The revised statement of the Veterans' Administration follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1954.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TALLE: The purpose of this letter is to clarify the statement which was submitted by the Veterans' Administration to the House Banking and Currency Committee regarding elapsed time in processing loan applications, pursuant to your request during the hearing on Friday, March 5, 1954. The statement referred to was reprinted on pages 232 and 233 of the hearings on H. R. 7839, 83d Congress.

A review of the statement as it appears in the printed record indicates that an error was made in setting up in type the listing of "Typical processing steps," on page 232. The line which follows step 2 reading "Total • • • 18.0" should have appeared as the total processing time for step 3. It will be noted that the 18 days actually represent the total of the three components listed in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of step 3.

This typographical error was discovered following a review of the debate on the Housing Act of 1954, as reported on pages 4431 and 4432 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 2, 1954. As will be recalled, VA's statement regarding processing time was read into the RECORD at that time. The remarks contained on page 4431, indicating that the total VA processing time was 48.4 days, occasioned surprise to the Veterans' Administration until it became apparent that due to the typographical error in printing the submitted table the figure of 18 days required for the VA appraisal function was actually counted twice in such computation. Accordingly, the maximum figure for VA processing time, arrived at by adding steps 3 and 5 together, would be 30.4 days, rather than 48.4 days.

It should also be emphasized that, as indicated by the second footnote in the table, steps 3 and 5 may be concurrent. Accordingly, in cases where processing was concurrent, the processing time for the longest step would actually represent the total time for VA processing. On this basis, the 18-day average elapsed time for VA processing compares quite favorably with the 13 to 16 day average reported by FHA. Of course, the 18-day average is based on a sample survey made nearly a year ago, and it seems quite certain that in recent months the processing time in most offices has been more favorable than indicated in the table, although it is recognized that the bulge in appraisal activity reported in many offices during February and March may result in some increase in average processing time.

It is hoped that the foregoing discussion will serve to clarify the facts regarding VA's processing time. If any further information is desired, please feel free to call upon this office at any time.

Very truly yours,

G. H. BIRDSALL,
Assistant Administrator for Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the question I asked in connection with the hearings was: "Approximately how much time elapses between the time when a veteran makes an application for a VA loan and the time when he has the money available for use?"

The original statement showed a total of 48.4 days. The revised statement shows a total of 30.4 days. Assuming the latter figure to be the correct standard, as stated by the agency, veterans seeking loans in the future will have a yardstick for determining whether they are experiencing undue delay in the lending operation. By the same token, veterans who have completed their loans will know whether this announced standard is correct in the light of firsthand experience.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1954

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 14, 1954)

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

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

God of the living and of the living dead, in the afterglow of Easter with its triumphant paeans of victory, we come girding ourselves with its deathless message as we take up daily tasks again; feeling through all this earthly dress bright shoots of everlastingness. In our own risen lives, seeking those things which are above, enable us to challenge with the conquering truth of Easter all tyrants who, denying it, deal in war and death and chains and who suppress, exploit, and degrade the holy temple of human personality.

Steady our hearts and steel our wills to pay the price for its coming, knowing that there is no way to dawn except by dark, no way to light except by night, no way to Easter except by Calvary. In the crises of our times join us with those who, across the wastes and wilderness of human needs, throw up a highway for our God. Rising above the deafening contentions of our embittered days, may we be the hearers and doers of Thy word and of Thy will. We ask it in the name of the risen Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 15, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On April 15, 1954:

S. 2405. An act to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station.

On April 19, 1954:

S. 208. An act for the relief of Sister Constantina (Teresia Kakonyi);

S. 532. An act for the relief of Giulio Squillari, Mrs. Maggiorina Barbero Squillari, Rosanna Squillari, and Eugenio Squillari;

S. 939. An act for the relief of Njdeh Hovhanissian Aslanian;

S. 1208. An act for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner;

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Dr. Uheng Knoo;

S. 1456. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928, as amended;

S. 1937. An act for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Hua Lin and his wife, Lillian Ching-Wen Lin (nee Hu); and

S. 2534. An act for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Do I understand that the request is being made only for today?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; only for today.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet on Wednesday afternoon, April 21.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may now be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, after the routine business is completed, it will be in order to take up the Consent Calendar; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, is the understanding of the junior Senator from New Jersey correct that the calendar will be considered from the point where the last call was concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ESPIONAGE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 794 of title 18, United States Code, relating to espionage (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 24 OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 371) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INTEGRATION OF JUDGE ADVOCATE'S PROMOTION LIST WITH THAT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to integrate the Judge Advocate's promotion list with that of the Army to restore lost seniority and grade (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONTINUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF ACT OF JULY 27, 1953

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MAY 22, 1896, CONCERNING THE LOAN OR GIFT OF WORKS OF ART AND OTHER MATERIAL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of May 22, 1896, as amended, concerning the loan or gift of works of art and other material (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 26th quarterly report on Export Control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON IRRIGATION POTENTIAL IN VICINITY OF CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning potential irrigation in the vicinity of the Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF CONCESSION CONTRACT, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS GOLF COURSES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a proposed extension of contract to operate the National Capital Parks golf courses and related facilitites, Washington, D. C. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overallotment of appropriations for Administrative Operations, Expenses, General Supply Fund, and Strategic and Critical Materials; to the Committee on Appropriations.

GRANTING TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF A CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order granting temporary admission into the United States of Stanislaw Argasinski (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas the Communist Party presents a threat to the Government of the United States and to this State; and

"Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States bills which would outlaw the Communist Party: Now, therefore

"*Resolved by the house of representatives,* That the members of the delegation in Congress from this State are hereby requested to give their active support to legislation which would outlaw the Communist Party in the United States and in this State; further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to each member of our delegation in Congress.

"NORMAN A. McMEEKIN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"RAYMOND H. CHASE,
"Representative From Dover.
"ROBERT L. STARK,
"Clerk, House of Representatives.
"[SEAL, STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE]
"Special session, 1954."

A resolution adopted by the Nevada County Republican Women's Club, Grass Valley, Calif., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 13) to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Two resolutions adopted by the East Los Angeles Parlor, No. 266, and Beverly Hills Parlor, No. 289, Native Daughters of the Golden West, both of the State of California and the Shelby County Federated Clubs, of Shelbyville, Ind., protesting against the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted by the East Los Angeles Parlor, No. 266, and Beverly Hills Parlor, No. 289, Native Daughters of the Golden West, both in the State of California, relating to the equal-rights amendment; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Joseph Priestley Conference of the Unitarian Church, in Arlington, Va., relating to the conduct of congressional investigating committees; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FORESTRY HIGHWAY FUNDS—RESOLUTION OF OREGON TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC., PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Oregon Trucking Associations, Inc., of Portland, Oreg., relating to the funds for forest highways.

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

Whereas the Federal Highway Act recognizes the responsibility of the Federal Government to construct highways through the national forest reserves; and

Whereas the Western States have spent about one and one half times as much money as the Federal Government on the construction of national forest highways and bear the cost of their maintenance; and

Whereas the States have planned the use of the $53,400,000 now authorized by the Congress and the failure to appropriate these funds seriously handicaps the planning and building of needed highways in the Western States; and

Whereas the need for more funds to build highways is now nationally recognized which is in decided contrast to the failure of the Bureau of the Budget to include in its budget the funds now authorized by the Congress for forest highways; and

Whereas the Federal Government is receiving a material income from the sale of timber in the national forests and the movement of the heavy log loads over the forest highways has caused failure of the light surfacing built for light traffic and there is an immediate need to reinforce these surfacings to withstand the loads imposed and to relieve the Western States of excessive maintenance costs; and

Whereas in the computation of the sliding scale rates of Federal aid participation in the public land States the Federal lands within the forest reserve are not included: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Trucking Associations respectfully request the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of the Budget, and the appropriate appropriation committee of the Congress to take the necessary steps to appropriate the $30,900,000 of the 1953 and the 1954 fiscal year forest highway funds now authorized by the Congress and apportioned by the Commissioner of Public Roads at the earliest possible date and to appropriate the $22,500,000 of the 1955 fiscal year forest highway funds now authorized by the Congress at the proper time next year to insure that the program for planning and building forest highways may continue in an orderly manner.

GEORGE H. FLAGG,
Manager.

INVESTIGATION OF HOUSING—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—REFERENCE OF SENATE RESOLUTION 229 TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 229) to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate housing, reported it favorably, with an amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (S. Res. 229) providing an appropriation of $250,000 to enable the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate the FHA, which resolution was unanimously reported today, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration as though it had lain on the table for 24 hours.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, the Senator from Indiana is merely asking that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration without waiting 24 hours under the rule?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, and I am not disposed to object, I should like to say that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration is not on the floor at this time, and, so far as I know, the minority has had no advice that this request would be submitted. Therefore, I must object for the time being, but I hope that later on in the day it will not be necessary to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to the reference of Senate Resolution 229. I have checked with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the suggested procedure is agreeable to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will then be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the request was that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration today, waiving the rule which would otherwise require it to lie on the table for 24 hours. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee unanimously reported the resolution today, providing $250,000 for the investigation of the FHA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the rule will be suspended, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 3316. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Jonathan Jones; and

S. 3317. A bill to consolidate, revise, and reenact the townsite laws applicable to Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3318. A bill to provide for a continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3319. A bill for the relief of Suzanne L'Heureux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 3320. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3321. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 3322. A bill for the relief of Ali Hassan Waffa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 3323. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 3324. A bill to facilitate the establishment of local self-government at the communities of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., and to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at such communities; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3325. A bill to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board to provide coherent and unified direction for the development of the Missouri Basin's natural resources, to give responsible direction to the resource development activities of the Federal Government in the Missouri Basin, and for coordinating those activities with resource development activities of the States; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3323) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The statement presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

I am introducing a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended. My colleague, Representative STERLING COLE, chairman of the joint committee, has introduced an identical bill in the House.

This bill was drafted to give the President the powers he requested with respect to the transfer of restricted data to our allies in NATO, under suitable safeguards. In addition, the bill provides the basis for licensing what is hoped will be a great new industry in atomic energy. At the same time, the Atomic Energy Act, while having its present substance retained, generally, insofar as it does not affect the ends set out above, has been reorganized in the light of our experience with the law, in order to provide a more readily accessible frame of reference for future operations in the field.

With respect to the exchange of restricted data with NATO, this bill would permit the President to authorize the Commission to cooperate with another nation or with a regional defense organization of which the United States is a party. It would authorize the Commission to communicate official data to that nation or organization necessary to (1) the development of defense plans, (2) the training of personnel in the use of, and defense against atomic weapons, including information as to the external size, weight, and shape of such weapons, and (3) the evaluation of capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons. The nation or regional defense organization must be participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement and making substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security.

