we would possibly get around to voting at 3 o'clock. But I could not keep up with the majority leader. He kept changing the date for voting, and it was impossible to know on what day we would vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that, although the majority leader kept altering the date when he would make the motion to table, from the beginning he made it clear that he was going to move to table the Anderson amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does it not also follow, therefore, that no matter when we had finished the discussion the vote would always have been on the Anderson amendment, just as it was?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not further true the reason why the Senator from Ohio refused to make a motion earlier was because he did not have his full strength on the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe there can be much doubt about that.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. If the time was more to the advantage of the opponents of the joint resolution and proponents of the Hill amendment to vote immediately, why did they not stop talking, so we could have voted at a time when they had more of their adherents on the floor and fewer of the opponents of the Hill amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In reply to the Senator from Louisiana asking why, I will say it is because we thought we were proceeding in an orderly manner. The pending amendment was the Hill amendment.

Generally, when an amendment is pending, the Senate can depend that a vote will first be taken on it. I am not saying that what was done was not legal. It was certainly within the rules of the Senate. I wish to say merely that there were a number of us who wanted to vote on the Hill amendment, and I submit that we did not have a chance to vote on the Hill amendment. We voted on the Anderson amendment plus the Hill amendment, which surely is not voting on just the Hill amendment.

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

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that many of us rose and appealed directly to the majority leader for a separate vote on the 2 amendments, and we were repulsed, even though it was perfectly clear that there were in excess of 32 or 33 Senators who wished the 2 amendments to be voted on separately?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from New York is correct. The issue was very sharply and clearly stated by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to the majority leader. I was present during the colloquy. I made the parliamentary inquiry as to what was the pending question, and the Vice President replied to the Senator from Minnesota that the

pending question was on the Hill amendment. In my rather naive understanding, I accepted the fact that the pending amendment was the Hill amendment and that that would be the amendment to be acted on.

Of course, there are rules and there are "gimmicks," and I submit that the majority leader knows the rules, and knows them well. Therefore, he proceeded to move to table the Anderson amendment, to which the Hill amendment was to be affixed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree with the Senator from New York that it is a most unusual proceeding in the Senate to kill a child amendment by killing the parent amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is certainly most unusual. I suppose it has been done before. However, in this particular instance, we should have expected, since the Hill amendment had been the subject of such lengthy discussion, that we would have an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota is aware of the fact that a study of the procedure, conducted by a man in whom I have the greatest confidence, discloses that the latest time in which the device was used was in 1890—63 years ago?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not familiar with that fact. If that is the case, I am pleased to have the information in the RECORD. I am saying that, on the basis of the rules, the majority leader has complied with the rules. The rules provide many opportunities for parliamentary strategy and tactics.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, on the basis of what I considered to be sound performance—I mean by that an opportunity to give the Senate a chance to vote on each amendment—it was unfortunate that the majority leader insisted upon combining the Anderson and Hill amendments.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the majority leader, as a matter of complete candor, a few days ago, about the middle of last week, informed the Senate that he proposed to make a motion to lay on the table the Anderson substitute, and that at the same time he gave the notice he stated that of course the Senator from Alabama could withdraw his amendment if he wanted to do so, or the Senator from New Mexico could adopt the Hill amendment, if he wanted to do so, and that he had no objection to either course being followed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must say it was very gracious of him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did he not give complete and frank notice as to what he intended to do days ago, for the information of the Senate and the public, and is it not a fact that such information was known to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say that the explanation undoubtedly complies with what is contained in the RECORD. Is it not generous of the majority leader to say, "You can always withdraw the amendment"? We do not have to be reminded of it. We know it. But was it not generous of him to say that we would vote on the Anderson substitute? I am saying that the pending business before the Senate was the Hill amendment. I submit that under the rules of the game it would be ordinarily accepted that we were to vote on the pending business, whether it was by voice vote, or division, or rollcall.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas is not as familiar with the rules of the Senate as is the Senator from Minnesota. However, would it not have been possible for the Senator from Minnesota to obtain a vote on the Hill amendment at any time before the motion to table was made today, if the proponents of the Hill amendment had been willing to stop talking and have a vote?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Apparently it was not possible, because the majority leader insisted all the way through that he was going to do what he did do.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not the Senator from Minnesota recall that the majority leader gave notice that he was going to make a motion to lay the Anderson substitute on the table, and that it would automatically carry with it the Hill amendment, unless the Hill amendment had been voted on before Monday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before Monday?

Mr. DANIEL. Before Monday. Before today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I may say to the Senator that there was no unanimous-consent agreement about any of this. The majority leader announced what he did. As a matter of fact, we could have prevented the majority leader from making his motion today if we wanted to do so. Let us face the issue. The majority leader merely stated that we were going to vote today at 3 o'clock. He did not get a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect. What he got was the respect and confidence of those of us who are in opposition to the joint resolution, to the effect that when the hour of 3 o'clock came, we were prepared to vote. However, had we known that we would not be able to vote on the Hill amendment, there would have been a different attitude shown on our part. No one was of the opinion that we could not vote on the Hill amendment.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why does the Senator now say that the Senators who voted as they did on the amendment did not know that they were not going to be able to vote on the Hill amendment, when it was stated last week that the motion to table would be with reference to the Anderson amendment, and that under the rule it would carry the Hill amendment with it? Why does the Senator from Minnesota say that he did not know that he would not get an opportunity to vote on the Hill amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I can only speak for what I know myself.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the Senator from Minnesota is speaking for other Senators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I can speak only for what I myself know. I did not know that I was not going to have an opportunity to vote on the Hill amendment. It was for that reason that I returned here today and left an engagement that I was supposed to fulfill.

The Senator from Michigan may be able to read the minds of some persons, but he cannot read my mind.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that, and I would not attempt to read the mind of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is out of order. Does he wish to ask a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did not the Senator from Minnesota say that "we"—referring to those who were voting with him—did not know they were not going to be able to vote on the Hill amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I assumed from my conversation with my colleagues. But, speaking precisely and definitely, I can only say what was definitely in my own mind. I asked the question today because I wanted to know why we were being denied the opportunity to vote on that amendment—not that it is a fundamental issue.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. When did the Senator from Minnesota first know there would be a motion to lay on the table the Anderson amendment in the nature of a substitute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I heard about it a week ago, but the time stated kept being changed. The majority leader gave us several notices about it, but finally he said the vote would be taken on Monday, about 3 o'clock. However, that was no assurance that we would vote then, because last week the majority leader said we would vote on Friday, but we did not; he changed his mind.

Mr. FERGUSON. That being true, if the Senator from Minnesota did not know the rule of the Senate, it would have been an easy matter, would it not, for him to have inquired from the Parliamentarian as to whether a vote on the Anderson amendment carried with it the Hill amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is exactly what I was trying to find out earlier this afternoon.

Mr. President, I may not be an expert on the rules of the Senate, but I wish to say that I look like a flaming genius on the rules, as compared with the knowledge of the law that the majority leader revealed this afternoon when he discussed this case; and I am about to explain why.

Let us see what the majority leader had to say.

His first comments were directed toward the extensiveness of the debate; and with accuracy he tabulated the number of words which had been spoken—as if that matter were of any relevancy to the merits of the issue that is the subject of the debate.

Then the majority leader said:

> The Anderson amendment admits title of the Great Lakes States to approximately 38 million acres of land lying in the Great Lakes well beyond the 3-mile limit.

Mr. President, all the Anderson amendment does is to confirm what the Supreme Court has already ruled. The Holland joint resolution confirms the ownership on the part of the Great Lakes States to the land under the Great Lakes.

So I do not see that that is a very positive statement on the part of the majority leader, except that it was said positively—as if, somehow or another, that meant that some persons were getting better things out of life than others were.

I repeat that all the amendments did—namely, the sections pertaining to the Great Lakes and to the submerged lands thereunder—was to attempt to write into statutory law what has been decided upon by court law, which is not an unusual practice.

Then the majority leader referred to the Anderson amendment and said:

> It also acknowledges title in the inland States to 27 million acres lying under inland waters.

That is right, Mr. President; and that is what the Supreme Court decisions have done throughout the years, beginning in 1845, if I correctly recall the date. I think there have been approximately 50 decisions to that effect, and they have not departed from the general theme or the central core of the law, to the effect that the States have title to the lands under the inland waters and under the waters of the lakes, and, likewise, to the land under the rivers.

As the Senator from Illinois pointed out, the Illinois Central case is the key case so far as the Great Lakes are concerned. In that case the State of Illinois was told that not only did it have title but it was a trustee, and could not divest itself of that trust.

So the majority leader was not giving anyone any news; what he said then was just about as new as Ben Franklin's almanac.

Then the majority leader pointed out that the Anderson amendment "provides that the 17 million acres along the coast within the 3-mile limit shall go to the Federal Government, not to the States."

Then the majority leader stated:

> It does not seem to me to be very fair treatment.

Mr. President, that statement was not germane to the issue. The land within the States is recognized as belonging to the States. It has been recognized as belonging to the States ever since the beginning of our Republic. But the lands under the waters outside the States have never been recognized as belonging to the States. Those lands have been recognized as being under Federal jurisdiction; at least, the lands beneath the territorial waters have been proclaimed as being under Federal jurisdiction. Of course, the documentation on this point has been cited in the extensive debate.

Perhaps if the majority leader had listened to the extensive debate, he would not have made his speech.

Then the majority leader said:

> Of course, I recognize the inducement that is made to those of us who come from the Great Lakes States. However, I do not understand how that in any way affects the basic principles upon which we should base our decision.

Neither do I, Mr. President, because the issue relating to the Great Lakes States is a separate issue. The Court has ruled on it separately, and has ruled that the Great Lakes are inland seas. Of course the Court has ruled that the Great Lakes have the characteristics of open seas, but the Court has ruled that they are inland seas.

As I pointed out the other day, monkeys have some of the characteristics of people, but that does not make monkeys people. Similarly, the references, in connection with this issue, to the fact that the Great Lakes have the characteristics of open seas, does not make those lakes open seas.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that a case cited by the very able junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], namely, the Rodgers case, which he cited in support of his contention that the Great Lakes are open seas, was an admiralty case which has nothing whatever to do with the question of submerged lands?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I recall that we discussed that point at some length, at the time when the Senator from Illinois presented his affirmative case in behalf of the Anderson amendment and the Hill amendment.

Later on, at the time of my discussion of the inland waters and the Great Lakes, in particular, that case was again brought up, for further discussion.

Of course, I acknowledge that all this material is in the RECORD. It is a matter of common knowledge; it is a matter of law. It is difficult for me to understand how the majority leader can say that the Supreme Court has been right for 100 years—that is what he said; he said the Supreme Court had made during the past 100 years the many, many decisions to which reference has been made, but that the Supreme Court has been wrong since 1947.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in 1947 the Supreme Court for the first time faced the question of the ownership of the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark, and that the California case was completely distinct and different from all the other 50-some cases which had related either to the tidelands proper or to the submerged lands under inland waters?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is exactly correct, and I thank the Senator from Illinois, because I shall point that out.

Later the majority leader refused to acknowledge that difference and refused to acknowledge that the first time the Court had ruled precisely and definitely upon the submerged lands under the territorial or marginal seas was in the California case in 1947. I shall note where the majority leader indicated by his statement that the Court had ruled many times before. The majority leader went on to say:

> Several times before Congress has determined that the States should be the real owners of the submerged lands within their historic boundaries. They had such ownership in 1946 before the Supreme Court opinion.

Oh, no, they did not, Mr. President. It is not ownership—merely a claim. Many persons move on other people's property and use it, and say, "This is ours." That is why people get into court. Litigants go to court in order to settle questions like that. Squatter's rights do not necessarily mean that one has legal rights to a particular property. Possession may be nine-tenths of the law, but it is not all of it.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Constitution, in article I, deals with the composition of powers of the legislative branch; in article II, with the composition and powers of the executive branch; and in article III, with the judiciary?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not further true that, by section 2, article III, of the Constitution, the judicial power was granted the final determination of property disputes (a) involving the Federal Government, (b) between States, and (c) between States and foreign powers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. His analysis of the constitutional provisions is appropriate and very germane to the present argument. Now, Mr. President, the majority leader, referring to the States, said:

> They had ownership before the Supreme Court opinion, and they had it after the Supreme Court opinion.

He then states:

> Mr. President, it is not a new issue. It has been considered by previous Congresses.

He goes on to say they have reaffirmed possession to the States. But, Mr. President, the Court in the California case said:

> None of the foregoing cases, nor others which we have decided, are sufficient to require us to extend the Pollard inland-water rule so as to declare that California owns or has paramount rights in or power over the 3-mile belt under the ocean.

Mr. President, the Court says in that ruling that in none of the cases that were before the Court for consideration before 1947 had there been any decision which extended the inland water rule to the submerged lands under the open seas. Yet the majority leader today makes the flat statement that the inland water rule of the courts does apply to the submerged lands of the open seas. I submit it was good rhetoric, but poor law. It was stated positively, but it is

positively wrong. It is about time we labeled the statement for what it is. I am going right down through the statement of the Senator from Ohio. I never heard such an argument, and I intend to make my rebuttal now, while it is still fresh and hot.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the impression of the Senator from Minnesota, from listening to the distinguished majority leader, that the majority leader gave the impression that the junior Senator from Oregon favored the Court-packing plan in 1937?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I got that impression.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Minnesota yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Minnesota be very much surprised if the junior Senator from Oregon had been for the Court-packing plan in 1937?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would be very much surprised. This Senator would be very much surprised if the Senator from Oregon was for the plan.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Minnesota be pleased to know that in 1937 the junior Senator from Oregon was opposed to the Court-packing plan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to hear that the Senator makes his position perfectly clear. I thought it had been clear. It seems to me that on other occasions I have heard the Senator from Oregon referring to the judicial system. I think I have heard him refer to the Court-packing plan. I recall having heard him refer to it at the time of our debates on the Steel case.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Minnesota be pleased to know that in 1937, when the junior Senator from Oregon was dean of the Oregon University School of Law, he made clear, time and time again, that he thought the packing of the Supreme Court could not be reconciled with government by law, but constituted government by men?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to hear the Senator make his position clear on that question again. But I may point out to my friend from Oregon that there are other ways to pack the Court, too; and one way to pack the Court is to pack it a wallop in its legal solar plexus, which is exactly what we are about to do through the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13. The Supreme Court will go down faster than Jim Corbett went down.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Minnesota, if and when he reaches that part of the remarks of the majority leader, the transcript of which he has before him, and which remarks, therefore, I have not had an opportunity to check, read to the Senator from Oregon the comment of the majority leader, which was made when I did not have the good fortune to hear him, referring to the junior Senator from Oregon, so that the junior Senator from Oregon may know exactly what the majority leader said, in order to make certain that he does the majority leader no injustice in raising the questions I am propounding? My questions are asked only on the basis of information just given to me by the press, that someone in the press formed the impression that the majority leader is laboring under the misapprehension that the junior Senator from Oregon favored the Court-packing plan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator, I do not believe that the remarks I have here, since they are only a portion of the majority leader's remarks, contain that reference. But I would suggest that we have that checked into, because no one here wants to do an injustice to the majority leader.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield in a moment. But let me, for a moment, read from the remarks of the majority leader:

> In the California case, the Supreme Court admitted it was reversing the opinion of every Supreme Court Justice who preceded them.

That is what the majority leader says, referring to the inland-water cases prior to the case of 1947, which dealt with the submerged lands under the open seas.

Mr. President, I read a moment ago from that, and I shall proceed to read it again. I read this case recently, and I submit that when one debates issues it is well to refresh his memory. There are so many law cases, even for good lawyers, and those of us who are not good lawyers must be more careful. I read from the California case:

> As previously stated, this Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times. And in doing so it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not. All of these statements were, however, merely paraphrases or offshoots of the Pollard inland-water rule, and were used, not as enunciation of a new ocean rule, but in explanation of the old inland-water principle. Notwithstanding the fact that none of these cases either involved or decided the State-Federal conflict presented here, we are urged to say that the language used and repeated in those cases forecloses the Government from the right to have this Court decide that question now that it is squarely presented for the first time.
>
> There are three such cases whose language probably lends more weight to California's argument than any others.

The opinion then proceeds to discuss those cases. Following that, Mr. President, the Supreme Court said what I shall now read, the majority leader notwithstanding.

> None of the foregoing cases, nor others which we have decided, are sufficient to require us to extend the Pollard inland-water rule so as to declare that California owns or has paramount rights in or power over the 3-mile belt under the ocean. The question of who owned the bed of the sea only became of great potential importance at the beginning of this century when oil was discovered there. As a consequence of this discovery, California passed an act in 1921 authorizing the granting of permits to California residents to prospect for oil and gas on blocks of land off its coast under the ocean.

The Court makes it perfectly clear, and how can it be made any clearer than in the language I have read, that the inland-water rule of the Pollard case does not apply? The majority leader stated:

> In the California case, the Supreme Court admitted it was reversing the opinion of every Supreme Court Justice who preceded them.