The bill provides that the agreement for cooperation must be approved by the Commission, and must include the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation. There must be a guarantee by the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards, as approved by the Commission, will be maintained. In addition, there must be the right of the United States to terminate the agreement and recall any materials furnished if in the opinion of the President the cooperating party fails at any time to comply with the terms of the agreement, or if the President finds that the conditions of the agreement would be contrary to the best interest of the United States. The President must have approved of, and authorized the Commission to execute the proposed agreement. He must also have determined that the cooperating party does not threaten the security of the United States, and that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States. The proposed agreement, together with the approval and the determination of the President, must then have been submitted for 30 days to the joint committee while Congress is in session, but the joint committee can waive any portion of that period.

With respect to the transfer of restricted data, the Commission is permitted to cooperate with another nation and communicate restricted data on:

1. The refining, purification, and subsequent treatment of source materials;
2. Reactor development;
3. Production of special material;
4. Health and safety;
5. Industrial and other application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; and
6. Research and development relating to those.

This cooperation on restricted data, since it is solely for peaceful uses, cannot in any way involve the communication of restricted data relating to the design and fabrication of atomic weapons. The same safeguards on the agreement for cooperation, as are set forth for the regional defense cooperation, are made applicable for the transfer of restricted data.

In seeking to establish an atomic-energy industry, this bill provides for the following general matters:

1. The bill would permit the Commission to determine that any material which would release substantial quantities of energy through nuclear fission or through nuclear transformation can be determined by the Commission to be "special material." This permits the Commission to determine that materials which are utilizable in a fusion process should be classed as special materials along with those items already determined

to be specially utilizable in fission processes. The term "special material" is then used throughout the act in place of the prior term of "fissionable material."

2. Title to all special material would be retained in the United States as an exercise of the powers of the United States to arm itself, and to prepare for its defense.

3. Regulation of the industry is accomplished by exercise of the powers over the property of the United States contained in article IV, section 3, of the Constitution, as well as its powers over interstate and foreign commerce, and its power to provide for the common defense.

4. Title to reactors and other facilities utilizing or producing special materials is allowed to be held by the private persons who would be licensees.

5. In order to encourage prospecting to increase our domestic supplies of uranium, the earlier provisions retaining rights to source materials in public lands have been eliminated.

6. Normal patent rights would be permitted in the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

7. Standards for licensing are established in order to provide sound statutory bases for guidance of the Atomic Energy Commission in this new field. In addition, normal administrative procedures have been established as far as possible consonant with the requirements of secrecy in the field because of common defense and security.

The criminal provisions of the present act, dealing with the unlawful disclosure of restricted data, have been reexamined and tightened. The bill proposes imposing absolute liability on those lawfully having access to restricted data who disclose the restricted data to persons not authorized to receive it.

In addition to these matters, many items of organization and powers of the Commission, of its advisory committees, and of the joint committee have been reexamined and strengthened. Wherever changes had been thought generally desirable, they were suggested.

The bill introduced is, of course, subject to revision by the joint committee. Undoubtedly it will be revised in some measure upon the completion of the public and executive hearings which will be held in May.

It is the hope of the joint committee that this session of Congress will see the passage of amendments to the Atomic Energy Act, which will give a material and substantive start in law to a new atomic industry. This will, it is hoped, help the peaceful uses of this new force to grow and flourish, both on the domestic scene and on the international scene. While assuring the common defense and security of the Nation, this will also be a tremendous force toward the future development of this Nation, and of its allies.

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT — DISPOSAL OF FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY AT OAK RIDGE, TENN., AND RICHLAND, WASH.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to facilitate the establishment of local self-government at the communities of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., and to provide for the disposal of Federally owned properties at such communities. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3324) to facilitate the establishment of local self-government at the communities of Oak Ridge, Tenn. and Richland, Wash., and to provide for the disposal of Federally owned properties at such communities, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The statement presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

Mr. President, ever since the Atomic Energy Commission took office and assumed operation of the vast and complex facilities of the wartime Manhattan Engineer District project, almost everyone, both within the Atomic Energy Commission and the cognizant committees of Congress involved in this work, has recognized the anomalous position of the Commission in owning and operating sizable communities such as Oak Ridge, Hanford, and Los Alamos. From time to time, commencing as early as its report published in October 1949, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has called upon the Atomic Energy Commission to expedite its plans for divesting itself of these communities. This committee has been joined on numerous occasions by the appropriations committees of both the Senate and House in urging this action.

It was obvious to all concerned that the man-hours and dollars expended by the Commission in maintaining and operating these communities could be more profitably used by the Atomic Energy Commission in expediting the urgent work of weapon design and development and production.

During the past 5 years the AEC has reported the steps which it was taking in order to comply with the wishes of Congress in this regard. It is a history full of conscientious effort to explore all possible solutions to this problem and to bring to bear upon the many complex factors the best talent available in the various fields to the end that the residents of these communities so essential to the welfare of the Commission's program might be adequately protected by a change of ownership.

Mr. President, the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative STERLING COLE, of New York, and I have introduced an identical bill which incorporates all of the features which the AEC and the executive department feel necessary to accomplish this very desirable end. It conforms to the requirements set out by the President in his budget message. It is the product of much labor and thought and contains many practical compromises to extremely complex and difficult problems which arise in a change of ownership of such sizable communities.

It will be noted that the proposed legislation does not apply to Los Alamos, N. Mex. As rebuilding of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory away from the town site progresses it may be, in the very near future, possible to also dispose of the property of this community.

The proposed bill is largely the plan recommended by the AEC's panel on community operations with some minor modifications resulting from further studies by the AEC itself. The Commission believes the bill represents a workable balance between several sometimes conflicting considerations. The proposed bill also strives to maintain at an adequate level services and conditions within these communities which the AEC considers highly necessary to attract and retain the kind of personnel which it needs at its installation. In brief the bill contemplates:

1. AEC assistance to the residents in the establishment of local self-government.

2. As soon as the local form of government for these communities has been established, the AEC will be prepared to transfer governmental responsibilities and donate municipal facilities to them.

3. Subsequent to the transfer of governmental functions to these recognized authorities, the AEC will have divested itself of all power and responsibility over local decisions.

4. Because there is an inadequate tax base in these single industry-type communities, it is felt necessary to lessen the shock of a drastic change in operations of these communities by proposing a Federal contribution to maintain essential municipal services and operate the schools and hospitals at a reasonable level for a period of 10 years.

5. Single family and duplex residence houses will be sold at 90 percent of appraised value under a system of priorities which will give preference to present tenants and which will give employees of the AEC project prior purchasing rights over the general public.

6. The existing tenants of commercial, church, and nonprofit properties will have a priority right to purchase at the appraised value.

7. FHA or VA mortgage insurance and, if necessary, direct AEC mortgaging will be made available to purchasers of residential properties. There will also be included some measure of protection against the special risks of buying houses in communities such as these in the form of a commitment by AEC to relieve the purchaser of liability for deficiency under mortgage indebtedness if the level of employment at one of these projects falls drastically.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am sure identical bills have been introduced in the House by Representative W. STERLING COLE, chairman of the joint committee. I had intended and expected to introduce the bills with my statements on last Thursday. However, like the banks in the days of the depression, the Senate recessed on last Thursday before I had an opportunity to introduce them.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR DWIGHT GRISWOLD

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 231), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. Dwight Griswold, late a Senator from the State of Nebraska, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FACILITIES FOR WATER STORAGE AND UTILIZATION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1300) to increase the limitation on Federal funds which may be used with respect to any one project under the provisions of the act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be referred, instead, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This bill relates to water conservation activities of the Department of Agriculture. Furthermore, it is similar in nature to another bill (S. 1727) to increase and revise the limitation on aid

available under the provisions of the act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the two bills should be considered together by that committee. The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], author of Senate bill 1300 also has requested this change in reference.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS TUESDAY ON WIRETAP LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to announce to the Senate that tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20, there will be an open hearing at 10 a. m., in room 424 of the Senate Office Building, on the subject of various alternative proposals dealing with admissibility of wiretap evidence in Federal courts and related phases.

Among the bills to be considered are H. R. 8649, as approved by the House of Representatives; S. 3229, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]; S. 2753, sponsored by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]; and S. 832, which I personally had introduced more than a year ago principally for the purpose of having this vital issue thoroughly debated and expedited.

I know how busy my senatorial colleagues are, but I cordially wish to invite them to sit in, if possible, with our subcommittee in order that they may hear the expert testimony at first hand.

Our initial witness will be the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Brownell.

Next week we will hear from Senate and House sponsors of the various bills, from the representatives of the various Government security and intelligence agencies, and from private individuals and organizations.

The committee is interested in obtaining the most expert testimony on this momentous subject.

It is an issue of the most significant proportions in terms of the national security of our country and its self-preservation from those who would destroy it from without and within.

It is an issue of deep significance in terms of the United States Constitution and the American way of life.

It is an issue which should, and will, I trust, be brought to the Senate floor after thorough subcommittee and full committee consideration, where all of its many ramifications may be brought to the attention of the American people.

REQUEST FOR SENATE MAJORITY POLICY COMMITTEE SCHEDULING OF H. R. 116, THE CHURCH-WILEY BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the calendar is scheduled to be called today on a number of relatively minor bills.

One of these bills, H. R. 116, had been personally reported by myself on April 14, with Senate Report 1209, and is on the calendar as order No. 1205.

The purpose of the bill is simply to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited.

I understand that some objections have already been received against the bill and that, accordingly, there is no chance of its passage today. This is indeed sad news. Every passing day means that more American youngsters will be given these lethal instruments, which have already caused such a terrible toll throughout our Nation.

I fully respect the right of Senators to object to this, or any other, piece of proposed legislation. I feel sure that they do so in accordance with what they feel to be the public interest. I disagree with them absolutely, however.

CIVIC GROUPS UNANIMOUSLY FOR BILL

And so does every parent-teacher group in the United States, every patriotic group, medical group, municipal group, blindness-prevention group, and every other civic organization which has looked into this legislation.

Today is April 19. In a little over 2 months we will celebrate another July 4. We will do so in the ghastly fashion of permitting the blinding of the eyes of little children, the loss of their fingers, hands, and limbs, the burning of their bodies, scarring them for life, and shocking them.

I say there is absolutely no excuse for this slaughter of our children. There is no reason why the right of the States to prevent this slaughter should be sabotaged by the shipment of bootleg fireworks inside their borders.

I presume that the lobbyists who have been so busily at work week after week and month after month, in order to protect the interests of a small number of fireworks manufacturers, are already celebrating victory.

I presume they think that they can encourage objections to be filed against this proposed legislation on the Consent Calendar—week after week until the July 4 slaughter takes place once again. But they have another guess coming.