I submit that when the majority leader misleads the Senate by such a statement, it is not lending the law to the argument, it is lending confusion to the argument.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, after which I shall defer to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that although in a few inland-waters cases the Court used language of a broader application which indicated that it might make a similar ruling on external waters, it was mere dictum, since it was not connected with the facts of the case, was irrelevant, and not germane, and, therefore, in no sense binding or controlling upon future decisions of the Court?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. It is like a Senator receiving a letter from a constituent and replying, "I enjoyed your letter. You have a good point. You have raised questions which I never before thought of, and I am surely going to take your letter under advisement; thank you for your consideration."

It means, of course, nothing, because when a Senator votes, he either votes yes or no, and the only votes that count are those that are recorded in the roll-call. The only thing that is important in the Supreme Court's decisions is the rule of law they lay down, not the politeness, the hospitality, or the innuendoes. They are obiter dicta, and are just so much window-dressing; they make it so much more palatable. It does not mean that in the oil cases and the cases involving paramount rights of the Federal Government over submerged land such dicta control. I am not a lawyer, but I know that much.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. What the Senator from Ohio said, according to the transcript of his speech this afternoon on the point under discussion, was as follows:

> I notice that the gentlemen who are called by the distinguished Senator from Oregon the little band of liberals were violently opposed to the Supreme Court in the

days when the Supreme Court was conservative, and did not hesitate by law after law to circumvent the opinions of the Court, and, gradually, by change in the character of the Court, to bring about a reversal of the previous opinions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator that I am glad he has read that back into the RECORD, because——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I correctly understand that that was a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yielded for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I make that point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yielded to the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota ask unanimous consent to allow the Senator from Oregon to raise a parliamentary inquiry with reference to the point of order made by the Senator from Michigan with the understanding that the granting of such unanimous consent will in no way jeopardize the right of the Senator from Minnesota to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may raise such a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. I object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the end of that.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me—and I am sure the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] will also agree—that after a point of order has been raised it is only fair and proper that we clear up the point of order by being allowed to answer the point made by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely agree with that, but there has been an objection recorded, and if the Senator will state it again in the form of a question I shall be glad to yield. Questions can consist of several words. Some of the greatest questions in the world have covered pages. As a matter of fact, Socrates used to do much valuable work by asking questions. He was a great interrogator. None of us is as great as was Socrates, but we can try. The Senator from Oregon is a fine man; he is capable of asking very involved but very pertinent questions. If he wants to ask a question, I shall do my best to give him an honest answer.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that when the press has formed an impression——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Oregon for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wanted to say to the Senator from Minnesota that if the Senator from Oregon wanted the floor to clear up a matter in the RECORD, rather than putting it in the form of a question, I would have no objection to his clearing the matter in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not quite understand. We get so formal around the dinner hour that I am a bit confused. I come here in my working clothes, and at 6 o'clock in the evening we have to put on the formalities. That happened the last time I took the floor. If the Senator from Michigan suggests that the Senator from Oregon may be permitted to make any correction in the RECORD——

Mr. MORSE. It was a matter spoken of on the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon be permitted to make a statement for the purpose of clearing up a point in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that when a Member of this body learns from the press that an interpretation is being made of a statement spoken on the floor of the Senate by the majority leader, which gives an entirely false impression of a position, in this instance one taken by the junior Senator from Oregon, a position which the transcript shows never was intended by the majority leader, that courtesy in the Senate itself dictates that the Senator involved follow the course of action which I have sought to follow by my questioning?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Oregon is correct. If the Senator's understanding of the RECORD was in error, and my understanding was, I think both of us should make it quite clear that the majority leader did not make the reference on which comment has been made, and the RECORD should be amended and corrected in accordance with the facts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree that we are only demonstrating our determination to see to it that fair play prevails in the Senate debate, and that when a serious misinterpretation of the remarks of one of our opponents in this debate is made by the press, and the Senator is not present himself to correct the misinterpretation, we are following a highly professional and ethical course of conduct in coming to the floor of the Senate and trying to get the matter clarified within the rules of the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the Senator is correct. I know the Senator from Oregon, as well as other Members of the Senate, wishes to have nothing in the RECORD that would in any way misinterpret or misjudge the remarks of any of our colleagues, and I am happy to see that the Senator from Oregon, after learning of the press comment, has come forth to make any corrections which may be necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that it is only fair to the majority leader to point out that the misinterpretation of his remarks by a member of the press is based upon the sentence I now read, to wit:

I notice that the gentlemen, who are called by the distinguished Senator from Oregon the little band of liberals, were violently opposed to the Supreme Court in the days when the Supreme Court was conservative, and did not hesitate by law after law to circumvent the opinions of the Court, and gradually by change in the character of the Court, bring about a reversal of the previous opinions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the sentence with which, I imagine, the comment would comport. I recall hearing that comment with reference to the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall that when the junior Senator from Oregon started this examination of the Senator from Minnesota, he made clear that he had not seen the comments of the Senator from Ohio, and had not been on the floor when the Senator from Ohio made his comments?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall that when the junior Senator from Oregon began this examination of the Senator from Minnesota, he stated that a member of the press had told him that a press member had formed the impression, from the statement made by the Senator from Ohio, that the junior Senator from Oregon was in favor of the Court-packing plan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for a last question in this round?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree that the Senator from Oregon has sought to correct an impression that he found existed, in the first place, and as to which, if it were not corrected on the floor of the Senate, with members of the press in the gallery listening to this colloquy, some newspapers might have gone to bed tonight containing an interpretation of what the Senator from Ohio said that would have been a great injustice to the Senator from Ohio, and a great injustice to the Senator from Oregon, as well?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Oregon has stated the situation very well. I wish to thank him, and

to assure both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Ohio, that every effort has now been made to make the record clear and accurate, and not to indulge in any misinterpretations.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. The majority leader stated:

> The gentlemen who called themselves liberals were very violently opposed to the Supreme Court in the days when the Supreme Court was conservative, and did not hesitate by law after law to circumvent the opinions of that court and gradually by change in the character of the Court bring about a reversal of its previous opinion.

In view of that statement, I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota feels that I am one of that small band of liberals to which the distinguished Senator from Oregon has referred, those who are opposing the joint resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from New York that he is one of the great so-called band of liberals. He is a great man in any group, whether it be a small band, big band, or whatever it may be.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota knows that in 1937, when I was Governor of my State of New York, and in spite of the fact that I was a great admirer of the then President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and have been a great admirer of him in all the years since then, I strongly opposed the plan that he submitted for a change in the personnel and the constitution of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy that history records that fact. I would not have doubted at all that an independent-minded Governor of the stature and person of the former Governor of New York, Governor Lehman, would have taken that position.

Again, I think it is well to make the RECORD clear that the broad generalizations made regarding independent-minded people sometimes do not serve the cause of justice or fair play.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that what is now being attempted, and to my great distress, appears to have a very great chance of success, is an effort to retry on the floor of the United States Senate what has already been tried and already determined by the Supreme Court of the United States on three separate occasions, in the cases of California, Texas, and Louisiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I wish to proceed to show what I consider to be the weaknesses and the limitations and, I believe, the inaccuracies, of the argument made by the Senator from Ohio.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield to the Senator in just a moment for a further interrogation, but I think he would be interested in listening to what I wish to say now. When the Senator from Ohio was speaking about the California case and the ownership of these lands, he had the following to say:

> The ownership of these lands was always considered to be in the States—always, by every authority in the United States—by the executives, by the judges, until the Supreme Court opinion in the California case on June 23, 1947.

The truth is that the matter of submerged lands under the territorial seas had never been brought to the attention of the Court. As I have read from the case of California against United States, the Court made very careful note of the fact that the Pollard doctrine does not extend to submerged lands. The Court made note of the fact also that that was the first time this kind of case had ever come before the Supreme Court.

So I submit that what the majority leader has done has been to try to transfer and translate the doctrine of inland water cases into the doctrine of marginal sea cases, and to say that when the court ruled in 1947, it was just upsetting everything it had done before.

Mr. President, when I debated this question earlier, in the past week, the subject of territorial seas received considerable attention and discussion. I recall that the majority leader reminded us again and again that nothing new could be said. That was a very broad statement. I would not have minded hearing that from Aristotle, but I simply refuse to accept it from any of my contemporaries.

But something new has been said.

It ought to be sufficient to point out that the Supreme Court in the first case, having to deal with the subject of ownership of territorial seas, decided in 1947 that the Federal Government had ownership and paramount rights in those seas, and the Court reaffirmed that decision twice in 1950.

But, even more important, in 1779 a committee of the Continental Congress reported upon supreme control of the United States over the several State jurisdictions in maritime matters. The committee of the Continental Congress further stated that this control was necessary in order to compel just and uniform execution of the laws of the Nation, and as being essential to the sovereign power of war and peace, and that the Congress could not divest themselves of it.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only thing that can be stated is that the Court had not ruled, up until 1947, because no cases were brought to the Court pertaining to the territorial seas or the marginal seas. If there is any weight of evidence on any side, it is on the side of the Federal Government's jurisdiction over the 3-mile belt, a jurisdiction which has been recognized for nearly 160 years.

I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator does not contend, does he, that maritime jurisdiction over the waters gives the Federal Government ownership of the soil?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; the Senator does not contend that at all. The Senator contends that when the Senator from Ohio says that the ownerships of these lands was always considered to be in the States, and when he refers to these lands about which he is talking as submerged lands under the territorial seas, the Senator from Minnesota unqualifiedly, unconditionally asserts and states, and is prepared to defend from now on out, the proposition that there is no such evidence.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. In fairness to the majority leader, does not the Senator believe that what the majority leader had in mind was that the recent Court decisions had overruled or held contrary to the belief of the former members of the Supreme Court, the belief as stated by the Court itself in the California opinion, that the States owned not only the soils under navigable inland waters within their territorial jurisdiction, not only the inland waters, but all the navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. The Senator is correct. I read that same passage, so that the RECORD would be complete.

Then the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made note of the fact that this belief or this general attitude which had grown up with the doctrine of the Pollard case was never anything else but dictum. It was never the rule of law, because the rule of law applies only when the issue is brought up, and the issue never was brought up.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. Will not the Senator agree that the United States Supreme Court has made the same mistake as the majority leader, if the majority leader has indeed made a mistake, when the Supreme Court said, for example, in Mumford against Wardwell, that—

> The settled rule of law—

We are now talking about the rule of law—

> The settled rule of law in this Court is that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possessed within their respective borders.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; but what does that refer to?

Mr. DANIEL. The settled rule of law, according to the Court, refers to all navigable waters within the respective borders of the States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator that that was a decision handed down about 1845.

Mr. DANIEL. In 1867, I believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can only say to the Senator from Texas that at that time

the issue of the submerged lands under the marginal seas and territorial seas was not a question at issue. The Court made known in the California case that it had really never become a matter of policy in connection with the ownership of submerged lands until the discovery of oil. Furthermore, at that particular stage of the game, in the light of experience and history, it is not controlling. The decisions of the Court, as they come down from year to year, are controlling. That is what controls in law.

Does not the argument of the Senator from Texas amount to this, that if the majority leader had lived a century ago he could not have been taken to task for inconsistency; but since he is living presumably in the 20th century rather than in the 19th century, he should be expected to know the decisions since 1947, and not merely the decisions prior to 1947 ?

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. In justice both to the majority leader and the junior Senator from Texas, let me ask if it is not true that I was speaking about the majority leader's statement that the present Court, in 1947, overruled or changed what the previous courts believed the law to be?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I submit to my friend, who is a most able lawyer, and one who, if he were on the other side of this case ,would be arguing with great vigor, eloquence, and more logic than he has presented——

Mr. DANIEL. I could never argue the other side of this case.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A good lawyer can argue either side of a case. Good lawyers are always able to argue either side of a case. I want the RECORD to show that the Senator from Texas is a good lawyer, an able lawyer, and an experienced lawyer. He could argue either side of the case. On this side he would have had more than argument. He would have had the real truth of the case.

I point out to the Senator that when he brings forth, as he has, the citation to which he has referred, he is saying for the RECORD, of course, that this is a rule of law. He is not saying that the Supreme Court in 1947 overruled a rule of law. What he is saying is that it overruled what were considered to be the beliefs or opinions of previous courts, as I commented some time ago. In the parlance of those of us who do not frequent the courtroom—at least as lawyers—that is what is called innuendo, general conversation, or, in language of the law "obiter dicta."

I submit that no good attorney—and the Senator from Texas is one of the best—would ever want to rest his entire case on the nice, melodious mutterings of the Court. What is important in the Court is the anvil chorus, when the hand of justice comes thundering down in the Court, and not the tinkling bells on the outside. What is important is the decision which is rendered. No one knows that better than does the able Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I remind the Senator that I was referring only to the argument of the majority leader, and trying to show that he was, in truth and in fact, correct in saying that the present Court did overrule or change what previous courts—all of them—believed the law to be. Those are the words of the Supreme Court in the California case that the former courts believed the law to be that the States owned all the lands beneath navigable waters, whether inland or seaward.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the junior Senator from Minnesota had made the argument which the majority leader made, the argument of the Senator from Texas would seem much more persuasive, because the junior Senator from Minnesota is not an attorney. He is neither a good one nor a bad one. He is not qualified. But there is no finer attorney in this body than the majority leader. His nearest equal is the Senator from Texas. I submit that the majority leader is not just giving us polite conversation when he makes these statements. He is the distinguished son of a great President and a great Chief Justice. He is a great attorney, and a great Senator. When that great Senator and great attorney says that the ownership of these lands was always considered to be in the States, always, by every authority, by the opinions, by the executives, and by the judges, until the Supreme Court's opinion in the California case on June 23, 1947, all that the Senator from Minnesota can say is that it is a good argument if one can get away with it, but I am not going to let the majority leader get away with it. It is always a good argument if it is not checkmated. What we are doing here is a little checkmating. Sincere rebuttal is indeed the life of good debate.

DAYLIGHT SAVING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from South Dakota has a very important item of legislation which requires some quick action. In view of the confusion of television programs, radio schedules, airline and railroad schedules, and so forth, and because of my affection for the Senator from South Dakota, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him for the purpose of legislative business, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is there to be a limitation on the length of time which the consideration of the bill will consume? If there is not to be a limitation, I shall object.

Mr. CASE. I was about to submit a unanimous-consent request that the message from the House in connection with Senate bill 1419, be laid before the Senate. I understand it is a privileged matter.

Mr. LONG. Then I suggest that the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from South Dakota for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to take up the bill without prejudicing the right to the floor of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I was going to ask for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to 10 minutes in connection with the consideration of Senate bill 1419.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as the present occupant of the majority leader's chair, I have been unable to advise Senators who desire to know whether or not we will have a vote on any matter. I feel that this matter should be held in abeyance until after the first quorum call. Therefore, I shall object at this time. That would give an opportunity to all Senators to be warned that there will be a new matter taken up on which there would be a vote. It is only for that purpose that I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield further to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I understood that the Senator from South Dakota had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to his request.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator from Minnesota give the Senator from South Dakota an idea as to how long he expects to hold the floor? If I knew, I would be on the floor for the purpose of trying to claim it, or seek recognition following the conclusion of the Senator's remarks, in order that I might move that the Senate concur in the House amendment, since I understand it is a privileged matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that around 8:30 this evening he will have a chance to bring up the matter. I assume daylight-saving time will not go into effect too soon, so that we will have plenty of time to sleep. I do not want to extend my remarks beyond 8:30, and the Senator from South Dakota may regard that time as being the limit or extent of the time I shall take. If he wishes to be here earlier, perhaps it would be advisable for him to be here earlier.

Mr. CASE. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Surely.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator from South Dakota be safe in going to dinner, assuming that he would be back on the floor at least by 8 o'clock, and perhaps a little earlier?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will give the Senator from South Dakota my personal assurance that he can eat a good steak and digest it comfortably in his own

time and that the floor will be his, to the best of my ability to deliver it, when he wishes to have passed the proposed legislation he has in mind.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy that we could accommodate one another tonight. There is nothing like good fellowship and a good exchange of facts in Senate debate. I want to continue exchanging facts. I regret that my protagonist, the Senator from Ohio, to whom I direct my words, is not on the floor. However, he will read the record with reference to what I am saying. What I say is said in all respect to the Senator from Ohio. However, we are arguing not about respect for one another but about statements and opinions.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was talking about some court cases and my differing on them with the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Ohio made some other comment which I thought necessitated a few more observations and possibly consideration. The Senator from Ohio pointed out:

> Whether the particular facts of each case covered lands beyond low tide is not always clear in the various cases; but the rule of law was clear and no one ever seems to have considered that the so-called low-tide mark had the slightest significance in determining where the State boundaries were and where the State ownership ended.

That was further addenda or addition to the general comments of the Senator from Ohio on cases.

I would say that a number of cases could be cited in which the lands beyond the low tide, at least on the landward side of the tide, were surely considered.

The Senator from Ohio cites the case of Pollard against Hagen, and he states what Justice McKinley said, as follows:

> First, the shores of navigable waters and the soils under them were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively. Secondly, the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over the subject as the original States.

Then the Senator from Ohio said that particular statement, whether bearing directly on the facts or merely considered as dictum, has been repeatedly approved by the Court and by many important Justices of the Supreme Court since that time. But the Senator from Ohio knows that that utterance did not bear upon the facts in the Pollard case. All I am trying to say is that when one is an experienced lawyer he does know what statements bear upon the facts. The Senator from Ohio did not differentiate in the Pollard case between the issue before the Court and the general wanderings of the Court; the Senator from Ohio, for example, did not even define what is meant by navigable waters. Insofar as it is concerned in the case itself, there was no true definition.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the Pollard case referred to land which once had been tideland proper in the city of Mobile, which was daily washed by the tide and subsequently became filled, and therefore was in no sense submerged land seaward from the low-water mark?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. What bothers me about the argument today, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, is the fact that we have heard this argument so many times. I heard the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] discuss the Pollard case again and again. The Senator from Illinois discussed the Pollard case, and I also heard the Senator from Tennessee discuss the Pollard case. It is an important case. All I can say is that for anyone to take from the Pollard case language which does not relate to the rule of law, and which does not relate to a justiciable issue, and then try to interpret it as being some kind of controlling language, is to miss the point of the case. What is more, it is using in the debate language which is not relevant to the issue before us.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If a law-school student were to confuse obiter dictum with controlling opinion, would he not fail the most elementary course in law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is quite correct.

Although I was not a law-school student, I did take several courses in constitutional law for the purposes of general education. I can recall very vividly a distinguished constitutional lawyer, who presently is a great professor at the University of Indiana, who told me again and again that what one seeks in a case is to get the heart of the argument and the issue before the court and the rule of law the court applies to the issue. Those were the points he emphasized. I do not recall that he ever gave anyone a passing grade for remembering side shows. What counts is the big show, the heart of the case, the main point.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota know that Chief Justice Hughes, in the case of Ashwander against Tennessee Valley Authority, made what the Senator from Minnesota alleges to be the mistake the majority leader made when Chief Justice Hughes wrote:

> *Pollard* v. *Hagan* dealt with title of the States to tidelands and the soil under navigable waters within their boundaries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Texas that when the Chief Justice said that case dealt with tidelands he was correct. When he said that case dealt with lands under navigable waters, he was correct. But that is not to say that all lands under navigable waters within the boundaries are necessarily submerged lands under the open seas.

There are so many ways of using words. When we speak about submerged lands under the marginal seas, we are referring to those very lands.

So I say to my friends who are skilled in the law that they should be as precise in their knowledge and use of the law as they are in their personal identifications. Every lawyer knows—and this Chamber is filled with good lawyers—that what the Senator from Illinois said is correct, namely, that if a law school student were to try to get by with such an argument, he would be called before the dean of the law school—and not for a social visit, either; he would be called there to be asked, "What kind of a lawyer do you think you will ever be?"

The Senator from Ohio was trying to make out a good case with poor law. Because he did not have the law, he was trying to make out a good case on the basis of general comment which did not relate precisely to the issue.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, without making any reflection upon any individual, that we should not appear here as lawyers defending a given case; but we should appear here as Senators trying to ascertain the truth and what is for the best interests of the United States; and we should not appear here in an effort to score spurious advantage over each other?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

I think the most important observation that can be made here is that this question is one of sovereignty and of jurisdiction; and it is the considered judgment and opinion of the junior Senator from Minnesota that those questions are settled in the courts. The matter now before us is not an ordinary legislative matter; it is not an administrative ruling which comes to us under the review procedures of the Administrative Procedures Act. In this matter we are talking about the integrity of the Federal system, the relationship of Federal power to State power, and the relationship of the Federal Government and its responsibilities and powers as a sovereign in the field of international affairs.

The Senator from Ohio went on to point out that when the Revolution took place, the people of each State themselves became sovereigns, and in that character held the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soil under them, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution.

The Senator from Ohio further said that, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], every administrative ruling of the Federal Government and every opinion of every court until 1947 assumed the States owned the submerged lands within the State boundaries.

Mr. President, let me comment on the latter statement by the majority leader. Certainly an assumption does not necessarily mean a fact; certainly an assumption does not necessarily make good law. An assumption that is not verified by fact and is not verified by court evidence cannot possibly become law or fact.

I shall go a little further into the early history of the powers of the respective jurisdictions of the States and the Federal Governments.

The Senator from Ohio pointed out that in 1947 the Supreme Court, to support its opinion, suggested there was no express understanding of the 3-mile limit in 1776. The Senator from Ohio said that is probably true, but that it is also true that long before that time many international law authorities spoke clearly of the ownership by each state or nation of the submerged lands beyond their tidal waters.

Mr. President, I wish to be perfectly clear on this matter. When the Senator from Ohio talks about international-law authorities speaking clearly of the ownership of each state or nation of the submerged lands, we should remember that the international authorities were talking about sovereign states and sovereign nations—sovereign states that could exchange ambassadors and ministers, sovereign states that exercised power over peace or war, sovereign states that had control of their whole domain, and sovereigns that were recognized in the law of the nations or among nations.

The Senator from Ohio knows that when we speak in terms of international legal authorities, we find that they do not speak in terms of the province or in terms of some segment or some portion of a nation-state. By virtue of the fact that they themselves are international lawyers, they speak in terms of the law of nations and in terms of sovereigns and in terms of international law and national responsibilities.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To carry out the analogy of the Senator from Minnesota, let me point out that when those authorities prior to 1776 spoke of the sovereignty of the state or nation, they were referring, for example, to the Republic or the Kingdom of the Netherlands, not to the separate states which comprised the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. Similarly, when the Senator from Ohio referred, in the course of his argument, to the King of England and his sovereignty, the Senator from Ohio was not referring to a state such as the State of Illinois or the State of Minnesota, or even to a province such as the Province of Quebec or the Province of Saskatchewan, in Canada.

On the contrary, the Senator from Ohio was referring to the nation and to the sovereign power vested in the nation, in the person of the King. In fact, the King derived his power from the fact that he was the sovereign—not just because he was George III, for instance, as a person, but because he represented the sovereign power of the State.

Now let me read a passage from the Law of Nations, a book from which I quoted at the time when I made my presentation about a week ago. The author of the book is Mr. Brierly. On page 47, we find the following statement:

> Thus for the practical purposes of the international lawyer, sovereignty is not the metaphysical concept, nor is it part of the essence of statehood; it is merely a term which designates an aggregate of particular and very extensive claims that states habitually make for themselves in their relations with other states.

At that point Mr. Brierly was referring to states as nation-states; and they are the same states that the majority leader referred to in his discussion, although apparently he would have one believe that the states mentioned in his discussion represent the so-called sovereign States or the 48 States of the United States of America.

Mr. President, the majority leader went further back in international law, to refer to the international law which prevailed long before 1776. He quoted the former Chief Justice of England, Mr. Matthew Hale, who, in 1670 said:

> The narrow sea, adjoining to the coast of England, is part of the wast and demesnes and dominions of the King of England, whether it lie within the body of any country or not.

Mr. President, what case does that support? I was surprised to hear the majority leader quote that opinion, because in that opinion the chief justice of England was saying that it was not Wales or Scotland or England or Ireland, but it was the King, the sovereign head of the whole nation of England, who exercised jurisdiction in the territorial waters.

The Chief Justice says:

> In this sea the King of England hath a double right, viz., a right of jurisdiction * * * and a right of property or ownership. * * *
>
> And besides, the soil itself under the water is actually the King's.

Oh, Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. Here we see exactly the claim we are making at this time on behalf of the United States of America, namely, that the United States of America, as an entity, as a Federal Republic, as a sovereign nation in the relationships with other nations, is recognized under the law of nations as a sovereign power over the territorial seas around it. The majority leader, I think, mistook the quotations from the case of 1670, in the days of Matthew Hale. I repeat the words of the Chief Justice:

> In this sea the King of England hath a double right, viz, a right of jurisdiction * * * and a right of property or ownership, and besides, the soil under the water is actually the King's.

It is conclusive evidence, if one wants historical evidence as to the sovereign power of the Federal Government over the territorial waters and the soil thereunder. The majority leader said this was in 1670, more than 100 years before the formation of the Constitution of the United States.

The majority leader then goes on to say:

> Samuel Puffendorf, who is recognized as one of the great German writers on international law, said in 1688—

Mr. President, I thought that would be somewhat interesting. Let me simply quote from The Sovereignty of the Sea, by Thomas Wemyss Fulton:

> The celebrated Puffendorf, whose authority later was only second to that of Grotius, dealt with the question in his great work on the Law of Nature and Nations, and with even less precision than Loccenius. On the general question of the appropriation of the sea, he discarded the objection that its fluidity rendered it incapable of possession, but held that it would be morally impossible for one nation to possess the ocean. He also set aside the moral objection in the absolute form in which it was put forward by Grotius, that the use of the sea was inexhaustible. On the contrary, he held with Selden and Welwood that fisheries in the sea might be exhausted by promiscuous use. "If all nations," he said, "should desire such a right and liberty (of fishing) near the coasts of any particular country, that country must be very much prejudiced in this respect; especially since it is very usual that some particular kind of fish, or perhaps some more precious commodity, as pearls, coral, amber, or the like, are to be found in one one part of the sea, and that of no considerable extent. In this case there is no reason why the bordering people should not rather challenge to themselves this happiness of a wealthy shore or sea, than those who are situated at a distance from it."

On this ground, for the right of exclusive fishing, and also to protect the security and defense of the state, a nation was justified in claiming dominion in the neighboring sea. The extent of this territorial sea, he says, cannot in general be accurately determined; but it is clear that he thought it might be very considerable.

Now, Mr. President, there is discussion of Mr. Puffendorf's arguments, to which the distinguished Senator from Ohio referred. I am going to say to the Senator from Ohio that he does not find in international law justification for his position on the pending matter. He does not find in the writings of Grotius, he does not find in the writings of Puffendorf, he does not find in the great decisions of the English court, he does not find in the records of the days of the colonies or in the days of the Continental Congress, argument to substantiate his belief that international law justifies State ownership of the submerged lands of the Territorial seas.

The trouble is—and I say this in all friendliness and understanding—I believe the majority leader has misunderstood the words of the international jurists, because when an international jurist or an international authority, refers to a nation, he frequently calls it a "state." I repeat that international jurists, when they use the word "state," are talking about nation states and are not talking about provinces, nor are they talking about states as we know them in the United States of America.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If an elementary student of constitutional law were to confuse 1 of the 48 States of the United States with a sovereign state, would he not be immediately flunked in the most elementary course that was given?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is a great teacher and surely knows what it means to judge the abilities of students, that if a student were taking a course in international law, and started talking about the sovereign powers of Rhode Island, Minnesota, or Florida,

as if the statement of the powers of those States had some relevancy to sovereignty as known to the law of nations, he would be either flunked from the course, or he would be asked to leave and take something else rather than be humiliated by his lack of understanding.

Mr. President, the majority leader quoted further—and every quotation he made, while it was supposed to be an argument in behalf of his position, in support of the Holland measure, is an argument in behalf of the Anderson motion, which he was attempting to defeat, and did defeat. He quoted from Sir Philip Meadows, in England, who, in 1869, said:

> And yet 'tis a thing undoubted, and never brought into question by any; but that every prince, whose country adjoins to the sea * * * has some portion of the sea belonging to him in property, as an accession of the land, or appendant to it.

Mr. President, this is nothing more nor less than to say that a sovereign prince, a king, a monarch, an emperor—a prince being nothing more nor less than a name for a sovereign head—when he rules the land which adjoins the sea, can claim some of the land out into the sea; not dukes, not little feudal barons, but the prince, the head of the state. I simply cannot believe that any Member of the Senate does not recognize that the Federal Government is our exclusive agent and the sovereign head of the Nation-State of the United States of America. In other words, in the terminology of the international jurist, it is the prince, it is the head of state, it is the sovereign power, and its sovereignty is exclusive and undiluted insofar as our relationships with other nations and in the open seas are concerned.

The Senator from Ohio spoke kind words, good words. The trouble is he got the evidence for the wrong case. The evidence which the Senator presented was evidence in behalf of the Anderson amendment rather than in behalf of the Holland measure.

Mr. Brownell understood the matter properly. That is why the Attorney General suggested to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that title not be granted to the States, that use be granted to the States, but that title remain with the Federal Government, because the whole weight of authority, the whole body of international law throughout the years and centuries, as expounded by men who have governed and men who have advised heads of state, has been that the territorial waters surrounding the Nation-State are under the jurisdiction of the head of the Nation-State, and not to be divided up and parceled up amongst portions or parts or segments of the entire Nation.

The majority leader went on to point out that he quoted leading international law authorities who wrote prior to 1776. I make the statement, Mr. President, subject to challenge, that of the leading authorities the majority leader quoted not one of them supports the contention the majority leader was attempting to maintain when he quoted from them, namely, the contention that the province, the state, a part of a nation-state, should have ownership and jurisdiction of the territorial waters.

Mr. President, international authorities, without exception, support the concept of sovereignty of the nation in the person of the head of state in external matters, and particularly as they relate to the sea. That is the whole weight of the argument of the Chief Justice of the Court of England, Chief Justice Matthew Hale. Let me read it again and see if any Senator can get any comfort from the argument of the Senator from Ohio:

> In this sea the King of England hath a double right, the right of jurisdiction and the right of privilege or of ownership, and, besides, the soil itself under the water is the King's.

He did not say it belonged to someone in Ireland or Scotland or Wales, but that it belonged to the King, the King of the entire sovereign state.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to ask him if he does not believe that what the majority leader had in mind with reference to the submerged lands being under the King of England was to show that when the original States won their independence the property passed from the King to the original States? As was said by the Supreme Court in the case of *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1):

> In England, from the time of Lord Hale, it has been treated as settled that the title in the soil of the sea, or of arms of the sea, below ordinary high water mark, is in the King. * * * And upon the American Revolution, all the rights of the Crown and of Parliament vested in the several states, subject to the rights surrendered to the national government by the Constitution of the United States.

Does the Senator not believe that that is what the majority leader had in mind?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is what he had in mind, but he was wrong.

Mr. DANIEL. In citing those authorities he said that under the common law the title was in the King, but he followed it by saying that when we won our independence the property passed from the King to the States. In the Waddell case it is said:

> When the revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know what the Senator from Ohio was driving at; I realize what his purpose was, but the weight of the evidence is against him.

Let me quote from Mr. Justice Story. Story's Commentaries are considered to be the finest work on the Constitution. What did he say about this very issue? Let us see what Mr. Justice Story had to say. We have got to rely on some source. I read from Mr. Story's book, his commentaries on the Constitution, page 152, book II, section 210:

> Now, it is apparent that none of the Colonies before the Revolution were, in the most large and general sense, independent or sovereign communities. They were all originally settled under, and subjected to, the British Crown. Their powers and authorities were derived from and limited by their respective charters. All, or nearly all, of these charters controlled their legislation by prohibiting them from making laws repugnant or contrary to those of England. The Crown, in many of them, possessed a negative upon their legislation, as well as the exclusive appointment of their superior officers; and a right of revision, by way of appeal, of the judgments of their courts.

In section 211 Mr. Justice Story says:

> In the next place, the Colonies did not severally act for themselves, and proclaim their own independence. It is true that some of the States had previously formed incipient governments for themselves; but it was done in compliance with the recommendations of Congress.
>
> In the next place, the Colonies did not severally act for themselves, and proclaim their own independence. It is true that some of the States had previously formed incipient governments for themselves; but it was done in compliance with the recommendation of Congress. * * * But the Declaration of Independence of all the Colonies was the united act of all. It was "a declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled"; "by the delegates appointed by the good people of the Colonies," as in a prior declaration of rights they were called. It was not an act done by the State governments then organized, nor by persons chosen by them. It was emphatically the act of the whole people of the united Colonies, by the instrumentality of their representatives, chosen for that among other purposes. It was not an act competent to the State governments, or any of them, as organized under their charters, to adopt. Those charters neither contemplated the case nor provided for it. It was an act of original inherent sovereignty by the people themselves, resulting from their right to change the form of government, and to institute a new one, whenever necessary for their safety and happiness. So the Declaration of Independence treats it. No State had presumed of itself to form a new government, or to provide for the exigencies of the times, without consulting Congress on the subject; and when they acted, it was in pursuance of the recommendation of Congress. It was, therefore, the achievement of the whole for the benefit of the whole. The people of the united Colonies made the united Colonies free and independent States, and absolved them from all allegiance to the British Crown. The Declaration of Independence has accordingly always been treated as an act of paramount and sovereign authority, complete and perfect per se, and ipso facto working an entire dissolution of all political connection with, and allegiance to, Great Britain. And, this, not merely as a practical fact, but in a legal and constitutional view of the matter by courts of justice.

That simply boils down, Mr. President, to one thing, that all the argument of the majority leader relating to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of England and the ownership being in the King of England, did not apply to that to which the majority leader would like to have it apply, namely, that the several States, when they ceased to be Colonies and became States, acquired the same prerogatives, because, as Justice Story points out, the States which are referred to are the United States; and, as he says:

> The people of the united Colonies made the Colonies free and independent States, and absolved them from all allegiance to the British Crown.