REQUEST TO POLICY COMMITTEE

I have written today to the distinguished chairman of the Senate majority policy committee, asking the opportunity to be heard to urge that H. R. 116 receive time very shortly on the Senate schedule for final debate. It is my earnest hope that the policy committee will comply promptly with my request. Every day, manufacturers are rushing as many of these lethal instruments as they can to our children. Each passing day means that some more youngsters have been given the opportunity to blind themselves for life.

YEA-AND-NAY VOTE PLANNED

I want to serve notice, moreover, as I served notice in the Senate Judiciary Committee, that when this issue does come up for a final vote, I am going to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Let those Senators, if there be any, who favor of giving little children the opportunity to blind themselves, vote publicly against this measure. Let those Senators who are in favor of protecting our children vote for it.

Let me say that I do not dispute that there may be technical reasons why some Senators oppose this bill, because I know that, after all, my colleagues are motivated by the same humanitarian interests as I am.

If they do have technical reservations in mind, we can settle them, if necessary, by prompt debate on the Senate floor. This, I trust, will be done. The alternative is tragedy in countless more American homes.

I send to the desk certain messages which I have received on behalf of the Church-Wiley bill. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

MADISON, WIS., *April 15, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:

We are deeply grateful for your untiring efforts to protect our youngsters from needless maiming by fireworks and join with you in the conviction that S. 2245 must receive favorable action on Monday. Best wishes for a happy Easter.

Mrs. GLENN F. OLWELL,
Legislative Chairman, Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers.

MADISON, WIS., *April 15, 1954.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:

The Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers heartily endorses and most sincerely appreciates your splendid work on Federal fireworks control. Passage of S. 2245 on Monday is imperative if our children are to be protected.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GEORGE STEINMET,
President.

NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., April 15, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We have just learned of the favorable action of the Senate Judiciary Committee relative to S. 2245 (H. R. 116) and I cannot let the occasion pass without expressing to you our keen appreciation of your untiring efforts in support of this important and desirable piece of legislation. We are all well aware of how hard you have worked to develop Judiciary Committee support for this bill, and you are certainly entitled to the gratitude of public safety and fire officials as well as parents throughout this country.

Sincerely yours,

PERCY BUGBEE,
General Manager.

MARYLAND SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF BLINDNESS,
Baltimore, Md., April 14, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We are indeed pleased to hear that H. R. 116, which would prohibit the interstate shipment of fireworks in violation of State laws, has been voted upon favorably by the Senate Judiciary Com-

mittee. We are urging your support of this important legislation when it is brought on the floor of the Senate.

The Maryland Society for the Prevention of Blindness, and other organizations interested in the sight and safety of Maryland children, fought for 8 years to secure the passage in 1941 of the present Maryland law prohibiting the promiscuous sale and use of fireworks in this State. It is a good law, but it has been undermined by lack of Federal legislation such as H. R. 116.

We earnestly request that you work for the passage of this needed legislation. Your cooperation will be a real contribution to saving sight.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. EDYTHE K. MOORE,
Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE
PREVENTION OF BLINDNESS,
New York, N. Y., April 16, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is indeed good to know that the Committee on the Judiciary has reported out favorably H. R. 116 with amendments.

The national society is deeply appreciative of your interest in this important legislation. We hope very much that the bill will be approved by the Senate on a unanimous-consent basis.

With many thanks again for your help in the prevention of blindness.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN M. FOOTE, M. D.,
Executive Director.

WHITE MAN FOLLY AND INDIAN WISDOM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the spring issue of American Heritage, a magazine devoted to the interesting lore of our country, and which should be read by every American, contains a very interesting story relative to an essay won by an Indian. The article in the Heritage is as follows:

From Knoxville, Tenn., comes word of a Cherokee Indian boy who entered an essay contest based upon two pictures—one of a dilapidated house and the other of a washed-out field. He won with the following:

"Both pictures show white man crazy. Make big tepee. Plow hills. Water wash. Wind blow. Soil, grass all gone. House rots down. No hog. No corn. No potato. No cow. No pony. Squaw gone with papoose.

"Indian no plow land. Keep grass. Cow eat grass. Indian drink health-giving milk. Buffalo eat grass. Indian eat buffalo. Hide make tepee. Moccasins too. Indian no make terrace. No build dam. No hunt job. No hitch-hike. No shoot pig. Great Spirit makes water. Also sunshine. Indian no waste anything. Indian no go on relief. White man heap crazy."

SURPLUS FOOD FOR NEEDY AMERICANS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on March 4 I obtained the Senate's permission to place in the RECORD copies of a number of letters which I had received relating to my efforts to stimulate action by the administration to develop a system of disposal of surplus goods in Government stocks to those of our citizens most in need of more adequate diet, especially the unemployed and elderly persons dependent on meager pensions and retirement benefits.

At that time I had not yet received a reply from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in response to the identical letter I had addressed on February 3 to the heads of this Department and the Departments of Agriculture and Labor. On March 8 I finally did receive a reply from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the most significant statement in which reads in part: "We are not in a position at this time to assist you in the formulation of a legislative proposal."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, March 5, 1954.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: This is in reply to your letter of February 3 and your telegram of February 13, 1954, requesting the assignment of qualified staff experts of this Department to work with you and your staff in the development of legislation for the domestic disposal of surplus food to beneficiaries of old-age and survivors insurance, old-age assistance, and unemployment compensation programs.

We are, of course, aware of and in full accord with the President's objective, expressed in his message of January 11, to insulate farm commodity surpluses from the commercial markets, and to use them in constructive ways some of which are already specified in existing law.

We understand that the Department of Agriculture, which has primary responsibility in this field within the executive branch, has been studying various proposals for further legislation on this subject and has been engaged in discussions with members and staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in that connection. This Department, as you know, has a request from the committee for an expression of its views on S. 2550.

In addition, as you are probably aware, the President has appointed an interdepartmental committee consisting of the representatives of a number of executive departments and the Foreign Operations Administration, in connection with the surplus food problem, and his appointed Mr. Clarence Francis as a consultant to advise this interdepartmental committee.

Since, as I have stated, the basic policy questions involved are primarily in the area of concern of another department of the executive branch, and since the interdepartmental committee has been created specifically to deal with this problem, we are not in a position at this time to assist you in the formulation of a legislative proposal.

If, even though the interdepartmental committee has been created, you intend to proceed with the formulation of a legislative proposal, we stand ready to give technical information on those particular aspects of such a proposal which directly affect the programs administered by this Department. For the purpose of seeking this technical advice, please feel free to call upon the Commissioner of Social Security.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

BUILDING PROSPECTS IN THE UPPER MIDWEST DURING 1954

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, optimism is replacing pessimism in our national economic structure. Those economic pessimists who have been whistling in the dark are beginning to see periods of light in an economic structure that bids to be second only to the year 1953, at which time we had our greatest gross national production.

Let us look at some of the facts. Construction expenditures for the first quarter of 1954, which have just been released, set a new record for the first quarter of the year. Total construction for the first quarter of 1954 was estimated at $7.3 billion, and on this basis, the estimated construction for the year will be $36.1 billion, or $2.1 billion more than last year 1953.

This overall construction program was not limited to any one phase, but showed gains in private housing, public utility construction and highway work.

These construction figures are most encouraging in view of the fact that new construction from Federal spending was down during the first quarter of this year 17 percent as compared with the same quarter in 1953.

There has been much discussion as to the effect a reduction of agricultural income would have on construction on the farm.

In a recent survey of building prospects, questionnaires were mailed to 1,712 lumber dealers in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota in March 1954. Six hundred and twenty-one replies had been received up to March 19.

I ask unanimous consent to have this report placed in the record as a part of my remarks, and also an Associated Press dispatch giving a report of the F. W. Dodge Corp., construction news and marketing specialists, in regard to future contracts.

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

MAIL SURVEY OF BUILDING PROSPECTS IN THE UPPER MIDWEST DURING 1954

Questionnaires mailed to 1,712 lumber dealers in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota on March 10, 1954.

Six hundred and twenty-one replies received to March 19, 1954.

Thirty-six and three-tenths percent return.

The question: How does the interest in building activity on the farm compare with last year at this time in the following categories?

	Please check one		
	Greater	Same	Less
Planning to—	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Build new homes	25.3	46.2	24.3
Remodel homes	35.9	45.9	12.6
Build corn cribs, granaries	21.3	48.0	20.1
Build poultry houses, hog houses	44.3	40.3	10.3
Build dairy barns	20.1	39.8	29.0
Build machine sheds, garages	40.6	43.6	12.4
Paint farm buildings and homes	25.9	51.9	9.3

NOTE.—Percentages across do not add up to 100 as some dealers felt it was too early to make predictions in certain categories of their trade.

82 percent say the same or greater than last year.

CONTRACT AWARDS ATTAINED NEW PEAK IN MARCH

NEW YORK, April 10.—F. W. Dodge Corp., construction news and marketing specialists,

reported today that contract awards in March for future construction in the 37 States east of the Rockies smashed all records.

The total was $1,527,517,000, up 25 percent over February and 13 percent over March, 1953, the highest previous March in the history of the Dodge reports.

By classifications, the report gave these figures:

Nonresidential: $532,060,000, up 14 percent over February and 18 percent over March 1953; residential: $667,737,000, up 31 percent over February and 10 percent over March 1953; public works and utilities: $327,720,000, up 34 percent over February and 12 percent over March 1953.

THE USE OF CERTAIN WITNESSES BY THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AND CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD what in my opinion is a very disturbing article. It appears in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. The article, written by the Alsop brothers, is entitled "The Powerful Imaginer."

I am so convinced of the carefulness of these journalists that I am satisfied they would not publish the article if it were not based on a considerable amount of research and study of the record with regard to the Communist referred to in the article, who is being used by the Department of Justice and by some congressional committees as a professional witness. He is Mr. Paul Crouch.

If only a small percentage of what the Alsop brothers have to say about Mr. Crouch is true—and I am satisfied that all of it is undoubtedly true—the State Department ought to be ashamed of itself for using such a professional witness.

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

THE POWERFUL IMAGINER

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

Just what sort of witness is being used by the Justice Department and the congressional investigating committees to attack the loyalty of citizens of this Republic? The question is sharply posed by the case of Paul Crouch.

Crouch is an ex-Communist informer who gets $25 per diem from the Justice Department when he is doing his stuff. Since he describes himself as "employed by the Government," being an informer seems to be his main source of income. He is the man who has made the most serious charges against Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, both to the Justice Department and to Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and his fellow investigators.

Now consider the following testimony that was once given by Crouch himself, under oath, concerning an untruthful letter he had written about an associate: "I am in the habit," said Crouch to the court, "of writing letters to my friends and imaginary persons, sometimes to kings and other foreign persons, in which I place myself in an imaginary position. I do that to develop my imaginary powers. That is why this letter is semifiction. Part of it is true and part of it is not."

The imaginative letterwriter, who has now become the professional testifier, was born 51 years ago on a North Carolina farm. He was clearly an infant prodigy, with access to a library without known parallel in the rustic South of that simple and remote period.

"Prior to the age of 12," he once told the Subversive Activities Control Board, "I had been reading the Communist Manifesto, Value, Price, and Profit; Wage, Labor, and Capital; as well as popular Socialist papers." Then he put away such childish things. "After the age of 12," he loftily explained, he "proceeded to more serious works," which led him eventually into the Communist Party.

In 1925, when he was an enlisted man in the United States Army in Hawaii, Crouch was tried for seeking to form a secret revolutionary organization. It was in this trial that the imaginative letter cropped up. Crouch was convicted, sentenced, and served about 3 years in Alcatraz as a military prisoner. In the face of these facts, Crouch has complained strongly about being called an ex-convict. Call him, then, what you will.

On emerging from Alcatraz, he became a professional Communist functionary. He remained in the party until some time in the forties. Just when he finally broke with the party is not clear; but he has testified that he discussed communism at length with an FBI agent in 1946 in Brownsville, Tex.

Under oath, Crouch stated that his historic interview with the FBI man took place in the presence of County Judge Oscar B. Dancy, who was, he said warmly, his personal friend from his home county. Judge Dancy has now told these reporters for the record that this story is simply not true—as far as he knows he never saw Crouch in his life.

Crouch has been telling his story a long time now, and thus has given the opportunity for an astonishing number of interesting variations. He has, for example, given six quite different and conflicting accounts of his attendance at meetings of the Communist Party Central Committee.

Again he has represented himself at one time as building "a vast apparatus in the Armed Forces of the United States," and at another time as supervising another apparatus "for the purpose of supplying the Soviet Union with information regarding scientific experiments * * * at the University of California." But on a third occasion he has sworn that he only interested himself in barroom talk. And when he made his fourth try he said flatly that he "did not obtain any military secrets from this country."

Rather more than a year ago these reporters described how Crouch had sworn he met an accused Government official and discussed communism with him in the presence of a third party. The third party had branded Crouch's story as untrue with the same fine lack of hesitation shown by Judge Dancy. It was suggested that this kind of hired informer was at the very best a dubious investment for the United States Government.

It has been more recently shown in this space that Crouch swore he joined with Dr. Oppenheimer and Dr. Joseph Weinberg in a Communist meeting at the Oppenheimer house in Berkeley, Calif. On the date Crouch gave, all the evidence indicates Oppenheimer had left Berkeley for a long holiday in New Mexico, and that Weinberg was also about 500 miles away. It was further shown that this marked peculiarity in Crouch's evidence apparently struck the officials of the Justice Department. At any rate, the Department did not ask Crouch to testify on this vital point when the Weinberg case came to public trial.

There was a minor error in this last report—the date of the alleged Communist meeting in the Oppenheimer house should have been given as 1941 rather than 1945. But the transposition of numerals does not affect the enormously grave issue that is raised by this instance and others like it.

Judge Dancy has plainly accused Crouch of untruths, and so has at least one other competent witness. No man in his senses can read Crouch's multitudinous, widely various, and often highly peculiar accounts of his own past and conclude that this man is a witness to be relied on.

One of MCCARTHY's public lickspittles has recently declared that it is a mark of leftism to publish the facts about such men as Crouch. Surely we have reached a very strange pass, when it is leftism instead of good Americanism to point out that the Government has a duty to investigate the reliability of the informers it hires. If we must have informers in America, let them at least be men who tell their stories in a way that carries a little conviction.

LIBERALIZATION OF SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the Senate Finance Committee the results of a vote recently sponsored by the Minnesota Bar Association on the question whether lawyers should be included in the social-security system.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the St. Paul Pioneer-Dispatch reporting the vote of 8 to 1 in favor of social-security provisions for attorneys be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

LAWYERS SEEK SOCIAL SECURITY

Minnesota lawyers by a vote of 8 to 1 favor inclusion in the social-security system on either a voluntary or compulsory basis.

The Minnesota Bar Association made public the results today of a statewide poll of its members, conducted to learn whether Minnesota lawyers are in favor of a bill now pending in Congress which would blanket in other professional persons not covered by social security.

At present, lawyers and other professional persons are not covered by social security. They also are prohibited from establishing tax-deferred pension plans for themselves.

Results of the poll were explained by Walter J. Wheeler, Minneapolis attorney and chairman of the bar association committee which conducted the poll.

Mr. Wheeler said the poll indicates that although a majority of Minnesota lawyers would accept the extension of social security to include their profession, 3 out of 8 lawyers would prefer that social security be extended to them on a voluntary basis.

CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I understand that morning business has been completed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. So far as the Chair can determine, morning business has been completed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, we are to have a call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Before proceeding to it, Mr. President, and after having conferred with the acting minority leader, I now ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, to which I understand there is no objection.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations appearing on the Executive Calendar under the heading, "New Reports."

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Laurence Ballard Robbins, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas Potter Pike, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

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

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wilbur Marion Brucker, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

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

IN THE NAVY OR IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy or in the Marine Corps.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

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

PROCEDURE ON QUORUM CALLS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to announce that I think this particular parliamentary procedure is being overdone. If a count were made of the number of times it has been used in recent weeks, I think it would be found—and I believe this to be an understatement—that at least three times a week, on the average, and some weeks more often—we rush out of committee from our offices, or from conferences, to the floor of the Senate to answer a quorum call, only to find, after reaching the Chamber, that the order for the quorum call has been rescinded.

I do not think it is fair to the Senate as a whole to follow that parliamentary practice. I do not object at this time, but reserve the right to object in the future, and I undoubtedly shall do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I think there is very considerable merit in what the Senator has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the order for the quorum call is rescinded.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, the call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection is next in order, beginning at the point where the previous call of the calendar was concluded.

The Secretary will call the first bill on the calendar.

HOSPITALIZATION AND TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COAST GUARD AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The bill (S. 3255) to provide for the hospitalization and treatment of members of the Coast Guard and their dependents in hospitals and other medical facilities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 13 of title 14 of the United States Code is amended by—

(a) inserting at the end of the analysis thereto the following:

"510. Hospitalization and medical, surgical, and dental care in hospitals and other medical facilities of the Armed Forces.";

and

(b) inserting, immediately after section 509 thereof, the following new section:

"SEC. 510. Hospitalization and medical, surgical, and dental care in hospitals and other medical facilities of the Armed Forces.

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly prescribe, commissioned officers, chief warrant officers, warrant officers, cadets, and enlisted personnel of the Regular Coast Guard, including those on shore duty and those on detached duty, whether on active duty or retired, and Regular and temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve when on active duty or when retired for disability, shall be eligible for hospitalization and to receive medical, surgical, and dental treatment at hospitals and other medical facilities of the Armed Forces in the same manner, to the same extent, and under the same conditions as personnel of like class of such Armed Forces receive such hospitalization and treatment.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly prescribe, dependents of members of the Coast Guard of the classes specified in subsection (a) of this section shall be eligible for hosptialization and to receive medical, surgical, and dental treatment at hospitals and other medical facilities of the Armed Forces in the same manner, to the same extent, and under the same conditions as dependents of personnel of such Armed Forces of like class are entitled by law or regulation to receive such hospitalization or treatment.

"(c) No hospitalization or treatment under this section shall be accorded to any individual if such hospitalization or treatment is available to that individual at any medical facility of the Public Health Service under section 326 of the Public Health Service Act."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I prepared on Senate bill 3255.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

This bill, S. 3255, comes about because of a bill, S. 33, introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada and on which the senior Senator from Nevada made a specific request for hearings. The bill, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services, carries forward completely the proposals originated by the senior Senator from Nevada, but the subcommittee, which considered the bill and of which the junior Senator from New Jersey happened to be chairman, reported a clean bill because of the feeling that the original language in S. 33 would not have achieved the objective which the testimony warranted and which we felt sure was desired by the author of that bill.

The problem is simply this: Under existing law, members of the Coast Guard and their dependents receive medical care from the United States Public Health Service. This arrangement is highly satisfactory, of course, so long as Public Health Service facilities are available.

However, Coast Guard personnel are stationed at the present time in numerous locations at which there are no Public Health Service facilities available, but at which hospitals and dispensaries operated by the Armed Forces are available.

Under existing law, active duty Coast Guard personnel can be hospitalized, on a reimbursable basis, in these Armed Forces installations according to the same routine that permits an Army man, for example, to be sent to a Navy hospital.

Insofar as the Coast Guard dependents are concerned, the situation is quite different. Dependents of service personnel may receive medical care, on a space-available basis, at service hospitals. Coast Guard dependents, stationed in the same area, may not receive such hospitalization.

This is an obvious inequity, which was clearly shown by the testimony concerning the situation in Hawaii. Dependents of Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel may use the facilities of the Trippler General Hospital on a space-available basis. Coast Guard dependents whose husbands are on duty in that area with air-sea rescue units may not utilize the Trippler Hospital.

The bill proposes that Coast Guard dependents may—and only to the same extent as dependents of personnel of the military service—be cared for in service hospitals when Public Health Service facilities are not available.

It is our feeling that this bill does not involve any additional commitments for medical care. The care given to all dependents is on a space-available basis. What the bill does is simply to spread this care, perhaps a little thinner, but to correct an inequity which has caused understandable dissatisfaction.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE VETERINARY CORPS

The bill (S. 932) to equalize the treatment accorded to commissioned officers of the Veterinary Corps with that accorded to commissioned officers of other corps of the Army Medical Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill give an explanation of it, particularly addressing himself to the question of why treatment should be accorded to veterinarians over and above that accorded other persons who have similar technical training?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I shall be glad to give an explanation. This bill proposes to give to commissioned officers newly appointed in the lowest grade in the Veterinary Corps the same scale of constructive service credit as is given to newly appointed officers in the other branches of the Medical Department.

Under existing law young officers coming into the Veterinary Corps at the bottom are commissioned as second lieutenants, with 2 years of constructive service to compensate for time spent in professional training. Physicians appointed in the Medical Corps, however, are commissioned as first lieutenants, with 4 years of constructive credit.

These scales were adopted in 1947 and written into the Officer Personnel Act. They were undoubtedly fair and reasonable at the time that the act was passed 7 years ago.

In the meantime, however, the educational requirements for veterinary officers have increased to a point where, instead of a 2-year initial credit, there is considerable evidence to support a 3-year credit, with original appointment in the grade of first lieutenant instead of second lieutenant.

S. 932 takes cognizance of that situation and rectifies what the subcommittee feels is an inequity.

No retroactive pay or benefits are involved and no readjustments in grade structure.