It is necessary to cite the record. Let me cite the rest of the record.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator has finished with that particular point, I should like to ask him a question at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield in a moment, but first I wish to read from the Curtiss-Wright case, because it follows along with comment on this doctrine. I quote from the Curtiss-Wright case, about which I spoke on April 22, as appears at page 3553 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was discussing Mr. Justice Sutherland's decision in United States against Curtiss-Wright Export Co. I read from his decision. It is one of the classical cases on the power of the sovereign nation. This is what Justice Sutherland said:

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.

I wish our good friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], were here at this time, because this is what he alluded to at the time of his interrogation of me.

What the Justice is saying there is that the doctrine of powers delegated to the Federal Government is only binding and controlling when it pertains to internal matters within the Nation. In that opinion it was indicated that the Constitution was carved from the general mass of legislative powers then possessed by the States, such powers as it was thought desirable to vest in the Federal Government, leaving those not specifically enumerated to the States.

In other words, the only powers which the Federal Government had internally were the powers which were taken from the States, carved out of the legislative powers theretofore possessed by the States.

This is Justice Sutherland speaking, in United States against Curtiss-Wright, in complete contradiction of the argument which was made here this afternoon:

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.

That is what the majority leader was referring to. He tried to make reference to the Crown as applied to the States. I may say to the majority leader, who has now come to the floor, that there is no evidence to support that contention.

Listen further to Justice Sutherland:

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.

That agency exercised the powers of war and peace, raised an army, created a navy and finally adopted the Declaration of Independence. Rules 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. * * * That fact was given practical application almost at once. The treaty of peace, made on September 3, 1783, was concluded between His Britannic Majesty and the "United States of America." * * *

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.

Justice Sutherland continues with his opinion in this famous case, which is the last word in the law, the case of United States against Curtiss-Wright, which is accepted legal doctrine, and this is what he said:

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 sovereign.

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.

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 whole doctrine of the case of Matthew Hale, of Britain, of Puffendorf, and later on of the English court, in the late 1600's, insofar as it has any application to submerged lands and marginal seas is as follows:

In this sea the King of England hath a double right, viz, a right of jurisdiction * * * and a right of property or ownership,

And besides the soil itself under the water is actually the King's.

That is a legal doctrine which is applicable only when we speak of nation-states—independent, sovereign nation-states. I submit that that doctrine, if it has any application at all in this debate, is an application on the side of the Federal Government.

As Justice Sutherland has noted, it is an external sovereignty, which accrued to the United States even without the Constitution, by the fact of its being a nation-state. Furthermore, I ask my distinguished colleagues, how can they set aside Justice Story's Commentaries on the Constitution, setting forth the history of the rights of this Republic, and stating that the powers that had been vested in the Colonies and States, severally, as units became vested in the United States of America when independence was achieved? How can they set aside the famous decision in the Curtiss-Wright case, and ignore that opinion? It seems to me that it cannot be done.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am wondering if the Senator from Minnesota can tell us how he ignores the two quotations from the United States Supreme Court and relies on the writings of a retired judge, who wrote a commentary as a textbook and reference work, although some of his words were written into decisions of the Court.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I am certain the Senator from Florida would not wish to have any remarks of his to be taken as at all derogatory of the authoritative nature of Justice Story's Commentaries on the Constitution. Certainly, the Senator would not wish to join issue with all the great men of history as to the brilliance and authoritativeness of Justice Story's Commentaries, would he?

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly the Senator from Florida would not wish to question the fact that Mr. Justice Story was a high-class writer. But neither do I wish to confess that there is anything wrong about the statement made by the distinguished majority leader, which I believe is in entire accord with many of the official pronouncements of many able Supreme Court Justices. It is those pronouncements that I wish to read. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to comment on them, and to state for the RECORD why it is that he ignores them in the statement he has just made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can only yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida will make no admissions placed in his mouth by his distinguished friend. He is asking his distinguished friend from Minnesota how it is that he makes his statement square with these two quotations by distinguished Justices of the Supreme Court. The first is the language of Mr. Justice Blatchford in Manchester against Massachusetts, in 1891. Mr. Justice Blatchford wrote the opinion for a unanimous Court. He stated as follows:

The extent—

Incidentally, he was interpreting the meaning of a Massachusetts statute, which stated the boundary as extending out 3 miles from the coast. This is the rule he stated:

The extent of territorial jurisdiction of Massachusetts over the seacoast is that of an independent nation; and, except so far as any right of control over this territory has been granted to the United States, this control remains with the States.

The second quotation——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me comment first on the quotation just given.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to cite the second quotation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me take them one at a time. It is much easier in that

way to maintain the continuity of the argument.

In the first place, this is a case which is very old.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was decided in 1891, long after Mr. Justice Story had gone to his reward.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Curtiss-Wright case was decided about 1935, I believe. Secondly, it was an inland water case. The Senator proceeds, as does the majority leader, in an effort to try to identify the legal doctrine pertaining to inland waters with territorial seas. It is a good deal if one can get by with it; but I am not going to allow the Senator to get by with it, because territorial seas and marginal seas are not inland waters. Submerged lands under territorial seas and marginal seas are not submerged lands under inland waters, lakes, bays, eddies, or inlets.

All I can say to the Senator is that the doctrine he is now bringing to my attention has not been accepted so far as the Nation's sovereignty over external matters is concerned.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. The second question I should like to ask the distinguished Senator is this: How is it that the distinguished Senator falls out with the majority leader, the Senator from Ohio, in view of the fact that, as late as 1926, another distinguished Justice, speaking for the full Court, found, in the case of Appleby against New York, what I shall read. I refer to the decision written by Chief Justice Taft:

> Upon the American Revolution—

I wonder how the Senator is going to get around this wording:

> Upon the American Revolution, all the proprietary rights of the Crown and Parliament in, and all their dominion over, lands under tidewater vested in the several States, subject to the powers surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution of the United States.

I am wondering how the distinguished Senator finds fault with his friend, the majority leader, the Senator from Ohio, when the statement made this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Ohio so nearly comports with that made by his distinguished sire, and not heretofore challenged at all by the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say, first of all, that that case applies to tidewaters. That is what the Senator is referring to. Tidewaters is an old English term, which does not have the same application in American law, and refers, essentially, to the area known as the tidelands. I know that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is going to jump on that assertion. I am all set for him. I am coming back to that subject.

It is now the accepted doctrine in the courts pertaining to the national sovereignty of the Federal Republic that the Nation's rights in matters of external affairs, over marginal seas and territorial waters in the open seas, are rights which do not even come under the precise language of the Constitution, but arise because of our existence as a Nation. What is more important, it seems to me, is that the question we are talking about is not tidelands or tidewaters. We are talking about the open seas. The continuous effort on the part of my colleagues is to associate the doctrine of inland waters with the open seas. The Court refers to the doctrine of inland waters. I shall show the Senator in a moment, by reference to the case of Manchester against Massachusetts, that the attempt to identify, by analogy and similarity, the inland-water doctrine with the external-sea doctrine is simply not the proper approach to this subject matter.

This is what the Court said in the California case:

> There are three such cases whose language probably lends more weight to California's argument than any others. The first is *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240).

To which the Senator has directed his attention. The State of California made every argument which has been made here. It went back and took up every one of the cases to which reference has been made. It tried to extend the doctrine of inland waters in the Pollard case down into the sea, 3 miles off the coast of California. It went through every case; and the judges of the Supreme Court, with their staff and facilities for research, came to a different conclusion.

Referring to the case of Manchester against Massachusetts, the Court said in the California case:

> That case involved only the power of Massachusetts to regulate fishing.
>
> Moreover, the illegal fishing charged was in Buzzards Bay, found to be within Massachusetts territory, and no question whatever was raised or decided as to title or paramount rights in the open sea.

When we state the issue as clearly as this, it becomes understandable. The truth is that Manchester against Massachusetts was a case pertaining to fishing, and it was a case in which illegal fishing was charged in Buzzards Bay—an inland water. Therefore, as the Court in the California case appropriately notes—

> No question whatever was raised or decided as to title or paramount rights in the open sea.

The Court specifically laid to one side any question as to the rights of the Federal Government to regulate fishing there.

I think the Senator from Minnesota is being very fair, and somewhat accurate, too, when he says that the argument which the majority leader made in an effort to apply, first of all, the doctrine of national sovereignty from British courts over to the colonies, and from the colonies in their colonial status into their status as independent States, and to say that the independent States took with them the powers of Great Britain and the colonies is fallacious, on the basis of the record of cases and the court decisions.

I think I am citing concrete evidence. As the Court said in the California case:

> No question whatever was raised or decided as to title or paramount rights in the open sea.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there not further corroboration of the views of the Senator from Minnesota, Justice Story, and the Supreme Court in the Curtiss-Wright case, in the terms of article III of the Constitution of the United States?

Article III, section 2 provides:

> SEC. 2. The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made under their authority; to all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers, and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction—

Note the words: "To all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction."

If the Federal courts were given jurisdiction over all maritime cases, it follows that it was the belief of the framers of the Constitution that the Federal Government had control of the maritime functions, including the waters upon which the vessels sailed along the coast. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Illinois is correct. The Continental Congress certainly was of that opinion. I was reminded a moment ago that the resolutions and statements of the Continental Congress applied directly to maritime matters, particularly to navigation and defense on the seas.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true not only of admiralty matters, but also of maritime matters. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Admiralty and maritime.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And maritime matters refer to issues arising on the open sea. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I want to say again, Mr. President, that international law, which deals with the subject of international sovereignty and with the exercise of sovereignty on the open seas, sets forth clearly and very convincingly that that sovereignty is vested in the head of the state or the government—the central government—and not in any of the appendages, portions, segments, parts or factors of the nation state. It is further clear that such sovereignty is absolute, unadulterated, conclusive, and comprehensive insofar as external matters are concerned, and particularly out in the ocean, because there has always been the question as to whether anyone owns the ocean.

As I pointed out, Puffendorf argued that if anyone owned the ocean it should be the nation-state adjoining.

Puffendorf spoke about the nation state. He did not talk about California, Delaware, or Maine. He did not talk about Nebraska or Arkansas. He talked about the state, which is represented throughout the history of civilization by terminologies like prince, emperor, king, or monarch, and in the parlance of great international jurists and great writers in international law by sovereign.

The word "sovereign" is not subject to misinterpretation, Mr. President, because when we are talking about the sovereign in international matters, and

in terms of nations, we are talking about the powers of the state, the nation state.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, when Puffendorf referred to that subject he had in mind Great Britain, and he was speaking of the powers of the King of England, not of the Earl of Dorset, the Duke of Kent, the Prince of Wales, the Earl of Sussex, the Earl of Southhampton, but the King of England. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The Senator's analogy is very appropriate and apropos to this particular argument. When we speak of sovereign power in the United States we are not talking about the sovereign power of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or the sovereign power of the great North Star State of Minnesota. Instead, we are talking about the particular system of government which we have in this country. We are talking about the sovereign power of the United States of America, as manifested in the Government of the United States of America, and as made particularly manifest in the President of the United States of America and the Congress. That is what we are talking about.

In external matters the President of the United States is the spokesman for the Government.

Mr. President, all I have tried to do during this time is to point out that while the majority leader's speech was stated positively, it does not mean necessarily that it is positively right. The majority leader's speech contained documentation and excellent use of legal cases. But the cases were directed toward the wrong objective. His references did not support his point.

The attempt to confuse, I say, is rather alarming. The attempt that was made to take the documentation of the Pollard case, which refers to inland waters, and apply it to exteral water and to land under the marginal sea, I submit, is not valid. I submit it is indefensible in the law. Further than that, Mr. President, I submit it does not bear out the argument that Senate Joint Resolution 13 should be passed.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the majority leader's argument on international law supports nothing at all he attempted to support. He intended his argument to support the thesis that several States like Rhode Island, Maine, Vermont, or New York—in other words, the Thirteen Colonies who became the Original Thirteen States—had particular powers and rights and prerogatives after they declared themselves independent from England.

But one of the greatest writers and one of the most learned authors in American history, the estimable judge and jurist, Mr. Story, in his commentaries on the Constitution, does not substantiate or support the claim of the majority leader.

My friend from Florida stated that Justice Story wrote lectures and that he did all this after he had left the Court.

Mr. President, the controlling case is the case of United States against Curtiss-Wright, decided in 1935. The most recent case therefore with reference to the basic declaration on the part of the Court on the question of the sovereign power of the United States of America was decided in 1935. Justice Sutherland in that case reviewed the whole history of our separation from Great Britain, and how the country of the United States was established, and how every State acted within the resolution of Congress, and how the Continental Congress sprung from the people, and did not spring from the States as such.

I note that my friend, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], wishes to ask a question. Is that correct?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not the Senator from Minnesota know that many distinguished constitutional lawyers differ with the opinion of Justice Story, and with some of Justice Sutherland's statements in the Curtiss-Wright case, especially Justice Sutherland's theory that the Nation has inherent powers in external sovereignty which are not obtained through the Constitution. I just wanted the privilege of asking the Senator the question, so as to make the point clear in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. In other words, that there are many lawyers who disagree with Justice Story.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Nevertheless it is true that the law of the Court has not been overruled.

Mr. DANIEL. I could not agree with the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator could agree that it has not been overruled; could he not?

Mr. DANIEL. I doubt that the comments of Justice Sutherland, which the Senator from Minnesota has read, are really the holding in the case. They might be some of the dicta which the Senator has been criticizing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The holding in the case related to the sovereign power of the Federal Government.

Mr. DANIEL. It was not necessary for the Justice to say how the sovereign power was acquired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator would say it was not nongermane, or that it related to cases on the sovereign power of the United States, but did not relate in the same way as in the case of Manchester against Massachusetts. That case was brought into the debate in an attempt to show that there were some peculiar rights in the State of Massachusetts out in the ocean, when it involved illegal fishing inside a bay within the territorial limits of the State of Massachusetts, and when the Court took specfic notice that no issue of the Government's paramount rights was ever brought before the Court. I would submit that kind of evidence is not very persuasive.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Did the Senator acknowledge that there were in the Treaty of Peace words which caused good lawyers and good students of history to believe that the individual States were sovereign? In that connection, I refer to the following words in the treaty between Great Britain and the original States:

ARTICLE I

His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz. New-Hampshire, Massachusetts-Bay, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North-Carolina, South-Carolina, and Georgia, to be free, sovereign and independent States—

Not just one State, but "free, sovereign, and independent States"—

that he treats with them as such; and for himself—

That is, the King of England—

his heirs and successors, relinquishes all claims to the government, propriety, and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof.

Does not the Senator from Minnesota realize that that wording of the Treaty of Paris gives foundation for the argument that the States were, as the treaty says, independent States, and that all property of the King in those States passed from the King to those individual States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me reply to the distinguished Senator from Texas as follows:

First of all, the language which was read is only part of the treaty; second, there is a reference to the United States; third, the representatives of the 13 States did not sign the treaty; the treaty was signed by representatives of the United States.

The Senator from Texas knows that the 13 States to which he has referred did not have separate representatives sign the treaty. If my memory serves me correctly, John Jay had a great deal to do with that matter, and so did George Washington. It was Gen. George Washington who, when he was first President of the United States, was—at a later time—stoned—some of the people threw rocks at his house—because of the treaty.

But it was John Jay, representing the United States of America, who signed the treaty of peace with England. The 13 colonies that became independent States did not sign the treaty. The treaty was signed by representatives of the United States of America.

So, again, a little evidence does not necessarily prove the main point.

The United States of America was the United States under the Continental Congress, and was the same United States under the Articles of Confederation, and is the United States of America, thank God, under the Constitution of the United States. An attempt to make it appear as if the United States of America does not have jurisdiction out in the territorial seas is an attempt to try to deny the Government of the United States rights and prerogatives which other nations possess. The territorial seas are defended by the Government of the United States, acting in its power as a Nation. The ships of our Navy are manned by men who serve in the fleet of

the United States of America, not the fleet of Kansas, or Texas, or Minnesota. The Coast Guard of the United States of America and the Navy of the United States of America and the Army of the United States of America, including the guns, tanks, battleships, airplanes, airplane carriers, and bombs, all belong to the United States of America.

For years it has been acknowledged that the territorial belt of 3 miles or the sea belt of 3 miles around this country was proclaimed by the United States of America. My children and my children's children and those of all other Senators will still be taught from the history books and in the classrooms of the high schools and colleges that the sea belt of 3 miles around our coastline was proclaimed by the United States of America, was defended by the United States of America, and was maintained as an integral part of our system of international relations and foreign policy and national security.

Mr. President, I keep on looking through the remarks of the majority leader because I must say that I was really very much saddened by them. I really was, because the majority leader represents, to me, a man of great integrity and outstanding ability, and I always have pictured him as an eminent lawyer. So I can only say, and I say it in all kindness, that I am sure the majority leader simply did not have time to study the RECORD in this matter. He counted the words, but he did not read them. He knew the number of words we had put in the RECORD. But if he had read those words, if he had studied them and if he had studied the philosophy and the logic that are to be found there and the citations of fact and cases and history, our majority leader never would have made that speech; he simply could not have done so. He is too wise in the law.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that one can have someone else count words for him, and that can be done very readily; but if one is to understand the words, he has to read them for himself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama is correct, and I thank him.