A subcommittee, of which the junior Senator from New Jersey was chairman, heard complete testimony from the Defense Department. It should be pointed out, Mr. President, that the Defense Department spokesman on personnel policy matters opposed the bill, on the grounds that educational requirements have risen in other fields, but have not been taken cognizance of by giving constructive credit to such persons as engineers, for example. The spokesman on professional policy for the Medical Department favored the legislation, on the basis primarily that the inequity as between the officers of the various branches of the Medical Department is much more clear cut than is the case when one considers all types of professions and scientific specialties.

The Armed Services Committee concurs in the latter view, feeling that this is a very minor problem, insofar as numbers are concerned—I believe there are only about 110 or 112 regular veterinary officers—and there is no sound reason why remedial action in this specific field should not be taken.

I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that the equities are certainly on the side of this proposed legislation so far as the Committee on Armed Services is concerned. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. GORE. In the first place, I do not know why the Armed Forces need so many veterinarians. That, however, is foreign to the consideration of the pending bill and to the question which I raised. I am not unsympathetic with a reclassification of veterinarians, because the length of time required for a college training in that profession has been increased.

However, the Secretary of the Army points out that men in combat units have also had training beyond 4 years of college. Engineers in electronics, historians, and men in other technical fields require the same training. Some of them hold masters degrees, which require 6 years to acquire. Some of them hold doctorates.

By correcting one alleged inequity, would not the Senator's bill create more inequities?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No; I think not. I believe that we must start correcting the inequities at some point. This is a start in the right direction. I grant that the situation which the Senator from Tennessee describes—with reference to engineers, for example—does present a problem; but I believe that we must move forward, and this is a step forward in the field of classification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 932) to equalize the treatment accorded to commissioned officers of the Veterinary Corps with that accorded to commissioned officers of other corps of the Army Medical Service, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, after line 19, insert:

(d) Each person appointed and commissioned an officer of the Veterinary Corps subsequent to December 31, 1947, who, at time of appointment, was credited with less than 3 years' service under the second sentence of subsection 506 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, shall, for promotion, seniority, and promotion-list-position purposes, be credited as of the date of appointment with 3 years' service: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued as the result of the enactment of this subsection for any period prior to the date of enactment thereof.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first proviso contained in numbered paragraph (1) of subsection 505 (b) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That in the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, Veterinary Corps, and chaplains promotion lists there shall be no second lieutenants, and the numbers authorized in the grade of first lieutenant in such promotion lists shall be all those not authorized in higher grades:".

(b) The third clause of the second sentence of subsection 506 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows: "each person appointed and commissioned an officer of the Veterinary Corps shall, at the time of appointment, be credited with an amount of service equal to 3 years;".

(c) The third sentence of subsection 506 (g) of such act is amended to read as follows: "Effective December 31, 1947, each commissioned officer of the Medical Corps who on that date has less than 4 years' service credit, each commissioned officer of the Dental Corps, each Regular Army chaplain, each commissioned officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department, and each commissioned officer of the Veterinary Corps, who as of that date had less than 3 years' service credit, shall, for promotion, seniority, and promotion-list-position purposes, be credited as of that date with 4 years' service and 3 years' service, respectively."

(d) Each person appointed and commissioned an officer of the Veterinary Corps subsequent to December 31, 1947, who, at time of appointment, was credited with less than 3 years' service under the second sentence of subsection 506 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, shall, for promotion, seniority, and promotion-list-position purposes, be credited as of the date of appointment with 3 years' service: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued as the result of the enactment of this subsection for any period prior to the date of enactment thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF ST. JOSEPH, MICH.

The bill (H. R. 7402) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to extend my sincere compliments to both the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and to the city of St. Joseph, Mich., for presenting us with a bill whereby the city of St. Joseph offers to pay compensation for the property involved. It illustrates the sound principle which I believe to be so important in these transactions. I am glad to find bills coming to the floor of the Senate with that principle included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7402) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich., was considered, or-

dered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 42) to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1152, S. 42. When the bill was previously called, my attention was momentarily diverted. I desired to object to the consideration of Calendar No. 1152, S. 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill already has been passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I had asked that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was previously passed over, after objection had been made by the Senator from New Jersey.

SZYGA (SAUL) MORGENSTERN

The bill (S. 278) for the relief of Szyga (Saul) Morgenstern was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Szyga (Saul) Morgenstern shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

FELICITOS VALERINA MARGARET HAUKE

The bill (S. 445) for the relief of Felicitos Valerina Margaret Hauke was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felicitos Valerina Margaret Hauke, the fiance of Cpl. Cecil Verne Bledsoe, RA–19333627, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Felicitos Valerina Margaret Hauke is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Cpl. Cecil Verne Bledsoe, RA–19333627, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Felicitos Valerina Margaret Hauke, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Felicitos Valerina Margaret Hauke, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Felicitos Valerina Margaret Hauke as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

WONG YOU HENN

The bill (S. 579) for the relief of Wong You Henn was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wong You Henn shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

FRANK BASTINELLE

The bill (S. 757) for the relief of Frank Bastinelle was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Frank Bastinelle, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. Lorenzo Fortuna, a citizen of the United States.

PAULUS YOUHANNA BENJAMEN

The bill (S. 794) for the relief of Paulus Youhanna Benjamen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.; That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paulus Youhanna Benjamen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DIONYSIO ANTYPAS

The bill (S. 841) for the relief of Dionysio Antypas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dionysio Antypas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARTIN ANTHONY BEEKMAN

The bill (S. 930) for the relief of Martin Anthony Beekman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martin Anthony Beekman shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

STAYKA PETROVICH (STAJKA PETROVIC)

The bill (S. 1158) for the relief of Stayka Petrovich (Stajka Petrovic) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stayka Petrovich (Stajka Petrovic) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

IRENE KRAMER AND OTTO KRAMER

The bill (S. 1267) for the relief of Irene Kramer and Otto Kramer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Irene Kramer and Otto Kramer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

CHUNG KEUN LEE (THUNG KUEN LEE)

The bill (S. 1478) for the relief of Chung Keun Lee (Thung Kuen Lee) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung Keun Lee (Thung Kuen Lee) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DAVID MAISEL (DAVID MAJZEL AND BERTHA MAISEL (BERTA PIESCHANSKY MAJZEL)

The bill (S. 1490) for the relief of David Maisel (David Majzel) and Bertha Maisel (Berta Pieschansky Majzel) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Maisel (David Majzel) and Bertha Maisel (Berta Pieschansky Majzel) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

MRS. DIANA COHEN AND JACQUELINE PATRICIA COHEN

The bill (S. 1617) for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

JOUBRAN A. ABOU JOUBRAN

The bill (S. 1896) for the relief of Joubran A. Abou Joubran was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joubran A. Abou Joubran shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MR. AND MRS. HENDRIK VAN DER TUIN

The bill (S. 2065) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Hendrik Van der Tuin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. and Mrs. Hendrik Van der Tuin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARINA BERNARDIS ZIVOLICH AND MIRKO ZIVOLICH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 259) for the relief of Marina Bernardis Zivolich and Mirko Zivolich, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "fees", to strike out "and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)" and to insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marina Bernardis Zivolich and Mirko Zivolich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IGOR MICHAEL BOGOLEPOV (ALIAS IVAR NYMAN) AND MARGARET JOHANNA BOGOLEPOV (ALIAS MARGARET JOHANNA NYMAN)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 629) for the relief of Igor Michael Bogolepov (alias Ivar Nyman) and Margaret Johanna Bogolepov (alias Margaret Johanna Nyman).

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? I note from the report that the beneficiary is a citizen of Russia, a former member of the Communist Party. I wonder if there has been an FBI investigation and by what right this man expects citizenship in the United States by reason of a special bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 50-year-old native of Russia and a 44-year-old native of Estonia, who are man and wife, and who are persons of undetermined nationality. The husband last entered the United States on April 4, 1952, as a visitor and the wife last entered the United States on May 3, 1952, as a visitor. Since entering the United States the male beneficiary has cooperated with various congressional committees in their investigations of communism and has otherwise participated in anti-Communist activities.

The purpose of the amendment is to remove the requirement for the payment of head taxes. I might say that the report speaks for itself. It contains a letter from the Commissioner of Immigration saying they have no objection to granting these aliens permanent residence in the United States.

There is a memorandum filed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which is self-explanatory. The committee investigated the case thoroughly, and we are satisfied the bill should pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 629) for the relief of Igor Michael Bogolepov (alias Ivar Nyman) and Margaret Johanna Bogolopov (alias Margaret Johanna Nyman), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "fees", strike out "and head taxes", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Igor Michael Bogolepov (alias Ivar Nyman) and Margaret Johanna Bogolepov (alias Margaret Johanna Nyman) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRENE J. HALKIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 790) for the relief of Irene J. Halkis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "act", insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Irene J. Halkis may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL, AGNES, AND SONYA LIEBERMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 830) for the relief of Samuel, Agnes, and Sonya Lieberman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Samuel, Agnes, and Sonya Lieberman shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FERMO BREDA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1128) for the relief of Fermo Breda, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Fermo Breda, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Adolph F. Breda, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1303) to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in occupied Japan was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NAHI YOUSSEF

The bill (S. 1421) for the relief of Nahi Youssef, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a similar House bill on the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1201, House bill 4236, for the relief of Nahi Youssef be considered in place of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4236) for the relief of Nahi Youssef, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1421 is indefinitely postponed.

RUTH JOHANNA HEIDENREICH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1430) for the relief of Ruth Johanna Heidenreich, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 13, after the word "fee", insert a colon and *"Provided,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ruth Johanna Heidenreich, the fiancée of David George Lynch, a citizen of the United States, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of such act, be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Ruth Johanna Heidenreich is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said David George Lynch and (2) that she is otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Ruth Johanna Heidenreich, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Ruth Johanna Heidenreich, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Ruth Johanna Heidenreich as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUIGI ORLANDO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1618) for the relief of Luigi Orlando, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "alien", insert "minor", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Luigi Orlando, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Ricci, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERNA PRANGE BLANKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1661) for the relief of Erna Prange Blanks, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "act", insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erna Prange Blanks may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA H. BRAUN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 222) for the relief of Martha H. Braun, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Dean S. Roberts (nee Braun) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dean S. Roberts (nee Braun)."

MRS. BERT I. BIEDERMANN (NEE ERMENEGILDA VITTORIA CERNECCA)

The bill (S. 1435) for the relief of Mrs. Bert I. Biedermann (nee Ermenegilda Vittoria Cernecca) was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill H. R. 4869, Calendar No. 1200, is an identical bill. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4869) for the relief of Mrs. Bert I. Biedermann (nee Ermenegilda Vittoria Cernecca) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1435 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 1200, House bill 4869. When calendar 1178, Senate bill 1435, was called, the House bill was substituted for the Senate bill and passed. I find that there is an error in the House bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the votes by which House bill 4869 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as I have stated, I find that there is an error in the House bill. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the word "have" and insert the word "has."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MR. AND MRS. EDWARD LEVANDOSKI—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 887) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill for the RECORD?

Mr. LANGER. This bill awards the sum of $15,000 to parents whose 11-year-old daughter died when she fell over a cliff while running along an unprotected and badly eroded path on Government property in Dunkirk, N. Y. This property is adjacent to a public park, where thousands of children play each week, yet prior to this incident no signs of warning or protection of any kind had been erected on the property. Since the accident the Government has taken steps to prevent a recurrence of this sort of accident.

The failure of the Government to provide safeguards against a tragedy such as this, where they were so obviously called for, led the committee to recommend favorable consideration of this claim.

I might say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that the committee considered the matter in great detail. The author of the bill, Representative REED, of New York, testified before the committee. The committee has records of exactly what occurred.

The committee felt that in this case, without its being made a precedent, the amount ought to be increased from $10,000 to $15,000, because of the unusual circumstances. The recommendation of the committee in this respect was unanimous.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does not the distinguished Senator from North Dakota think that $15,000 is excessive in this case?

Mr. LANGER. The committee felt that it was not an excessive amount in this particular case. While $10,000 is the amount provided under the usual rule, in this case the committee felt that even the sum of $15,000 was inadequate, because of the disgraceful negligence on the part of the Government. All that was necessary to have been done at the point of the precipitous drop was to erect some warning signs, but that the Government failed to do.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Do I understand correctly that the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary does not feel that the award in this instance will establish a precedent by which the Committee on the Judiciary will be bound in the future?

Mr. LANGER. I do not, because of the unusual circumstances surrounding this particular accident. As chairman of the committee, I am opposed to any reduction in this sum. I think that, if anything, the amount is too small.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary why it was that the parents of the child did not bring an action for recovery under the Federal Tort Claims Act, which would be the proper procedure in a case such as this.

Mr. LANGER. I think I can explain that to the satisfaction of the distinguished Senator from Florida. I read from a letter dated May 20, 1952, to Representative REED, as follows:

> Thank you very much for your letter of May 16, 1952, relative to the Levandoski claim. I would, myself, prefer to bring the action in the United States district court as I believe that in the event a recovery were allowed, that it would be substantial and the fee with it would be substantial.
>
> I would like, however, to call attention to some of the manifest weaknesses of our case as would be presented in an action at law. As you know, the law of the State in which the action is brought is binding on the district court except as to matters of evidence and the rules of weighing it. In this State, it is established that the owner of land owes to a trespasser no duty of care other than that of refraining from doing the trespasser deliberate injury.
>
> For example, in the case *Mendelowitz* v. *Neisner* (258 N. Y. 181) it was thus held. It was also held that the only duty the owner or occupier of land owes to a trespasser is to abstain from inflicting intentional or wanton injuries. *Ehrets* v. *Village of Scarsdale* (269 N. Y. 198). Thus in this State—

The State referred to is the State of New York, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Florida—

> the doctrine of attractive nuisance to children is not recognized and the owner of such attractive nuisance is only bound to refrain from such intentional injury, even to a child. (*Morse* v. *Buffalo Tank Corporation* (280 New York 110).) This was held in the case of a 5½-year-old infant who fell into a smouldering fire. (*Zaia* v. *Lalex Realty Corporation* (287 New York 689).) Affirming the opinion expressed in 25 New York 2d 183. A similar holding is reported in *Steinnett* v. *Liberty Aircraft Products Corporation* (77 New York, supplement 2d 357). Also reported in structure where children played in and were continuously chased away. The owner was held not liable for resulting injuries to three boys. *Carbone* v. *Mackchil Realty Corporation*.
>
> I am very much afraid of this doctrine preventing us from obtaining a recovery. In addition to this, the mother, especially, of this child, is in such a highly emotional state that I am afraid a prolonged litigation would result in serious injury to her health.
>
> I trust, therefore, that you will again take this up with the committee as rapidly as possible, because of the factors I have explained above.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> ANTHONY JOHNSON.

The committee felt that if a tort action were brought, the parents might not recover anything at all. The committee believed the case involved very unusual circumstances. The area was a public park, to which, apparently, everyone was invited and in which children were encouraged to play, but no warning signs were posted and no safeguards were erected. As a consequence an 11-year-old girl met her death. The committee did not consider that the child was to blame. In view of all the testimony taken, it was felt that equity and justice demanded that the claim be allowed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not true that the Treasury Department recommended against passage of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Presumably, according to the report, the Department of Justice never expressed itself, or did not have an opportunity to express itself one way or the other.

Mr. LANGER. The Department of Justice is always invited to express itself in these matters.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would the distinguished Senator tell me what the Department of Justice recommended in this case?

Mr. LANGER. The Department of Justice did not make any recommendation, because the bill was passed by the House on the basis of the report of the Treasury Department.

Mr. SMATHERS. It could not have been passed on the basis of a report by the Treasury Department, because the Treasury Department reported against the passage of the bill.

I am just as sympathetic as is the Senator from North Dakota toward the father and mother of the lovely little girl who lost her life. On the other hand, there are laws which provide remedies in such cases.

I ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar, so that we may have time to make a further investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

PETER A. PIROGOV

The bill (H. R. 1100) for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER AUGUSTA SALA AND SISTER ELVIRA STORNELLI

The bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of Sister Augusta Sala and Sister Elvira Stornelli was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JUAN ANTONIO RIVERA AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2660) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antello, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JAMES FRANCIS NICHOLSON

The bill (H. R. 6020) for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. ALEXANDER D. MORUZI

The bill (H. R. 673) for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the call of the calendar on April 5 this bill was passed, but subsequently the votes by which it was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed were reconsidered. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but in compliance with an understanding with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared in connection with the bill under consideration, the bill which affects Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

I should like to point out that Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi is a skilled and renowned surgeon. He entered the United States on an exchange visa. Granted that an exchange visa was improper, but at the time of his entry visas were not available to Rumanians except on an exchange program. Dr. Moruzi is 54 years old. He was head surgeon in the Caritate Hospital, Iasy, Rumania, 1931. Chief of a motorized Rumanian Red Cross hospital which came the nearest to the battlefront of all major surgery units on the Russian front in 1942, 1944, and 1945. During the war years some 7,000 were under his personal care, and he performed among many others a very great number of major operations on head, lungs, abdomen, great articulations and bones, nerves, etc. He was chief of the Caritate Hospital, of Iasy, Rumania, until his flight from Rumania on May 19, 1947; chief of a surgical department in the Hospital Los Andes, Merida, Venezuela, from April 1949 to October 1950. He has practiced surgery for more than 25 years and performed more than 18,000 operations.

This outstanding surgeon now seeks permanent residence in the United States as a stateless person. He fled from Communist Rumania because of his devotion to the principles of democracy. As a result, he is now stateless.

I have here several affidavits from the Rumanian Welfare, Inc., 145 East 52d Street, New York, N. Y., testifying to this fact and to Dr. Moruzi's high personal and professional qualifications.

Dr. Moruzi has made the following statement: "As a university professor and as a spiritual leader of the students, or as a hospital director, I have always expressed my disapproval for the totalitarian regimes and in my ethical as well as in my practical life I have maintained my faith in the ideals of Western civilization and democracy. I succeeded in keeping this trend of thinking and manner of acting even under the disastrous dictatorships of King Carol and Marshal Antonescu. However, I was less successful under the Communist government. My resistance and struggle against communism in my native Rumania finally resulted in active persecution by the authorities of that government. Only my escape from Rumania on May 19, 1947, saved me from a slave-labor camp.

"From July 1947 to September 1948, I lived in Switzerland where I rejoined my wife and children, whom I had the foresight to send there just before the Russian invasion of Rumania in 1944. During this time I was looking for a position in order to earn our livelihood. Finally, I found it in Venezuela, where I resided 2 years."

On February 12, 1954, I received the following information from Dr. Moruzi:

"Since I last wrote you concerning my problem of being allowed to remain in this country, I have worked arduously and continuously, using all the means I know to obtain the right for me to leave the country and to return with a preferential immigrant visa. I am still in the same position as 10 months ago. I have tried to obtain permission to enter Canada, Mexico, Costa Rica, and Venezuela. The Venezuelan consul, as I informed you before, did not even reply to my inquiry. So the situation remains that I am not able legally to remain in this country; nor can I leave it and return."

I have a copy of the letter which Dr. Moruzi sent to the consul general of Venezuela.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 673?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 673) for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FINANCING OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8097) to authorize the financing of a program of public-works construction for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection until I can make a statement which will take approximately a half a minute?

I quite agree that a bill of this importance should not be considered on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, but should be scheduled for full debate in the Senate. I sincerely hope that the leadership of the Senate will afford an opportunity for full debate on the bill at a very early date because its objective—the end result, so far as accomplishing a program for the construction of public works in the District of Columbia is concerned—is sorely needed. I say that as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

In my judgment, the bill is in need of a great many revisions, particularly in connection with some of its tax provisions, particularly the provisions which would put upon the necks of the people of the District of Columbia the sales tax yoke. Nevertheless, the bill should be considered by the Senate, and I hope it will be scheduled for debate at an early date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 975) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FOR ACCRUED LEAVE TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 22) to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a), notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended (37 U. S. C. 33 (c)), any payments for accrued leave heretofore erroneously made to any member of the Armed Forces who was discharged after August 31, 1946, for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period are hereby validated.

(b) In any case in which any member or former member of the Armed Forces of the United States has received any erroneous payment which is validated by subsection (a) of this section and has been required to repay to the United States all or a portion of such erroneous payment, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such member or former member, or in the event he is deceased, to the person entitled to receive his arrears of pay in accordance with the act of June 30, 1906, as amended (10 U. S. C. 868), a sum equal to any amount so repaid which has not been refunded to him.

(c) The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for any payment validated by this act.

PUNISHMENT FOR FRAUDULENT ACCEPTANCE OF BENEFITS

The bill (S. 1754) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, so as to provide punishment for fraudulent acceptance of benefits was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (64 Stat. 794; 67 Stat. 6), is amended by inserting the following 2 sections after section 13:

"SEC. 13a. Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, allowance, or allotment under this act, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 13b. Any person who has been entitled to payment of an allowance or allotment under this act and whose entitlement to payment of such allowance or allotment has ceased shall, if he thereafter accepts payment of such allowance or allotment with the intent to defraud, be punished by a fine of

not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5416) to authorize the advancement of certain lieutenants on the retired list of the Navy was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

PROMOTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The bill (H. R. 5627) to amend Public Law 472, 81st Congress, approved April 11, 1950, entitled "An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2665) to amend the Classification Act of 1919, as amended, the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

CONVEYANCE OF FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS AT CAMP BLANDING, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 7512) to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, whatever the pleasure of the Senator from Florida may be with regard to explaining the bill, I shall be very glad to listen to his statement before I make a supplementary statement setting forth why I think the bill should be passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator.