I think he will agree with me that if the majority leader had gone through this record as carefully as I know he would like to, he certainly could not have made the quotations he did from the chief justice of England, because although I appreciate the friendliness the majority leader has exemplified during this debate, I must say I did not expect him to plead our case for us. Yet some of the quotations the majority leader gave in the course of his speech are the quotations we have been looking for for a long time. I am delighted that someone was able to produce them, because they further document the contention being made by those of us who are in opposition to the joint resolution.

Mr. President, this afternoon some comment was made about the statement made by Thomas Jefferson in 1793. The majority leader said it was claimed that Thomas Jefferson in 1793 was the first to insist on the 3-mile limit, and that therefore title was acquired by the Federal Government. Then the majority leader referred to a portion of the letter Mr. Jefferson wrote.

All I can say, again, is that if we accept the interpretation made by the majority leader, when he said that Thomas Jefferson did not wish to have the jurisdiction of the United States Government extend to a distance of 5 miles, but only to a distance of 3 miles, whose case does that argument help? The joint resolution that the majority leader has before us, wishes to extend the control of the States for a distance of 10½ miles. Thomas Jefferson said that 5 miles was too far for the Federal Government to extend its jurisdiction, and said that jurisdiction should extend only 3 miles. Then the majority leader uses that citation as an example. I cannot quite understand whose side the majority leader is on. Perhaps I am being too critical of him; if he is on our side, I wish to apologize, for surely what he pointed out in his discussion—and I have the whole record of it before me now—was that:

> His letter is rather one to cut down the ownership to 3 miles, than it is to extend it to 3 miles. The letter was written to indicate that the United States would not claim jurisdiction for 5 miles from the land, and that therefore the United States would release the British brig *Fannie*, which had been captured at a distance of 5 miles from the shore.

That is merely a statement that Jefferson set the line of 3 miles for the purpose of our national security, declaring jurisdiction by the Federal Government over the territorial seas for a distance of 3 miles, but saying that it was not desired to have the Federal Government's jurisdiction extend for 5 miles.

Yet the majority leader uses that as support for a measure which would extend the jurisdiction of the States out no one knows how far. In fact, on the basis of the claims which have been made in the course of this debate, and in reference to the alleged historic boundaries, no doubt control for a much greater distance than that will be claimed for the States.

Finally, Mr. President, I say that when the majority leader said that in 1947, in his opinion, the Supreme Court simply ignored international law or, as he said, "ignored in an astounding way, I think, the arguments presented by the various States."

The fact is that the Supreme Court did not ignore international law, but took international law into consideration, just as Mr. Dulles took it into consideration when the State Department testified before the committee. Yet his action in that respect did not extend the jurisdiction of the States beyond the 3-mile limit. He wanted to minimize the constitutional questions involved.

Then let me refer to Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General—not one of the Fair Deal or New Deal Democrats, but one of the persons engaged in "the practical crusade." Mr. President, the crusaders have not agreed upon the nature of the crusade. They have not even agreed on the road they are going to take in this issue.

The Attorney General has said, "Go this way, and go slow—at 3 miles an hour."

The Secretary of State has said, "We already have trouble with the Soviet Union, over boundaries. We have trouble with Mexico over boundaries. We have trouble with other Latin American countries over seaward boundaries. If you extend the territorial sea any farther than 3 miles or if you extend the boundaries of the United States beyond 3 miles, you will get us into even more trouble."

Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD that the joint resolution would do just that. It has been sent from the committee to the Senate without any regard for the testimony of the Attorney General and in disregard of the advice and counsel of the State Department.

The argument which was made this afternoon to defeat the Anderson amendment is an argument which does not hold water; it is an argument which is not cogent; it is an argument which is not based upon either fact or law; and it is an argument which is confusing—an argument which only confounds and continues to confuse the issues before the Senate.

I also realize, Mr. President, that the Supreme Court in its 1947 opinion did not ignore international law. If there has been any ignoring of international law, it has only been the ignoring of the conclusions of which international law treats. The majority leader drew some fine quotations from international law, but his conclusions will not lead to the objective he seeks. I have before me Puffendorf's own statements, which the majority leader quoted; I have quotations from the opinions of the courts of England, which the majority leader quoted; the quotations from Story's Commentaries; those from Curtiss-Wright against the United States, in the decision rendered by Justice Sutherland. The argument in any court would be on the side of those of us who have cited the decisions of the courts and have not cited what it was hoped the courts would decide. I have noticed that the proponents all the way have cited what it was hoped the courts might decide.

Mr. President, one other thing that was rather interesting to me was the statement, which I paraphrase that those of us who oppose the Holland resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 13, have argued that the Supreme Court ought to decide the case, and not the Congress of the United States. The majority leader reminded us that there was nothing in the Constitution which gives the Supreme Court the final right to determine the meaning of the Constitution or the laws.

I recall, however, that there is a very notable case on this subject, in which a very distinguished Justice handed down the decision. I refer to the case of Marbury against Madison. I believe the Justice was Chief Justice Marshall. Mr. President, this is an elementary case in constitutional law. Let me say I studied that case in 1937, a long time ago, but I cannot forget it. In Marbury against

Madison, the Chief Justice, that great and wonderful man of the earlier years of our Government, who to a great extent established the powers of the Federal Government by his legal doctrines, said that the duty of the Supreme Court was to determine the meaning of the Constitution and to judge of the constitutionality of laws. All I can say is that it is one thing to assert—that there is nothing in the Constitution which gives the Supreme Court the final right to determine the meaning of the Constitution, and it is another thing to be able to document it; and I must rely on Marbury against Madison, rather upon the majority leader, because Marbury against Madison is a legal decision which has been accepted down through the years by all the courts.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to yield to a great lawyer and a fine Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that after I studied law, I really thought I knew a great deal about law, including constitutional law. But after about 30 years' practice of the law, and my contacts with the law, I came to the conclusion that I did not know so much. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Minnesota is a lawyer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator I do not want him to make any comments regarding the majority leader now if that is what he is driving at, because I think the majority leader knows a great deal about the law, even if he has practiced it but 30 or 40 years, and I am not going to let the Senator from Michigan cast any aspersions upon the majority leader's argument whatever.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield at the moment. The majority leader knows the law, and I submit that anybody who studies the law undoubtedly finds that there is much more to learn, as one finds in regard to anything; and that is what I am trying to indicate here. I know there is much to learn. I am not a lawyer, as the Senator has properly pointed out.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not a lawyer, but we know it happens, occasionally, that someone on the outside can help the lawyer a little bit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I proceed with the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is that the Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was surprised that the Senator from Michigan would use such an analogy as the fact that when one has been in the law business for 30 years he finds that there is so much more to learn. What I have been saying all afternoon is that I respect the legal talents of my colleagues, and I realize that they must know that there is a very great deal to learn. I do not know very much about the law, but what little I know tells me that what I have heard this afternoon simply does not add up to make sense. What little I know is that the Pollard doctrine does not relate itself to the submerged lands under the seas; and not only is that true on the part of the Senator from Minnesota, but every other lawyer knows it, too.

What we all know is that the California case of 1947 was the first case wherein the doctrine relative to submerged lands under the seas was ever decided in the courts. Every Senator knows that was the first case in which the doctrine of submerged lands under the territorial or marginal seas was tested in the courts. Furthermore, the Senator from Minnesota knows that the doctrine of international law which has been quoted as a means of substantiating the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 13, is no doctrine at all to substantiate that resolution. The doctrine of international law substantiates the conviction and the philosophy and the statement that the nation state is sovereign in the territorial seas.

Mr. President, I do not have to be reminded by my colleagues of my limitations and by lack of knowledge of the law. I do not claim to be an expert, and regardless of whether that insinuation comes by way of question or the more courageous manner of direct assertion, I will still stand on the floor of the Senate today to say that the case of 1947, United States against California, did not repeal the Pollard doctrine and did not reverse previous Supreme Court decisions. I can quote from the California case itself as my authority, as my witness. It merely discards the dicta of the Pollard case, and of other cases, which were irrelevant to the question of the territorial sea. Let me point out that the Supreme Court says that—

> None of the foregoing cases, nor others which we have decided, are sufficient to require us to extend the Pollard inland-water rule so as to declare that California owns or has paramount rights in or power over the 3-mile belt under the ocean.

The question of who owned the belt in the ocean was only taken to the Court in the beginning of the present century, when oil was discovered there.

What does the California case hold? It cites the cases of Louisiana against Mississippi; Manchester against Massachusetts; the Abby Dodge case. The Court mentioned other cases, and when they got all through with them, they reviewed every case that has been tossed up here every time we have debated this subject, and the Court said:

> None of the foregoing cases, nor others which we have decided, are sufficient to require us to extend inland-water rule so as to declare that California owns or has paramount rights in or power over the 3-mile belt under the ocean.

I was rather surprised to see that an attempt had been made again to confuse the issue by trying to extend the doctrine.

In the Texas case specific note was made of the fact that the cases were distinct and apart from cases involving inland waters. Even Justice Reed in his dissent in the California case had this to say:

> While no square ruling of this Court has has determined the ownership of those marginal lands, to me the tone of the decisions dealing with similar problems indicates that, without discussion, State ownership has been assumed.

He says there is no square ruling of the Supreme Court. Why? Because the issue had never been brought before the Court. How can the Court overrule something that has not been brought before the Court?

I have heard arguments this afternoon with reference to national sovereignty. The treaty with England was brought up as a means of supporting the idea or the assertion that the several States were independent sovereign nation states, and yet that treaty was not negotiated by representatives of New York, or of any other particular State; it was negotiated by representatives of the United States of America. I think we should be very happy and proud that we have such a glorious Federal and national beginning.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have made note of the fact in my argument this afternoon that the Federal system of our Government is rather unique in that it is the only such system in the world. It is unique in that respect, and it is a matter of great pride to us. Therefore, Mr. President, it appears to me that when one speaks of sovereign power in the United States of America he has to weigh his words carefully. He has to know whereof he speaks and what he speaks, and realize that in the internal aspects of the United States, in its internal jurisdiction, the powers are divided between the Federal Government on the one hand and the State governments on the other. But in its external aspects, in its dealings with foreign powers, in its relationships with other nations of the world, the States have no powers, no rights, no prerogatives, no duties or responsibilities. Their agent, the agent of the whole people of the 48 States of the United States of America, is the Federal Government of the United States of America.

I was rather surprised, as I said earlier today, to note that this issue might be discussed and decided on the basis of the results of the election. That is a very interesting doctrine. If the Federal Union had to be governed and protected on that basis throughout its 160 years of existence, we would not have had any Federal Union. One of the purposes of the Founding Fathers was to establish a system of checks and balances. The courts were established as a co-equal branch of the Government so that some place in the Government men and women would have an opportunity to have their cases decided on the merits, upon equity, and upon law, rather than to be brought into a political body for decision. There are other places in the world where justice is handed out on the basis of politics. That is true in Red China and in Moscow, behind the Iron Curtain. But, Mr. President, here the courts hand out justice regardless of politics. One of the reasons why judges

are appointed for life in some of our courts, or during good behavior, is to protect the integrity of the judicial process.

I want to read from Mr. Hamilton. He had this to say in the Federalist papers:

> The complete independency of the courts of justice is peculiarly essential in a limited constitution. By a limited constitution, I understand one which contains certain specified exceptions to the legislative authority; such, for instance, as that it shall pass no bills of attainder, no ex post facto laws, and the like. Limitations of this kind can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of courts of justice, whose duty it must be to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void. Without this all the reservations of particular rights or privileges would amount to nothing.

I wonder how that jibes with what the majority leader said about the Supreme Court. The majority leader intimated that some of us have a mistaken notion that the courts should have the final say on the Constitution. Hamilton, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota, and a few of our colleagues have the contrary opinion. I am delighted that I have not seen the truth coming to me from the flickering lights on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the position of the Senator from Minnesota not only true generally, but particularly true as to admiralty and maritime relations, because section 2 of article 3 of the Constitution specifically provides that it is the judicial power of the United States, not of the individual States, that shall prevail in all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. Furthermore, as the Senator knows, we have in the Senate Manual the Constitution, and it is a good thing to look at it once in a while. I am inclined to think we had better look at it a great deal in the next few days. The Senator will note that in all cases affecting ambassadors and other public ministers representing the national sovereignty, the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction. Why? I read a few days ago from Madison as to why the Supreme Court should have original jurisdiction. The Court was to stand as an arbitrator and a judge between the claims of a State and the claims of the Federal Government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand the Senator's position to be, that the States never had sovereignty, and the Federal Government existed prior to its formation under the Articles of Confederation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was quoting from Mr. Justice Story and from Mr. Justice Sutherland. Even in my most braggadocio moments I would not claim to have even 50 percent of the insight of those men. Mr. Justice Story was of the opinion that the Nation possessed sovereignty and that the several States never did possess it. They came in as an entity under the Continental Congress pursuant to the rules of the Continental Congress.

This is a long, involved argument. I feel so inadequate. I just read from the law book, and it is a lot like reading the Scriptures. There are times when I feel I do not want to talk about it. So I read it from the book. When we read it from the book, we get it from the Lord himself. We do not get it with all the interruptions.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. This is a question I have in mind: Is the Senator arguing that the ownership of the Federal Government of submerged lands beyond the low-water mark is derived from the Constitution, or from some other source?

Mr. HUMPHREY. From both, as an attribute of sovereignty. The court said in the Texas and California cases that the Federal Government had paramount rights, and the court reviewed the whole legal background.

But discussing that would involve a full course in history, and I am not prepared tonight to give a full course in history. What I am prepared to do is to review the claims made on the floor of the Senate, particularly the claims made this afternoon. I am prepared tonight to read what I have said before, showing that the doctrine of law which pertains to inland waters does not necessarily follow through to external waters and submerged lands under the sea. If anyone has ownership, I may say it is the Federal Government, surely not the State governments, because the State governments are only parts of the Federal Government. We are attempting to make a more perfect union, and the Federal Government is supreme in external matters and represents the sovereign power of the nation state. No single State represents the sovereign power.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell us in what part of the Constitution the States yielded their submerged lands?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If only some words like "submerged lands" could be found in the Constitution, I am certain that the Senator from Louisiana and others would be among the first to bring them to our attention. But the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has pointed out that the Constitution does make note of the fact that admiralty and maritime matters are within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. That is a little closer than the evidence of the proponents that submerged lands belong to the States.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in addition to the opinion of Mr. Justice Story, this issue was decided in the bloodiest civil war of all time, from 1861 to 1865; and that as a result of the bloodshed upon the battlefields of the Civil War, the American people decided that the Federal Government was something more than a mere federation of states by supporting an external sovereignty? In the test of force, the American people decided that the Federal Union was something more than a mere federation of states, did they not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois, with his typical brilliance, eloquence, and sincerity, has stated the case more forcefully than the Senator from Minnesota ever could state it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to be associated with the Senator from Illinois in this argument. I do not say this in a sense of false humility. It is wonderful to walk in the shadow of a great Senator. It is wonderful to be on a team such as we have here. This is a real crusade.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Minnesota perhaps think that the slogan of the majority party should be "Raid, not aid"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me answer that question, which is indeed provocative. I want to give a very unprejudiced answer: Yes. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to my friend from Maryland, because we want to help Maryland protect her rights.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. So do I. Simply because the judicial power of the United States extends to maritime matters, does the Senator contend that that gives the United States title to the lands in the controversy? Is that the Senator's argument?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. We are not contending that any one of these many things are references that may give the United States title. We are contending, however, as to the totality. After listening to the argument of the majority leader, it is going to take time for me to get the law in proper perspective.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. At the rate the Senator is proceeding, it will take considerable time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has been out of the Chamber, eating. Man cannot live upon bread alone; he must be free to get the philosophy we are giving him tonight. [Laughter.]

All we are saying is that if any power owns the land under the sea, it is the sovereign nation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Would the Senator say that because the commerce clause rests in Congress the right to regulate commerce, that gives the Government title to all land in all the States over which commerce passes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course I do not say that. I say that three Supreme Court decisions are much more reliable in content than what may be said in 25 political speeches given in a campaign or in a mass of argument, which may be justified on the basis of doctrine which is not relevant to the issue before us.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. But the Senator has left his thesis. Let us stick to the point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator ask a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The mere fact that Congress has control of interstate and foreign commerce does not give Congress control of all the lands and waters in the United States, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I am trying to keep Congress from horsing around with those. That is what the whole proposition is about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The Chair regrets that it is necessary to remind the occupants of the galleries that they are present as guests of the Senate, and that, under a rule of the Senate, they are forbidden to express approval or disapproval. This is supposed to be a serious debate. In order to maintain decorum, the Chair must ask the occupants of the galleries to please refrain from expressing their feelings vocally.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to reply to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Maryland; then I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

When the Constitution was adopted, it was constituted on the part of the people of the States, by a constituent act. It was also an act granting sovereignty. It established sovereign power in a Federal Government. It established a great Federal system. I have tried to review international law and have used the references made by the majority leader to show where attention was really directed. I have cited the papers of the Continental Congress of 1779, the doctrine of our courts, three Supreme Court decisions, the debates of the Constitutional Convention, to which I have referred, the Federalist Papers, Justice Story's Commentaries on the Constitution, and Supreme Court cases such as United States against Curtiss-Wright.