I understood the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, acting for the committee which approved this bill, perhaps had a statement to make. If he does not have such a statement, I shall be glad to make an informal one, but I would prefer for the Senator from New Jersey to do so, if he cares to make one.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Recalling the appearance of the distinguished Senator from Florida before the committee which conducted public hearings on the bill, I remember very well that he had a very thorough knowledge of the whole situation. I think perhaps his explanation would be more advantageous for the RECORD than would the explanation of the Senator from New Jersey, so I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Camp Blanding, which is located near Starke, Fla., was an important Army training base during World War II. It was built around a Florida National Guard camp of some 32,324 acres, which was owned by the State of Florida, and on which important installations already had been erected.

The Federal Government secured additional adjoining lands, which now amount to 40,146 acres, and which adjoin the State-owned lands on two sides. The 3 areas, that is, the State area on which the actual buildings, the utilities and the railroad terminus are located, plus the 2 Federal areas make up one large and very satisfactory training area which was used as a 2-division camp during World War II, with certain added extra units being trained at the same time that 2 divisions were in training.

There were additional lands which were leased by the United States in that neighborhood, but they were allowed to go back, and I think very properly so, to the private owners, after the termination of the war.

While the Korean war was at its height, the Federal Government, as the Senate will remember, appropriated sums of money to keep in good shape several of the camps which were regarded as well located and which could be used as standby installations, for use in the event the war assumed greater proportions.

Camp Blanding was one of those several camps, and some $5,700,000 was appropriated and assigned for modernization and the bringing in of additional improvements and facilities. Something over $2 million was expended, almost all of it on the railroad terminus, and the railroad terminus happens to lie on the State-owned part of the reservation.

The Armory Board of the State of Florida has made a proposal to the Department of Defense, and particularly to the Department of the Army, which has been accepted. It has been worked out very carefully. The Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the similar committee of the House gave careful attention to the proposal and several amendments were written into the bill, as a result of study, first, by the Armed Services Committee of the House and later by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

I believe the bill is in excellent shape. It has been approved in its present form both by the Department of the Army, speaking for the Department of Defense, and by the Armory Board of the State of Florida.

The bill as now written will allow the State to take title subject to an understanding that Federal areas will not be alienated, and subject to the further understanding that no State areas may be alienated, so that they will be held together. In the event of war or other emergency requiring the Department of the Army to request the use of the property for Federal purposes, the land would be turned over to the Federal Government, with the exception of 20 acres for warehouse purposes, which in that event would be used by the State government for the storage of State equipment. The use would comprise also the care of the timber on the area, which very badly needs care—that is, insofar as the Federal ownership is concerned—and the appropriate Federal agencies have reported that the size of the project is not sufficient to justify separate Federal operation.

The profits derived from the Federal forestry operations which would be carried on by the State government, namely, by the armory board, would be expended wholly on the Federal part of the area, in keeping it up, or in keeping up basic utilities located on State land.

Only one proposal called for considerable discussion, namely, the one calling for so-called strip mining in certain portions both of the State area and the Federal area, for the production of ilmenite, zirconium, and other rare minerals, which, as I understand, are sources of titanium. I understand that strip mining already is going on in the State-owned area, which is shown on the map in the rear of the Chamber, and which operation lies in the northwest corner of the State area.

The area which, by the provisions of the bill, as amended, is to be limited for strip mining, includes only a narrow strip of sections along the west side of the State ownership and a similar narrow strip of sections along the west side of the present Federal ownership, so as not to encroach on the main bodies of land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). The Chair informs the Senator from Florida that the 5 minutes available to him have expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the Chair's warning. I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 3 minutes, in order to complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from Florida may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The strip mining going on there by the State's licensee is to be allowed to continue, and it will include, as I have said, only a strip of sections on the west side of the State ownership. Similarly, a corresponding operation could be carried on in the area on the west side of the Federal ownership. The profits are to be used exclu-

sively for the management of natural resources on the Federal ownership area and for the upkeep of basic utilities on State lands; and if there are any profits over and above that amount, the division of the profits is to be arranged under a contract now being negotiated, and which is subject to approval by the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses.

Last of all, Mr. President, the map in the rear of the Chamber does not show the north 4 miles, all of which is federally owned, and most of which is at this time being used by the Navy air arm, out of the Naval Air Training Station at Jacksonville, as a bombing range, and it will continue to be so used.

Mr. President it is my firm conviction that this arrangement is highly desirable from the standpoint of both the State and the Nation and I certainly wish to voice my gratitude for the careful consideration given by the Senate committee and for the way it has worked out the amendments, all of which are acceptable to both the Federal Government and the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The amendments reported by the Committee on Armed Services were on page 5, at the beginning of line 19, to insert "to use for military purposes only, and"; on page 6, line 1, after the word "States", to strike out "without the consent of the Secretary of the Army"; on page 8, line 17, after the word "time", to insert "use for other than military purposes,"; in line 20, after the word "land", to strike out "without the consent of the Secretary of the Army,"; on page 9, line 7, after the word "agreement", to insert "within 9 months subsequent to the date of enactment of this act"; in line 14, after the word "States", to insert *"Provided further,* That prior to the consummation of the agreement with the State of Florida or board, the Secretary of the Army or his designee shall come into agreement with the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives concerning the terms of such agreement"; and on page 10, line 6, after "section 30", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That in event of breach by the Armory Board, State of Florida, of any of the provisions of this act or of the provisions of the agreement pursuant to the act, title to the Federal lands will revert to the United States."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, before we proceed further, I submit an amendment to correct a clerical error in the bill. The amendment speaks for itself, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 21, after the word "representatives", it is proposed to insert "the right."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the RECORD and for future reference, I wish to make a statement on the Morse formula in connection with proposed legislation of this type.

I have studied the bill very carefully; and not only am I satisfied that the so-called Morse formula is not violated by the bill, but I am also satisfied that the bill is very much in the public interest. In fact, I think the people of the Nation are greatly indebted to the State of Florida for the cooperation it has extended, through the expenditure of great sums of money by the State, and also for the development of a very fine combined Federal and State guard military installation. Certainly it is true, and I am sure no one would dispute it, that the existence of the installation is of great economic benefit to the State of Florida. However, in my judgment, that is irrelevant to the problem confronting the Senate; namely, the effort to work out the best possible arrangement between the States and the Federal Government for the defense of the Nation.

As the map shows, here is a great military installation, in connection with which the State of Florida has spent huge sums of money, particularly for the public facilities, including the railroad terminal facilities, all on State so-called guard property; and the installation has served very well both the State and the Federal military organizations.

I wish to state that a study of the record in connection with the application of the Morse formula will show that this case is distinctive, in that a great deal has been done by the State in connection with the State guard installations. When such installations have existed I have made clear time and time again, in speaking on the floor of the Senate, that the Morse formula does not apply, because certainly the people of the United States have received adequate compensation for any Federal interest that may be involved in connection with any conveyance of the Federal property concerned.

In my judgment, as I study the record in this case, there is not a scintilla of evidence to show that any giveaway of Federal property or Federal interest is involved. On the contrary, the case rests on a mutuality of defense interests, in which all of us have a great stake.

I wish to make a brief comment on some of the protections to be found in the bill, and I desire to commend the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Florida for bringing forward a bill so carefully worked out in that connection.

There is to be a reversion to the United States in case of national emergency. Furthermore, the Board, acting for the State of Florida, agrees to use the land for military purposes only, and not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of the land or improvements thereon to any party other than the United States.

In addition, in the event that the State or the Board at any time shall use for other than military purposes or shall sell or convey or otherwise dispose of, or attempt to sell, convey, or dispose of, all or any part of the State or Federal land, all the right, title, and interest in and to the Federal land shall revert to the United States.

The bill contains a mineral reservation. I am glad the Senator from Florida has mentioned the one point which might bother some persons if they did not take sufficient time to study in detail the provisions of the bill; I refer to the failure to include a reservation regarding the use of the timber. However, a study of the bill will show that certainly the Federal public interest has been adequately protected, because although the timber and timber products taken from the land are to go with the land to the State, nevertheless the reservation of protection included in the bill provides that insofar as grants or sales affecting Federal lands are concerned, they shall be entered into only after the State of Florida or the Board and the United States, by and through the Secretary of the Army, have reached an agreement whereby the revenues received by the State of Florida from such lease or sale shall be expended for the management of the natural resources at Camp Blanding and for its maintenance and preservation as a military installation, and providing for the sharing of the residual revenue by the United States and the State. As the Senator from Florida pointed out, the small size of this particular piece of timber property is such that the most economical and efficient use of this piece of property would be to have the State handle the timber resources, but with an agreement between the State and the Federal Government that the returns from the timber resources shall be used for the benefit of the maintenance of the military reservation itself.

Mr. President, I think my time has expired. I ask unanimous consent to continue for half a minute longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say for future reference that, in my judgment the bill meets the principle of the Morse formula, in that the people of the United States are receiving adequate consideration for the transfer. I think it should be particularly stressed that there is not the slightest indication that the taxpayers of the country as a whole are giving away to the people of Florida anything for which the people of Florida have not paid adequate consideration, within the confines of the Morse formula.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I had intended to make a very careful explanation of the bill. However, as I indicated when the bill was called, the Senator from Florida presented such a fine case before the subcommittee at its hearings that I felt he could better explain the bill on the floor. With his explanation we have a record behind the bill which spells itself out completely. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his explanation.

I now send to the desk the explanation which I had intended to make, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

The basic feature of H. R. 7512 is that it authorizes the Secretary of the Army to

convey about 40,000 acres of Federal land to the Armory Board, State of Florida, on the condition that the State of Florida preserve for future military use both the presently owned Federal lands and the State owned lands at Camp Blanding, and also comply with other conditions in the bill.

Before discussing the details of this measure, which passed the House on February 16, 1954, it might be noted that a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services heard extensive testimony on this bill from both the Department of the Army and representatives of the State of Florida. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida also appeared before the subcommittee and was most helpful by his testimony. During my statement I will explain the various amendments which the subcommittee felt greatly strengthened the bill.