The final point of view must measure up to and finally be decided by the evidence and the facts which are available, the evidence of history, the evidence of philosophy, the evidence of the great historical documents of our country, the evidence of decisions of our great men, the evidence of our courts, the evidence of the rule of law. All these lead to the conclusion that the States do not have title to ownership. If there is title in ownership, it is possession in the Federal Government as a sovereign representative over a united people.

The United States of America or what is more, the Federal Government, cannot divest itself of that sovereignty. Furthermore, if there is a test to be made as to which has the power, the States or the Federal Government, the place to test that question is not, as we have been reminded in the Senate this afternoon, out in a campaign, but in the courts.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does it not follow from what the Senator from Minnesota has just now so brilliantly argued that the essence of his thesis is that all interest in the submerged lands involves a determination of the sovereign rights of the Federal Government?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The Senator has again stated the issue. I appreciate the Senator's question. However, we have repeated this general thesis over and over again. I remind the Senator that the State Department, under Mr. Dulles, came before the committee which held hearings on the bill and reminded the committee that any violation of the 3-mile limit would pose certain problems for us internationally. The Attorney General admonished the committee which reported the Holland joint resolution, which gives title and ownership to the States. He suggested to the committee, "Do not do this. Save the title for the Federal Government. Let the States develop it, but do not try to give them the title. If you do, there will be constitutional questions."

I say to the Senator from Oregon that when someone has been promised something, and promised it so often, as the majority leader reminded us this afternoon—promised it on the radio and on the television, and in other ways, so that no one could possibly deny the promise—when it becomes a promise that must be kept, we must ignore the Attorney General. We must ignore the Secretary of State. We are not compelled to ignore them, but we do. We ignore even the historical evidence which is before us. We ignore the decisions of the Court; and we even ignore the direction of the Constitution.

Mr. President, the majority leader gave us some quotations from the President's campaign statements. I do not want to hold them against the President. I think the President was busy in the campaign. I think he was poorly advised. But I will say this: When we are discussing a basic national policy, namely the conservation, protection, and use of vast quantities of natural resources, as well as a constitutional issue relating to the powers of the States as against those of the Federal Government, and the grave international problems involved in this issue, if a mistake has been made in the campaign, it is better to say so.

We are paying too much for the education we are getting in politics. The tuition charges are going up too high. The cost of tuition for political mistakes is running into the billions of dollars.

I cannot consider such a course a crusade. I repeat that one does not have to crusade to give away the national domain. Crusades are born on the basis of saving the national domain. Theodore Roosevelt was a crusader. Gifford Pinchot was a crusader. Abraham Lincoln was a crusader. He saved the Nation. Andrew Jackson was a crusader. He saved the Union in his time. We have had great crusaders.

One does not lead a crusade to defy a rule laid down by the Supreme Court three times. One does not lead a crusade to make a mockery out of Jefferson's policy of 1793. One does not lead a crusade to ignore the admonition and the precautionary words of distinguished lawyers and a distinguished Secretary of State. The American people are not going to be very happy when they learn that we have passed those resources away in the name of good government, in the name of efficiency, in the name of States' rights and crusading.

The way to crusade is to join this little band, as we are called. Join the crusade to protect the resources of the American people. Join the crusade to help the education of American children, which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] eloquently and passionately described this afternoon as a pathetic need. If someone wants to crusade in America, let him crusade for 325,000 schoolrooms, which our children need. Let him crusade to see whether or not we can conserve the riches which God Almighty has bestowed upon this Nation. Let him crusade to make the Government of the United States more responsible and less irresponsible.

The pending joint resolution does not represent a crusade. If this is the crusade we were led into, all I can say is that it will be a short-lived one. The American people want hope; they want leadership. It does not require leadership to give away the national treasure. It does not require leadership to reverse a public policy which was established in this land almost 50 years ago by a great President who had to meet difficult issues head-on in his day.

I am proud to defend the cause we are defending. I feel that I am engaged in a righteous cause. I agree with the majority leader that if there were not one dollar involved, it would still be a righteous cause. This is a cause which is basic to the general soundness of the American economy. If this cause is lost, if this great public domain and its resources are given away, we shall have opened up a Pandora's box of troubles for the American people.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that, in view of the nature of the argument made by the distinguished majority leader this afternoon, it has now become important for this little band of liberals in opposition to the joint resolution to take considerable additional time to impress upon the American people the fact that the issue of sovereignty involved in this case is an issue which must now go before the Supreme Court, so that it may be established beyond question of doubt that political promises in the midst of a campaign must never be used to infringe upon the separation-of-powers doctrine which guarantees to the Supreme Court constitutional jurisdiction to determine questions of sovereignty?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator that we must take the time which is necessary to debate these issues. However, I wish to say that we are going to vote on these issues. We have before us the Douglas amendment, and we shall vote on it very shortly. However, I wish to make it perfectly clear that there are a number of amendments which require full discussion. I do not mean discussion week after week. I mean full discussion. I took the time tonight to discuss what had been said here this afternoon, because, very frankly, Mr. President, I was disturbed. I do not mind

losing a fight. I have lost more than I have won. However, I do not like to lose an argument when the argument that wins is one which, when examined, is as flimsy as a nylon nightgown.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall that the late senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, many years ago once proposed a measure providing for the reversal of decisions of the Supreme Court by way of the political power of Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin ran into overwhelming opposition, as it should have, because the principle involved a proposal which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] referred to the other day as a legislative packing of the Supreme Court?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not too familiar with that history, but I recall it. It seems to me, as the Senator relates it, that is the substance of the story.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Minnesota familiar with the fact that the great Abraham Lincoln, in his time, in discussing the question of sovereignty, made clear his point of view that, after all, the sovereignty of the Federal Union as a whole was greater than the sovereignty of any individual State?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Oregon, if anyone reviews the period of 1832, 1837, and 1838, the period of the so-called tariff of abominations, and the period of the debates between Calhoun, on the one hand, and Jackson on the other—Jackson at that time being the President of the United States—he will find what the substance of those arguments was.

I wish to point out that Jackson made it perfectly clear that when the Federal Government acted in a field in which it was privileged, it acted completely, and that an individual State had no right to declare whether or not it would obey or abide by such action.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall that the Great Emancipator took the position that the sovereignty of the Federal Government was greater than the summation of the sovereignty of the several States?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I remember that. In fact, I had the privilege of reviewing that delightful and interesting period of American history with my 14-year-old daughter. My daughter, although she is only 14 years old, understands this much about American history: that the Government of the United States is sovereign, with full powers of sovereignty, when it comes to matters pertaining to the marginal sea or to the territorial sea or to relationships between the nations.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that the point recently made in this debate by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] concerning one of the basic issues of the War Between the States, was the issue of the supremacy of the sovereignty of the Union over the sovereignty of any separate State or combination of States, or the summation of the sovereignty of the separate States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is exactly the issue, I will say to the Senator from Oregon. There has never been any recognition of secession. The States never seceded. The States may have apparently thought they had seceded, but so far as the Union was concerned and so far as Lincoln was concerned and the courts were concerned, secession was not a fact.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that as a result of the War Between the States there certainly was recognized the fact—the constitutional-law fact—that under our Constitution when a Territory was made into a State and came into the Union, whatever sovereignty it had merged into the greater sovereignty of the Federal Government as a totality?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that was the general development of the theory of Justice Sutherland and Justice Story in their discussion of national sovereignty.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me, then, that on the basis of the principle that was clearly, and I thought once and for all stated, at the end of the War Between the States, when the Lone Star flag came down and the Stars and Stripes went up in Texas, Texas then had any sovereign rights such as the Federal Government had to any lands off its coast?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the way I understand it. That is the way I attempted to develop my argument the other day. It is my sincere belief that the equal-footing provision in the resolution admitting the State of Texas into the Union, as well as with respect to the other States, means exactly what it says. Equal footing means no more and no less. I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon was in the Chamber at the time, but during my discourse on April 22 I discussed the equal-footing clause in some detail. I went into the historical background of it.

I made note of the fact that at the time of the Constitutional Convention the equal-footing clause was brought into it for full discussion, and attempts to give anything less than equal footing, or to extend anything less than equal footing, were defeated, and the general concept of equal footing was approved.

In that connection I quoted from James Madison and from the Constitutional Convention debates. I also quoted from the resolution offered by Gouverneur Morris, of New York, who wanted to say what some people are seeking to say today, namely, that some States had more privileges and other States had fewer privileges.

That argument was repudiated overwhelmingly by the Convention. Therefore the equal-footing clause in the resolution of admission to the Union is not something that was pulled out of thin air. The equal-footing clause comes from the Constitutional Convention. It does not make any difference which State is involved, whether it is little Rhode Island or the large State of Texas, or New Mexico, Arizona, Minnesota, California, or Michigan. Each State comes in, under the resolution of admission, on an equal footing with the Thirteen Original States; no more and no less.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that the statements which the President has made in his speeches and in recent days to the press, in connection with his interpretation of the rights of Texas, which he believes give Texas some special claim to the submerged lands lying off her coast, have no foundation in fact in any of the decisions of the Supreme Court?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Insofar as the Supreme Court is concerned, the Court took that case under advisement and gave its decision. The most I can say is when Texas was admitted, she was admitted under the same conditions as every other State was admitted.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield; yes.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's understanding that following the California case the forces who wanted to get jurisdiction over the oil under the submerged lands off the coast thought they might be able to get a reversal of the California case, and therefore the Texas case was brought?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There can be no doubt about that.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator knows that the sequence of the cases was California, Louisiana, and Texas.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that when the Supreme Court reached the Texas case, it not only did not reverse the California case, but it had presented to it, by distinguished counsel representing the Texas interests, the special claim of Texas; and the Court did not put its stamp of judicial approval on that argument; and therefore it is fair to point out that the Texas case really is, in effect, a practical reversal of the position that President Eisenhower takes in regard to the Texas claim?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is a reversal. The Texas case is a ruling by the Court that Texas has no peculiar, special claims or rights beyond those of all other States. Really what is happening here is that the President and the Congress are trying to reverse the Court.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been listening to the private conversation between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon. I believe the rule requires that a Senator address the Chair, before a Senator who has the floor may yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield. First, Mr. President, may I say that I wish to have the rules applied, and we shall see that they are applied. However, I have always liked to expedite the handling of this matter and to eliminate as many detours as possible. However, we shall apply the rule.

As I understand, I can yield for a question only when asked to do so by the Chair, and not by having another Senator ask me to yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in connection with the point of order, I should like to read from rule XIX, which provides that:

> No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer.

That is the substance of the point I make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that the procedure we were following was really one which was saving the Senate's time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with that statement. I must say that both the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon are very much concerned about saving the Senate some time in connection with these matters.

Furthermore, I wish to say that the Senator from Oregon and I were not holding a private conversation. I must confess, however, that in view of some of the statements I have heard, I am of the opinion that everyone of us who has been in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 13 must have held private conversations, because apparently no one else heard what we said.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must again remind the occupants of the galleries that they are here on sufferance, as guests of the Senate. If there is any further demonstration by the occupants of the galleries, it may be necessary to ask the guests to leave.

The Senator from Minnesota may resume.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Minnesota has yielded to me for a question, I should like to inquire whether he agrees with me that when President Eisenhower takes the position that the pending proposed legislation should be passed, and when he thereby seeks a political reversal of the Supreme Court's opinion, such a course of conduct on his part is, in fact, a threat to the separation-of-powers doctrine, and may even rise to plague an Executive at a future time because his jurisdiction is also dependent upon preservation and protection of the separation-of-powers doctrine?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Oregon has raised a very important point.

Let me point out that there never has been an Executive who did not feel there was some invasion of his powers, and there never has been a Congress that has not been somewhat concerned about invasion of the legislative powers by the Executive; and both the Congress and the President have at times been somewhat concerned about the invasion of their powers by the judiciary.

The respective division of authority as between the Executive, the legislative, and the judiciary constitutes a very important part of our governmental process. The decision that may be made here—and apparently, as pointed out this afternoon by the majority leader, it will be made because we had an election; he said that twice in the course of his speech—may very well come home to worry and cause serious concern to both the Congress and the President.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland, and in a short time I shall yield to him. However, first I should like to continue to yield to the Senator from Oregon, until he has completed his interrogations. Thereafter I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall that in the recent administration of President Truman, there arose several cases which involved the question of the power of the Executive, under the separation-of-powers doctrine, to wit, as the last example I recall, the attempt to require a witness before the Armed Services Committee to testify about what transpired in the White House, in the course of a conversation the President had with certain high Government officials?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that matter. As the Senator from Oregon knows, I do not know the details, because it happened in the Armed Services Committee, of which I am not a member, and of which the Senator from Oregon no longer is a member.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do so; for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall, in connection with the last incident I cited—namely, that involving the separation-of-powers doctrine—that it was the position taken by the Chief Executive that to require a witness to testify regarding a conversation at the White House between the President and certain Government officials would be an invasion of the separation-of-powers doctrine and would invade the jurisdiction of the Executive?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oregon is correct. There are many examples of cases in which the Executive has asserted again and again his jurisdiction, under the separation-of-powers doctrine. George Washington, our first President, himself, asserted his jurisdiction and stated his feeling on the separation of powers, as did the Congress; the 1st Congress was very jealous of its rights.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question ?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do, for the purpose of a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall that in recent years—in fact, already at the present session of the Congress—there has been considerable discussion between Members of the Congress and members of the executive branch of the Government as to whether Congress should have the right to demand to see the contents of executive files, such as, for example, FBI files?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a standing argument in this Congress, as it has been in other Congresses.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall that in all the controversies of recent years over the question of whether the Congress as a matter of right should be allowed to see the contents of executive files, it has been the consistent ruling of Attorneys General of the United States that under the

separation-of-powers doctrine, Congress has no such right?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oregon is reporting accurately as to the developments which have occurred and the general decision which has been made throughout several administrations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do so yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that, under the Constitution, when issue arises as to whether a constitutional power is being transgressed, the branch of Government that has jurisdiction to render the decision is the judicial branch?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator from Oregon that is my understanding, and I think it is the general understanding that has grown up through 160 or 165 years of law in this country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for the purposes of a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that if under the separation-of-powers doctrine and if under our checks-and-balances system, by means of which we have a constitutional government of coordinate and coequal branches, the time ever comes when we proceed, by the exercise of political power, by a preponderant majority, to make the Congress of the United States supreme in the matter of deciding constitutional questions, then we shall have entered an era of government by men and by politicians, not a government by law?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I could not agree more with the Senator from Oregon. I wish to say to him that there may be those who feel that when Senate Joint Resolution 13 is passed—and I am of the opinion that it will most likely find its way into public law—they will have won a victory; there may be a legislative victory; there may be those who feel that promises have been fulfilled by the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13. But, Mr. President, that does not decide the issue because this will be a court case, just as there were other court cases, and notice to that effect has been given. I am of opinion that the temper of the American people is going to compel the State governors and other officials to initiate suits in Federal courts under the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, just as Rhode Island is planning upon doing; so, if the purpose of the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 is merely to keep a campaign promise, and to get a number of persons off the hook, I suppose we can endure that dubious luxury. But if the purpose is to develop oil, if the purpose is to get exploration and development under way, I fear that that will not happen right away because there will be little but exploration and development in the Supreme Court Building; there will be litigation and a good deal of it.

But, Mr. President, even more important—and I am not at all facetious—for the life of me I cannot understand how we can pass the pending measure, since Senate Joint Resolution 13 is in many instances, not in all, but in many instances, ambiguous and uncertain. I regret that our great friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is not here. I understand he is indisposed, having become ill this afternoon. But I recall very well that the Senator from New Mexico pointed out the many dubious qualities of Senate Joint Resolution 13, and asked what was meant by certain words.

I do not know this particular subject matter as completely as does the Senator from New Mexico. He had a number of questions in mind, and I know the Senator from New Mexico told some of his colleagues this morning that it was his intention on the basis of those questions to submit a series of amendments to the joint resolution. We are not resolving questions. The Douglas amendment will help resolve some of them, because it will limit State control and ownership to 3 miles, and it will make it perfectly clear that the Federal Government has the supreme jurisdiction, control, and ownership beyond the 3 miles. That, at least, is understandable. I am not saying that the 3-mile concession is meritorious, but I am saying that at least we can understand what it means.

I further say that it more or less generally complies with the recommendations that have been made before the committee by the Attorney General, except—and this is a very important exception—the Attorney General did not recommend ownership by the States. He suggested development and use, but not ownership; and I have yet to hear anyone really discuss why it was so necessary to have ownership. I have yet to find anyone who really has made a case as to why the States should have title, in view of what the Attorney General has said. But I submit, Mr. President, that the Douglas amendment gives each and everyone of us, a clear-cut chance really to prove that we mean that the Federal Government ought to have the Continental Shelf, that the Federal Government ought to go beyond 3 miles.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland rose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question, and if so, to whom? The Senator from Maryland has taken his seat. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon, for a question only.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the Constitution of the United States provides a very specific and clearly written-out procedure for amending the Constitution?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It surely does.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for the purposes of a question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does it follow, in view of the fact that the procedure that is spelled out in the Constitution for amending the Constitution, in keeping with the separation-of-powers doctrine, makes it very clear that the constitutional fathers intended that if the people do not like a holding of the Supreme Court in regard to constitutional rights in connection with any litigation, we ought to proceed by the constitutional process for amendment of the Constitution, and not seek to substitute the legislative process to nullify the Court's decision?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator will recall that the Supreme Court held the income tax law unconstitutional, and that the way by which the income tax law became constitutional was by the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution.

That is the way the process ought to be carried out, and particularly if we are going to alter it. I may say to the Senator from Oregon, if it is to be proposed later to alter the relationship of power between the States and the Federal Government, if that is to be altered in the Federal system, it had better be taken up by constitutional processes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Oregon?

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I cannot yield, of course, to anyone for the purpose of asking a question of another Senator except the Senator from Minnesota, since I have the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota be permitted to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland be given the privilege of asking a question of the Senator from Oregon, without jeopardizing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? Hearing none, the Senator from Maryland may address a question to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Oregon seems to lay much stress on the separation of powers, and the fact that the Congress, in a case involving the Constitution, should not by legislation overrule the Supreme Court. Is it not true that, under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress may withdraw from the Supreme Court

appellate jurisdiction in cases arising under the Constitution?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am delighted to have that question, but it will take me some time to answer it; and I now proceed to answer it at some length.

I want to say, Mr. President, that the argument by analogy my good friend from Maryland has just made has no relationship whatever to the separation-of-powers doctrine. What we are dealing with here is the separation-of-powers doctrine, reserved under our Constitution, so far as the Supreme Court is concerned, to the jurisdiction and the power to pass final judgment in the absence of a constitutional amendment, on such great questions as questions of sovereignty, which go to the inherent power of the Government itself.

Our constitutional fathers would revolve in their graves if they thought that any suggestion would ever be made on the floor of the Senate that, because we have the power to exercise some jurisdiction over the appellate powers of the United States Supreme Court, we would therefore have the power to take away from the United States Supreme Court the power to determine whether the Constitution, in fact, has been violated so far as the inherent powers of this Government are concerned.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. My answer is based on the fact that the argument by analogy rests on the false assumption, I respectfully submit, that the Congress of the United States is supreme. The Senator from Maryland has pointed out the whole fallacy of trying to substitute an argument, or a matter of form, for a matter of substance.

The question as to sovereignty goes to the very substance of the Constitution itself. I say, most respectfully, Mr. President, that we cannot, under our separation-of-powers doctrine, without an amendment to the Constitution, take away the power of the Supreme Court to sit as the Court of last resort in protecting the people of this country from an unconstitutional assumption of power on the part of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No. I am going to answer the question. It is pretty fundamental as to whether we can, by legislation, destroy a third branch of the Government, which, in effect, we would do if we recognize the fallacious argument inherent in the question of the Senator from Maryland, because the Supreme Court sits under the division of power stated in the Constitution, under the article of the Constitution which gives the Court the power it has, and we cannot take that power away through legislation by the Congress of the United States, through usurpation of power by the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. When we come to the question of sovereignty, we are dealing with something which the Supreme Court has the innate power to decide. What the Senator is trying to say to us is that the blood that was spilled in the War Between the States means nothing. To say now that Congress can decide, in effect, that we can destroy sovereignty by denying the Supreme Court the power to pass upon the question is absurd. It is a proposal to make the Congress of the United States a super-Supreme Court.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall have to object to any further questions of the Senator from Oregon or we shall have another speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I intend to proceed, but I should like to give my good friend from Maryland a chance to make a reply.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for just a minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland be permitted to make such statement as he may wish, at whatever length he may wish, without jeopardizing my right to the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection if the statement is not to be more than 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the suggestion that the Senator from Maryland be given 1 minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. My request was for a longer time than that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the Senator from California will be more generous to his colleague from Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland may be allowed to speak for more than 1 minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

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

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I merely want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that during the Civil War there was a case involving man's most sacred right, his right to freely move about, and the Supreme Court of the United States said that the case was no longer before it, although it had been argued and was in the bosom of the Court at the time because the Congress had theretofore passed a law withdrawing its jurisdiction.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of a question.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he thinks that the Senator from Maryland has read recently the case of Marbury against Madison?

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I said in reply to the Senator from Ohio, the majority leader, who chastised in a severe manner those of us who thought that the Supreme Court might have the right to define what was constitutional and what was unconstitutional, I am rather surprised that we have even a suggestion brought up on the floor of the Senate that the Court did not have that particular authority, as matter of law. I quoted from Hamilton in the Federalist Papers, where Hamilton talked about the jurisdiction of the judiciary and its function in the American constitutional system, and I made note of the fact that the Court——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at that point for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I want to ask the Senator from Minnesota to share a book by Woodrow Wilson which I loaned to the Senator from Oregon yesterday, in which Mr. Wilson pointed out the very danger about which I am now speaking.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is not a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is a very fine debater, and is always courteous, and I wish to assure him that I have read that book.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am referring to Woodrow Wilson's book on constitutional government in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have read that book and other books of his. If the Senator from Maryland would support what Woodrow Wilson supported we would have a majority. What a man Woodrow Wilson was. Those who are the first to try to take the spirit of Woodrow Wilson out of government want us, at the same time, to read what he said.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Speaking of Woodrow Wilson, is it not a fact that some persons often separate statements from the general context, and is not that what is being done with reference to statements of the Supreme Court?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not exactly sure what the Senator from Maryland was referring to in connection with Woodrow Wilson's book on constitutional government, but the analogy which the Senator has used, taking short statements and drawing long conclusions from them which are not the conclusions which would follow from reading the full statement, is a correct one. That has been demonstrated today. I pointed out the fact that the majority leader had taken a number of cases to demonstrate a rule of law, only to find out that they did not state the rule of law at all. The majority leader was trying to indicate that they demonstrated the rule of law which he wanted to demonstrate. He tried to say that the small States in the great Nation had particular and peculiar rights in the territorial seas, and that was not substantiated at all.

What I am getting at is that unless one really checks the RECORD, unless he follows through all the way, he is likely to be convinced or persuaded by statements which are taken out of context and do not add up to the proposition

or the objective to which they are directed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to ask another question of the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia for the purpose of a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that the people of the United States, all 158 million of us, believe in three divisions of government, and we do not believe that any one of them can encroach upon the power of another, except that in a case when Congress passes a law it thinks is right and the Executive takes the stand that it is wrong, the third branch, the judicial branch, acts as the umpire, and its opinion is the opinion of the people.

If we take the stand now suggested, of allowing Congress to repeal the Constitution of the United States by taking the power out of the hands of the Supreme Court to determine the sovereignty of the United States, will we not be going against the understanding of the people, who are the Government, and the backbone of the Government of this country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from West Virginia, in reply to his question, that we are very much going against what I consider to be the basis of our constitutional system, when we follow a course of action which in any way limits the sovereignty of the Federal Government in its particular areas of responsibility; likewise, if we limit the sovereignty of the States in their respective areas of responsibility.

I point out that the peculiar, yet unique, wonderful constitutional system under which we live in this country is a delicate mechanism. It has separate powers, checks and balances, and proper respect for the rights, prerogatives, and responsibilities of each of the co-equal branches of government. We have legislative, judicial, and executive branches.

As I have stated again and again on the floor, the judicial branch is interpreted in the Federalist Papers as being, more or less, a gyroscope. It is a balance wheel between the powers of the Federal Government and the powers of the States; between the powers of the legislative branch and of the executive branch. Without this triumph of the concept of a Federal judiciary in the Constitution, there would be no such thing as the Federal system under which we now live. Hamilton made this point particularly clear in Federalist Paper No. 80, which he wrote to the people of New York. In speaking about the judiciary, Hamilton outlined four or five points of the judicial system. Coming to the fourth point, concerning the Supreme Court's original jurisdiction in cases between States, and between States and the Federal Government, he said:

> The fourth point rests on this plain proposition: That the peace of the whole ought not to be left at the disposal of a part. The Union will undoubtedly be answerable to foreign powers for the conduct of its members.

All that I am saying is that if we give to Florida, if we give to Texas, if we give to all the States what they are claiming with respect to unusual boundaries and extra privileges, they are going to be extraordinarily out of line in terms of the international implications that will come from extending boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit which has been recognized in the law of nations.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at this point for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from West Virginia for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Would it not be a fact, then, that if extraterritorial powers in the Gulf of Mexico were granted to 3 States, the Union, in respect to those 3 States, would be held responsible for anything that interfered with freedom of the seas, navigation, and the rights of other sovereign countries?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is exactly what Alexander Hamilton was stating. He said:

> The Union will undoubtedly be answerable to foreign powers for the conduct of its members.

That was the opinion of Alexander Hamilton, speaking in 1789. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in 1953, says the same thing. I do not necessarily say there is any similarity between the men, but there surely is a similarity between the statement of Alexander Hamilton and the statements of the State Department before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, when Mr. Dulles wrote that if we in any way jeopardized, altered, or adjusted the boundaries of the United States or of any of the members of the United States, namely, the States, it would draw us into untold international problems and difficulties. Those are not his exact words, but that is the meaning of what he said. He further wrote that if we jeopardized boundaries by changing them, we would do injury to ourselves in many of the disputes which arise.

Then we have the testimony of Mr. Jack Tate, deputy legal advisor of the State Department, speaking for the Secretary of State. I cannot for the life of me see how the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 can ignore Mr. Tate's statement. This is what he said, as it appears at page 1053 of the hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on the subject of submerged lands:

> The Department is concerned with such provisions of proposed legislation as would recognize or permit the extension of the seaward boundaries of certain States beyond the 3-mile limit. In international relations, the territorial claims of the States and of the Nation are indivisible. The claims of the States cannot exceed those of the Nation. If the Nation should recognize the extension of the boundaries of any State beyond the 3-mile limit, its identification with the broader claim would force abandonment of its traditional position. At the same time, it would renounce grounds of protest against claims of foreign states to greater breadths of territorial waters. This is without reference to the question as to whether the States should be permitted to exploit the resources of the Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries.

The Douglas amendment, which is the pending question, says, "No; everything beyond the 3-mile area shall be under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government."

The Douglas amendment recognized that within the 3-mile belt the several coastal States will have jurisdiction—and, I regret to say, control. That is the proposition which is apparently before us. Very frankly, what we are trying to do is to make this a better measure, if possible, to make it a measure which will be defensible in court, out of court, and in the public interest. So the Douglas amendment, which was proposed earlier today, says, in effect, "We recognize that the 3-mile limit from the coastline, 3 miles out to sea, is under the jurisdiction of the States. But beyond that, unmistakably, unequivocably, affirmatively stated and asserted, the jurisdiction is that of the Federal Government, with all revenues going to the Federal Government, as provided under the general terms of the Hill amendment."

That is about what the Attorney General and the Secretary of State suggested. That is about what the Eisenhower administration suggested. But, I have not been able to find out precisely where the administration stands. Mr. Brownell stands in one place. Mr. Dulles stands in another place. The majority leader stands in another place. The President takes still another stand. In the meantime the American people are led to believe, apparently, that this proposal must be fulfilled because it was promised.

Let me say for the RECORD now that there may be those who said that Franklin Roosevelt gave many things away. There may be those who said that the Fair Deal and the New Deal were the great giveaway administrations. But, Mr. President, they were secondraters in giving away as compared with the present administration. They were pikers compared to this administration in giving away the public treasure. What was given in previous administrations was given to the great rank and file of the people throughout the United States, people in need, people in distress, people seeking the privilege or opportunity to work in this great land.

I submit that this is not what the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 13 appears to be. The purpose seems to be, as recited, to restore to the States or to give to the States the submerged lands under the marginal seas.

The majority leader was kind enough to comment upon what the President had said during the campaign. I said something on that subject the other day. The majority leader pointed out that during the campaign certain commitments had been made. But, Mr. President, those commitments related to the historic boundaries. Of course, that raises the great question as to what are the historic boundaries. How far out do they extend? But even assuming that they are what has been testified, 10½ miles on the western coastline of Florida and on the eastern coastline of Texas, that is a violation, or at least a repudiation, of what the State Depart-

ment recommended before the committee.

On pages 3617 and 3618 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 23, I analyzed the statements of the Presidential candidate of the Republican Party in many addresses, particularly the one at New Orleans, and one or two in Texas. All I pointed out then was what I considered to be the fallacy of those arguments. With respect to States ownership of lands and resources between inland and offshore navigable waters the statement of the President was:

> State ownership of lands and resources beneath inland and offshore navigable waters is a long recognized concept.

It has not been long recognized. It has not been recognized at all.

At Long Beach, Calif., the Presidential candidate said, on October 9:

> For 100 years or more the lands under the seas along our coasts have been held by the courts and by the agencies of the Government to belong to the State.

No; that is not so. There are no relevant court cases which hold that the lands under the seas along our coasts belong to the States. There are some court cases which hold that inland waters belong to the States. There are some court cases which hold that tidewaters and lands under the tidewaters belong to the States.

I should like to go back over the equal-footing clause, because apparently some of my colleagues were not present when I covered that subject previously. I quoted at considerable length from Mr. William M. Meigs, an eminent authority on the Constitutional Convention, in his book The Growth of the Constitution in the Federal Convention of 1787. The book was published in the year 1900. It is a standard work on the subject of the Constitution and the Constitutional Convention.

Mr. Meigs in his book discusses the whole idea of the phrase "equal footing" which appears in so many of the documents of admission of new States into the Union. This is what he had to say, referring to a clause which had been discussed by the Committee of Detail of the Constitutional Convention. The Committee of Detail was working on a more detailed draft of our Constitution. Mr. Meigs said:

> When this clause came up in the Convention on August 29 and 30, it was much considered, and a large number of amendments proposed, many of which seemed to vary from each other but very little. Gouverneur Morris moved to strike out the last two sentences requiring admission on the same terms as the original States except as to the public debt.
>
> He said he did not want to bind down the legislature to admit the Western States on equal terms.

It is clear that Morris was proposing that future States might have even fewer rights than the Original States, but the majority of the Convention disagreed with him. This is what Mr. Meigs stated in his book:

> Mason said that, if it were possible to prevent emigration to the West, it might be good policy: "but go the people will, as they find it to their interest, and the best policy is to treat them with that equality which will make them friends, not enemies." Madison insisted that the Western States neither would nor ought to submit to a Union which degraded them from an equal rank with the other States.

There we have it. The fathers of the Constitution certainly had the policy of equal footing for all new States in mind. They certainly did not have in mind special favors to any States. Though the equal-footing doctrine was not eventually spelled out in the Constitution, it, nevertheless, became generally accepted.

In the Illinois Central case in 1892, the Supreme Court, I think, put it right on the line as to the acceptance of that doctrine. I read a little from that decision. The Court said:

> The State of Illinois was admitted into the Union in 1818 on an equal footing with the original States in all respects.

That is the same language under which Texas was admitted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? This is the same language——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator please address the Chair?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not that the same language which was used in the case of the admission of Florida and Iowa in 1845?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It certainly is. I will say to the Senator, although I may be in error, insofar as I can recall, I know of no State which was admitted without the equal-footing clause in the resolution of admission. It appears to me that it means just what it says, and nothing more. As the Court said in the Illinois Central case:

> The State of Illinois was admitted into the Union in 1818 on an equal footing with the original States in all respects. But the equality prescribed would have existed if it had not been thus stipulated. There can be no distinction between the several States of the Union in the character of the jurisdiction, sovereignty, and dominion which they may possess over persons and subjects within their respective limits.

Mr. President, it appears to me that the equal-footing clause has enough merit to it to justify the Court's claim in the Texas case. The Texas case is very pertinent. In the Texas case it was held:

> The equal-footing clause has long been held to refer to political rights and to sovereignty. It does not, of course, include economic stature or standing.
>
> There has never been equality among the States in that sense. Some States when they entered the Union had within their boundaries tracts of land belonging to the Federal Government; others were sovereigns of their soil. Some had special agreements with the Federal Government governing property within their borders * * *.
>
> Area, location, geology, and latitude have awarded great diversity in the economic aspects of the several States. The requirement of equal footing was designed not to wipe out those diversities but to create parity as respects political standing and sovereignty.
>
> Yet the "equal-footing" clause has long been held to have a direct effect on certain property rights. Thus the question early arose in controversies between the Federal Government and the States as to the ownership of the shores of navigable waters and the soils under them. It was consistently held that to deny to the States, admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union, ownership of this property would deny them admission on an equal footing with the original States, since the original States did not grant these properties to the United States but reserved them to themselves.

Mr. President, the real point is parity as respects political standing and sovereignty. I fail to see why a few States should be claiming sovereignty over so much more than the rest of the States.

This question raised some general reflections which I now wish to put forward.

The Holland joint resolution, as we all know, contains a provision allowing some States to extend their boundaries, if they can do so, to something which its supporters call "historic limits." But, first of all, the term "historic limits" is not in the joint resolution. Secondly it is by no means certain what the phrase means. What makes these boundaries historic? It has been amply shown in the debate for example, that there is no historic basis for claims to historic limits up to 10½ miles of ocean.

Mr. President, I should like to move along now to a different subject matter, in reference to the question before us, particularly with reference to the Douglas amendment.

I should like to direct my attention for a few minutes to the subject of conservation under the respective amendments which are before us, particularly as it applies to conservation of the great oil resources. It is my intention to speak on that subject for a few minutes. As I stated earlier, the issue before us is not merely one of deeding submerged land in the marginal territorial seas to a few States; the issue relates to the whole public policy pertaining to public lands, if one may term these lands as public lands. It relates to the whole question of conservation of our natural resources. I wish to give attention to that subject matter.

I was very much interested to note that at this very moment, while the oil giveaway bill is before the Senate, President Eisenhower has called a conference of governors, to brief the governors on the state of the world. I could not help reflect that the first such conference which was called in this country was called by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908. It met to discuss the subject of conversation of our national resources. I wish we were so concerned about that subject today, as were the President and the governors in 1908.

President Theodore Roosevelt's words set the keynote for that conference of 1908, which marked the beginning of a coherent conservation policy in this country. They still provide a keynote for American policy today.

This is what the beloved President Theodore Roosevelt had to say:

> Nature has supplied us, and still supplies us, more kinds of resources in a more lavish degree than has ever been the case at any

other time or with any other people. Our position in the world has been attained by the extent and thoroughness of the control we have achieved over nature; but we are more, not less, dependent upon what she furnishes than at any previous time of history since the days of primitive man.

All these various uses of our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated, and should be treated as part of one coherent plan and not in haphazard and piecemeal fashion.

Finally, let us remember that the conservation of our natural resources, though the gravest problem of today, is yet but part of another and greater problem to which this Nation is not yet awake, but to which it will awake in time, and with which it must hereafter grapple if it is to live—the problem of national efficiency, the patriotic duty of insuring the safety and continuance of the Nation.

We are coming to recognize as never before the right of the Nation to guard its own future in the essential matter of natural resources. In the past we have admitted the right of the individual to injure the future of the Republic for his own present profit. The time has come for a change.

As a people we have the right and duty of obeying the moral law, of requiring and doing justice, to protect ourselves and our children against the wasteful development of our natural resources, whether that waste is caused by the actual destruction of such resources or by making them impossible of development hereafter.

That was the opening statement of Theodore Roosevelt in 1908.

In October 1903, Theodore Roosevelt appointed a Public Lands Commission. Writing of this Commission in his autobiography, Roosevelt stated:

Among the most difficult topics considered by the Public Lands Commission was that of the mineral land laws. This subject was referred to by the Commission to the American Institute of Mining Engineers, which reported on it through a committee. This committee made the very important recommendation, among others, "that the Government of the United States should retain title to all minerals, including coal and oil, in the lands of unceded territory, and lease the same to individuals or corporations at a fixed rental."

As President Roosevelt pointed out, "the necessity for this action has since come to be generally recognized."

One of the foundations of Theodore Roosevelt's conservation policy was the withdrawal of these lands from entry, so that the minerals under them could be wisely conserved. Thanks to this policy, our coal and oil reserves were saved from the utter depletion which then threatened them.

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious that had Theodore Roosevelt not acted in this manner, had he not had the foresight, and the insight, also, into human nature which he possessed, the great natural resources of this country—forest lands, water, oil, and the other great resources such as minerals, that were to be found under the land—may very well have been jeopardized and squandered and exploited.

I want it crystal clear that I am not accusing Texas, California, Florida, and Louisiana of having unworkable or weak conservation policies. In fact, I think particularly in the case of Texas and probably also in the case of California, Louisiana, and Florida, there are good conservation departments. However, oil is a very volatile commodity—economically, chemically, and politically. When one concentrates this vast natural resource within the confines or the historic boundaries of a particular State, it has a way of having undue influence and undue power upon the political structure and political processes of the State. I am not simply surmising, Mr. President; we know this from history. History has taught us that where there are vast, untold treasures, it is always very difficult to manage them in a limited area.

One of the advantages of the Federal conservation policy and one of the advantages of Federal management is that the objects over which the political pressures will concentrate their attention are dispersed and spread out, and are not pocketed or forced into a small mold.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 A. M. ON TUESDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request, without causing him to lose his right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate takes a recess tonight, it takes a recess until 11 a. m. tomorrow.

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

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was pointing out how important a Federal conservation policy is and how important a Federal management policy of vast natural resources is, because the natural resource we are discussing in connection with the pending question is highly sought after, and nations may go to war over it.

Certainly great companies will perform every kind of economic and political deal to get that resource, because there is "gold in them thar submerged lands"—black gold, oil. When oil gets mixed into politics, it has a way of getting completely out of hand and rather messing things up and getting rather slippery. We have had some experience with that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree that whereas oil and water do not mix, yet oil and politics seem to intermingle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I have said, oil has become one of the most volatile economic, chemical, and political substances we know of.

For instance, in the Near East oil is the big problem. It is likewise the big problem in Iran. It is a problem of such tremendous proportions that some of our companies are willing to pay 50-percent royalties in connection with their foreign operations—much larger royalties than they are willing to pay at home.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that by the Iran agreement the American oil companies give one-half of the oil they extract to the local government for the privilege of extraction?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is historically, politically, and economically correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for another of his splendid interrogatories, because the Senator from Illinois not only asks questions but also provides me with the handle which gets the answers quickly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator from Minnesota noted an equal degree of generosity in the case of the share the oil companies give to the various States or to the Federal Government in the case of the oil that is extracted inside the United States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly I have not noted such generosity. A moment ago I was referring to that very point, namely, that the farther from home the oil companies go the more generous they become in the leases, royalties, bounties, bonuses, or whatever they may be called, that are provided.

Furthermore, if we run short of oil, it will not be Texas that will have to go to Iran to look for oil, or it will not be California, Louisiana, or Florida that will do that; it will be the 48 States, plus Alaska and Hawaii, I hope. If oil becomes a problem in connection with the national security, it will not become a problem in the case of only a few States which may enjoy the privilege of production or the privilege of having oil resources; it will become a national problem.

Furthermore, if Florida or Louisiana or California or Texas drill oil wells in the submerged areas, it would not be the fleet of Florida or of Louisiana or of California or of Texas that would protect those wells; it would be the Navy of the United States Government.

Theodore Roosevelt made another statement which I think is very important. He said:

The various uses of our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated, and should be treated as part

of one coherent plan, and not in haphazard and piecemeal fashion.

Mr. President, today the United States is a net importer of oil; we import a million barrels of oil a day; we need all the oil we can get and then some; and we need a coherent plan which will govern the development and the disposition of our oil reserves.

The major source of the oil we import is the Middle East—a source which will probably be dried up instantly in event of an emergency. But it is estimated that a military emergency involving mobilization would require at least a 15-percent larger oil supply over our normal requirements. We ought to plan for at least a 25-percent expansion in order to assure a safe margin. This expansion will have to be developed from domestic sources entirely, since all sources of imported petroleum are likely to be cut off.

Now it is contended that if this oil is turned over to three States, it will still be available in event of an emergency. I want to make several observations on this point.

In the first place, we would be sure of this, and we would be sure of wise development and production plans, if the Federal Government retains control of what it has always owned.

The second point is that emergencies come up quickly these days; they slip up on us without warning. Planning for emergencies is a sensitive business, and ought not to be unnecessarily spread out or made liable to contradiction or delay. This is particularly true for our single most important natural resource, the resource upon which our military efficiency and our productive efficiency today are almost entirely dependent.

It seems foolhardy in the extreme to invite confusion, misunderstanding, and delay in our planning and our use of this vital resource in the Continental Shelf.

Mr. President, I repeat that the Senator from Illinois now has before us an amendment which clearly states that the reserves of the Continental Shelf shall be under the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Government. I further state that that was requested by the Attorney General. I think it is fair to ask a rhetorical question; namely, why was it not provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 13?

I think it was not provided for because I believe that at a later date, others intend to attempt to have the Continental Shelf taken for the States, just as at this time some persons are attempting to have the submerged lands out to the 3-mile limit taken for the States—something which it is not possible to justify in law and something which it is not possible to justify in terms of our historical development or in terms of the national security of the country.

Mr. President, at this point let me note the recommendation of the Paley Commission, in 1952, on national resources. I read now from the report of the Paley Commission:

> The Federal Government encourages immediate exploration for oil on publicly owned offshore lands; that leases to private companies, whether by the Federal Government or the States, contain provisions requiring well spacing or withdrawal rates calculated to increase the normal life of the pools with a view to providing faster withdrawals if ever such action is required to meet the needs of war.

The Paley Commission made that recommendation in the light of what was a very obvious fact, namely, the necessity to safeguard our great reserves of oil and at the same time to have enough oil available, by means of oil wells, so we could quickly increase production.

It is true that in the Continental Shelf there is an estimated 45 percent of our oil potential. If we pass any proposed legislation which will result in turning over that vast untold resource to the 3 States in question, we shall be making a most unwise decision in terms of ultimate national policy.

I read now another part of the report by the Paley Commission: This is from a summary of volume 1 of the report to the President by the President's Materials Policy Commission, dated June 1952:

SECURITY AND OIL

> The outbreak of all-out war would create a sudden, and possibly wide, gap between requirements and current supply for the United States and other free nations alike. Rationing of nonmilitary use, even if much more severe than in the last war, would fall far short of diverting enough to close the gap. Since there can be no conventional stockpile of oil, it is imperative to have an emergency cushion of oil production and refining capacity in the Western Hemisphere which can quickly increase supply. The most effective form this could take would be an "underground stockpile" of semiproved oil deposits which, as required, could be drilled up with maximum speed and at minimum expenditure of materials and manpower. Fortunately, a large area lends itself to such treatment—the Continental Shelf, particularly that section off the Gulf Coast.

Mr. President, I have here the report of the Paley Commission, showing that there is a great area which the good Lord, in His infinite wisdom, has provided as a sort of Government stockpile for the people of the United States of America—all the States—and it is in the Gulf of Mexico and on the Continental Shelf. By the way, the basin of oil on the Continental Shelf, and in the 3-mile limit, too, is a big bowl. There are ways of getting pipes to run to operations under water and under land. But the Paley Commission points out that—

> Fortunately, a large area lends itself to such treatment—the Continental Shelf, particularly that section off the gulf coast. Geologists agree that prospects for finding large pools of oil in this offshore area are excellent. The technical problems of exploring and producing underwater oil are, however, difficult and expensive.

Mr. President, I could go on to read what the Paley Commission has said. In fact, it is very interesting reading. But I am not going to do it, out of deference to my colleagues, and particularly to our great friend here, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. But I submit that a sensible nationwide conservation policy of this vast resource is a part of our national-security program, and ought to be so regarded.

Mr. President, I have talked about the recommendations of the Paley Commission, yet I have found nothing in the hearings to indicate that steps have been taken to guarantee such safeguards of our oil supply. The recommendations of the Paley Commission also raise some other questions. First of all, while the Commission allows for leasing by the States, I wonder what it would say if confronted by the present situation, wherein the future of State action is clouded by all sorts of doubts and the prospect of abundant litigation. We will never develop our oil resources quickly or efficiently in the manner proposed.

Secondly, what is the wisdom, in the light of a possible early military emergency, of an act of Congress which deals with only 20 percent of the estimated oil supply in the Continental Shelf, and leaves unprovided for the 80 percent beyond the area claimed by three States?

Mr. President, let me emphasize again that that is exactly what the pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 13, does. It provides for a generally accepted estimate of about 20 percent of the oil supply in the submerged lands. The 80 percent is still left in the area without. Is there any Senator who can make a conclusive statement that America need not worry about her oil supply? Is there any Senator who is not concerned over what is transpiring and developing in the Near East? Are there not those in this country who know that there is 1 oil well in the Near East that produces 150,000 barrels a day—just 1 well? The most, I understand, we get from any well in the United States is about 600 barrels a day.

If there is any problem that really concerns our military today, Mr. President, from what I have heard, it is the question of what we would do in the event of an attack upon the Near East. How could we defend it? Could we defend it? What would be the immediate impact upon the America economy? The oil is there, and the oil, out to the 3-mile limit, amounts to so much. Then there is the 10½-mile limit, and the oil area extends out on the Continental Shelf, particularly near Texas. Yet there is a legislative program before the Senate which is supposed to be highly important and basic to the future welfare of the country, and which provides for and deals with not more than 20 percent of the available resources in this great underground stockpile of oil. It is not clear, it is not conclusive, insofar as the remainder of the Continental Shelf is concerned.

The Douglas amendment provides for a definite legislative policy in reference to the Continental Shelf. It says to the coastal States, "You get what is under the ocean out for 3 miles; beyond the 3 miles it is the Continental Shelf."

All the arguments we have heard in reference to the development of the Continental Shelf could be quickly resolved if the Douglas amendment were adopted. We would then know what was going to happen to the Continental Shelf. We would know what was going to happen within the 3-mile limit; we would know what to expect. We would have at least a program before us that included all the problems involved in the great natural resources in the submerged lands.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from California for the purpose of a question, providing I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota approximately how much longer he expects to address the Senate? We have had some inquiries on this side of the aisle by Senators who have been wanting to know whether they should return to the Senate Chamber, and just how long we might be in session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator I am prepared now to yield the floor, and to let the Senator from South Dakota proceed. I understand he has a measure that is of great importance, because failure to pass it may cause a great deal of difficulty. I told the Senator I would yield sooner, but I will now yield the floor, so that the Senator may proceed.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1419) to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance the standard time applicable to the District 1 hour for the period commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April of each year and ending not later than the last Sunday of September of each year. Any such time established by the Commissioners under the authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, be the standard time for the District of Columbia.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the House amendment gives to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia permanent authority to establish daylight-saving time within the District, beginning not earlier than the last Sunday of April, and ending not later than the last Sunday of September. This corresponds to the action already approved and taken by the Senate in the passage of Senate bill 1419, on April 2, except that at the time the Senate passed the bill, the power of the District Commissioners was conditioned upon finding that the cities of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York, or any two of them, had so acted with respect to changing standard time during the summer months of any year. But the House amendment, in effect, leaves out that provision, and grants the authority which was conveyed by the final paragraph of the bill as it passed the Senate. In other words, it does exactly what the Senate proposed to do when the bill passed the Senate.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the motion. I shall not suggest the absence of a quorum. I am content that action be taken by voice vote. I did not know this bill was on the calendar. It went through under unanimous consent. Otherwise, I should have opposed the bill.

Daylight-saving time is an inconvenience to many persons, especially those of us who have young children. We have to put our children to bed when the sun is still up. It may be very convenient for some persons, but others find it very inconvenient. I am one of the younger Members of the Senate, and I have been opposed to it. Former Senator Overton was also opposed to it. He said he preferred to live by God's time. In Louisiana many people feel the same way.

Therefore, I shall vote against the bill because I was against it originally.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee a question. How will it affect the outlying communities around Washington, in Maryland and Virginia?

Mr. CASE. The outlying areas have always followed the District of Columbia in times gone by, so they will conform. Several Senators have spoken about the inconvenience with reference to persons who have come to this city under the assumption that Washington already had daylight-saving time. The Senator from Pennsylvania spoke of someone coming from Philadelphia, and the Senator from Maryland spoke of the confusion caused in Baltimore by some persons who were not aware of the condition existing here. Television schedules were in confusion yesterday, as were radio schedules. People are missing trains and planes because of the confusion. The passage of the bill will eliminate the confusion and will permit carriers to operate on the same time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I always take my children to school in the morning. If they continue on the same hours on which they are now operating, I would have to be at the Senate by 9 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. CASE. My understanding is that the new time will be conformed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Has it already been agreed to?

Mr. CASE. No. The Commissioners will have to act after the bill is passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What authority would the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have over what happens outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. CASE. The answer is that the outlying districts have always conformed in times past.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My objection is that we have to put small children to bed at night very early, and we have to get them up an hour earlier in the morning. I was always opposed to daylight-saving time, but I am not going to object to action on the bill. Heretofore I have spoken against it at length, but I shall not do so tonight.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] could probably give the Senator from South Carolina some information.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, Maryland has daylight-saving time in every community except Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties. The reason they do not have it is because they constitute a part of suburban Washington, and they are waiting for the District to act in the matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is the Senator from Maryland assured that there will be daylight-saving time in Maryland?

Mr. BEALL. Suburban Washington has always coordinated their program with that of the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That answers the question so far as Montgomery County is concerned.

Mr. BEALL. And Prince Georges County.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am interested in Montgomery County, personally.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this measure and the debate on it constitute an argument for having home rule in the District of Columbia. It is perfectly ridiculous that the Congress of the United States should pass on the question of daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois does not at this time get home rule mixed up with daylight-saving time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. In accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 28, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Julius J. Hoffman, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, to fill a new position.

Win G. Knoch, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, to fill a new position.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named ensign of the line of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy with the grade of ensign:

James A. Whelan