The lands described in H. R. 7512 amount to approximately 71,000 acres. Of this acreage approximately 31,000 are owned by the Armory Board, State of Florida, and about 40,000 are owned by the Federal Government. The armory board is a statutory agency of the State of Florida which is charged with the management and ownership of all properties devoted to military purposes. The 71,000 acres described in the bill constitute the present total acreage of the Camp Blanding military reservation. Even though this camp has been deactivated since shortly after World War II, the Department of the Army has a military requirement that both the Federal and State lands be preserved for future mobilization purposes.

It should also be pointed out that more than $2 million of Federal funds have been expended on Blanding since 1951 under the act of September 28, 1951, which authorized the construction of standby facilities at 10 military installations throughout the United States. The outlay at Blanding has been mainly on a railhead facility and certain other utilities. This construction is ample evidence that the Department of the Army hopes to use this installation during times of emergency.

Since 1949 about 27,000 acres of the Federal lands have been under license to the State of Florida.

In order to consolidate the management of both the Federal and State lands, to preserve them for future military use, and at the same time safeguard the interests of the Federal Government, H. R. 7512 would provide as follows:

1. Authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Army Board, State of Florida, the federally owned lands totaling about 40,000 acres, reserving to the United States all fissionable rights in the land pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

2. The conveyance by the Secretary of the Army, however, would be effective only on the following conditions:

(a) That during periods of national emergency the Federal Government will have the right to use both the Federal and State lands.

(b) The armory board will not sell or otherwise dispose of, or use for other than military purposes either the Federal or State lands. In the event that the armory board uses for other military purposes or sells any part of the State or Federal lands, title to the Federal lands will revert to the United States.

I should like to point out that the State of Florida is presently under no legal obligation to make available to the Federal Government during times of emergency the State-owned lands. The State ot Florida, therefore, would be restricting the use of its own lands under the terms of this bill. It might also be pointed out that the State property has been owned by Florida since 1939, and during the war, the Federal Government used this property for nominal cost as a part of the Camp Blanding military reservation.

It can be said that the provisions of the bill that I have so far explained are no different from similar legislation which the Congress this session has enacted. We now have as public laws, H. R. 5632 (Public Law 327) and S. 489 (Public Law 315), which authorized the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of North Carolina and the State of Connecticut certain acreage to be used for military purposes only.

The bill contains a provision with respect to the timber and mineral assets on the Federal land, which differs from previous bills of this type.

There are considerable mineral and timber assets on the Federal lands, as well as the State property. Army testimony indicated that the timber assets on the Federal property have a present value in excess of $1,250,000. It was estimated that there could be an annual cutting of about 1 million board-feet of timber and 12,000 cords of pulpwood, which should produce an annual gross return of from $75,000 to $85,000.

With respect to the mineral assets there is on the Federal lands a concentration of heavy minerals, namely of ilmenite, a titanium ore. It is understood that the major portion of mineral concentrations are on the State-owned property. The armory board has already entered into an agreement with private interests permitting the mining of ilmenite on the State-owned property.

In order to consolidate the management of the timber and mineral interests, the bill provides that the armory board may manage the timber and mineral aspects of the Federal lands. It is further provided, however, that the management of these lands will be carried out only pursuant to an agreement between the Secretary of the Army and the armory board, which agreement must be reached within 9 months after the effective date of this act. It is also provided that the Secretary of the Army, prior to entering into an agreement with the armory board, must come into agreement with the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services. This latter provision was inserted by the Senate subcommittee, and appears to be an adequate safeguard for the protection of the interests of the Federal Government.

Although the terms of management would be provided for in the agreement, testimony before the committee indicated that the plan for management of this entire area would be as follows:

The armory board would maintain separate accounts with respect to the income and expenses for the management of the State and Federal lands. The income from the State lands would be spent on the improvement of the State property. The income from the Federal lands would be used for the improvement of the Federal property and also certain basic facilities on the State lands which are being preserved solely for future Federal use. If there should be any residual revenues from the Federal property, the sharing of such funds would be also subject to the terms of an agreement.

The junior Senator from New Jersey certainly has no doubt that the interests of the Federal Government will be safeguarded since the subcommittee which will approve this agreement is headed by Senator CASE, along with Senator STENNIS and Senator DUFF. This subcommittee, Mr. President, has certainly acted wisely and effectively regarding the real estate transactions which have come before it.

I urge that H. R. 7512 pass the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, several months ago the Acting Governor of the State of Florida sent a telegram to me in which he objected to the bill passing in its then form, under the belief that certain former owners of the land should have some opportunity to recapture it. However, today I am in receipt of a telegram from the Acting Governor in which he states that, after examination, he withdraws any objection he previously had to the bill. I ask to have the telegrams printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *February 22, 1954.*

Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS,
United States Senator:

My attention has been directed to a House bill now before the Senate which would appropriate certain surplus lands in the Camp Blanding tract to the Florida State Armory Board. Many of the original owners of this property feel that they were not adequately paid for their property at the time of its acquisition by the Government and that if it is now deemed surplus that they should have prior rights to repurchase for same consideration which was paid to them at time of acquisition. There appears to be just criticism to any proposal that might authorize a grant of this property to Florida State Armory Board. I am most anxious to secure copy of this measure so that we might study the matter. I hope and trust that it will be possible for you to delay Senate consideration until after we have had an opportunity to confer about this measure. With my kind personal regards.

CHARLIE E. JOHNS,
Acting Governor.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *April 16, 1954.*

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building:

After my examination of the Blanding bill and upon further investigation, I wish to withdraw any objection previously made on this legislation. My kindest personal regards.

CHARLIE E. JOHNS,
Acting Governor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY IN MARION COUNTY, IND.—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 232) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, but I have some objections to the bill in its present form.

This bill involves the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property. The stated purpose is the conveyance of land, fixtures, and improvements for use as a military base by the National Guard. The bill contains most of the reservations which I usually ask for in connection with the transfer of surplus property, but in this particular case there is no reservation of mineral or timber rights, as is usually required. I

therefore send to the desk an amendment which I hope will be accepted, reserving to the Federal Government the mineral rights.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. In view of the fact that it seems that no member of the committee is present, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, so that members of the committee may have an opportunity to examine the amendment just sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed to the foot of the calendar.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF CERTAIN DECEASED CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT

The bill (H. R. 3477) to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF CONDITIONAL GIFTS TO FURTHER THE DEFENSE EFFORT

The bill (S. 3197) to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to further the defense effort of the United States—

(a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept or reject on behalf of the United States any gift of money or other intangible personal property made on condition that it be used for a particular defense purpose; and

(b) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to accept or reject on behalf of the United States any gift of other property, real or personal, made on condition that it be used for a particular defense purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury may convert into money, at the best terms available, any such gift of intangible property other than money; and the Administrator of General Services may convert into money, at the best terms available, any such gift of tangible property, or transfer to any other Federal agency without reimbursement such property as he may determine usable for the particular purpose for which it was donated.

SEC. 3. There shall be established on the books of the Treasury a special account into which shall be deposited all money received as a result of such gifts.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury, in order to effectuate the purposes for which gifts accepted under this act are made, shall from time to time pay the money in such special account to such of the various appropriation accounts as in his judgment will best effectuate the intent of the donors, and such money is hereby appropriated and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of the appropriations to which paid.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services shall consult with interested Federal agencies in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed to modify or repeal the authority to accept conditional gifts under any other provision of law.

INCREASE IN PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 3200) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166, as amended; 5 U. S. C. 836) is amended by striking out "$9" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12."

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask what happened to Calendar No. 1202, Senate bill 3200?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was passed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed are reconsidered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I certainly desire an explanation of the bill. It involves a great deal of money. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, to which bill does the Senator from New Jersey have reference?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I refer to Calendar 1202, Senate bill 3200, a bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses.

Mr. SMATHERS. I was under the impression that the bill had not been passed, but that it had been merely called by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. According to the RECORD, the bill was passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. I join in the request of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill be passed to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed to the foot of the calendar.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF ELECTION UNDER THE UNIFORMED SERVICES CONTINGENCY OPTION ACT OF 1953

The bill (H. R. 8539) to extend the period of election under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 for certain members of the uniformed services was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an explanation of House bill 8539, Calendar 1203, the bill just passed. The statement was prepared by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously reported the pending bill, H. R. 8539, and would point out the need for prompt action on the bill to prevent an April 30 cutoff date from causing hardship to a group of officers on active duty with the Armed Forces.

Last year the so-called Survivor Benefits Act permitted retired military personnel to take a reduced retirement pay and thereby provide an annuity for their surviving dependents. The program is entirely self-financing, and involves no expense to the Government.

One section of the act requires persons on active duty, who have completed 18 years of service, to make an election within 6 months as to whether they wish to participate. The 6 months expires April 30, which explains the urgency of the pending bill.

The services report that officers who now are overseas, or who have been stationed overseas during the past 6 months, have been unable to make the election in the time allowed.

Families are separated. The officers do not have their insurance papers with them at their overseas stations. It is all but impossible for these families to discuss this very vital problem among themselves, or to make any informal appraisal of the matter.

The following quotation from a dispatch from the Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, summarizes the situation pretty well.

"Particularly for officers and men in Far West Pacific units afloat and ashore, personal files and contacts are not available for consultation and use as basis for decision in limited time now available. Example, personnel embarked in ships or ashore where dependents not residing with them would not likely carry their insurance policies with them. Such policies should be reviewed prior to making irrevocable election. Also such personnel will wish to discuss in person or by correspondence with their families the problems involved. Time remaining does not permit this."

The bill therefore proposes to give this group an additional 6 months to make their election in this matter.

The Armed Services Committee feels that the bill is entirely justified, and recommends its enactment.

STUDY OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The resolution (S. Res. 214) providing for a study of technical assistance programs was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, should not the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration under the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 116) to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited was announced as next in order.

Mr. COOPER. I object, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 75) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1954, p. 5084.)

O. E. HAMBLETON AND MRS. HARRIET ELIZABETH HAMBLETON

The bill (S. 1140) for the relief of O. E. Hambleton and Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to O. E. Hambleton, and his wife, Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton, of Seattle, Wash., the sum of $5,552.52, in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the mistreatment of the said Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton during her interrogation by a member of the Criminal Investigation Division of the Army on January 20, 1948, and in compensation for the resulting injuries sustained by the said O. E. Hambleton and Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton, the claimants having no remedy under the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CPL. ROBERT D. McMILLAN

The bill (S. 599) for the relief of Cpl. Robert D. McMillan, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not object to the passage of the bill, but I wish to call attention to one paragraph in the report, which I believe is based on faulty reasoning, and which I hope will not be included in other reports.

The paragraph appears on page 4 of the report. It is the second paragraph. It states:

The claim cannot be settled under the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended, for the reason that the evidence fails to establish definitely that the damage complained of was "caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment," a condition precedent to the maintenance of a claim or suit under that statute.

Of course the clear implication is that under the facts this claim could not have been settled under the Federal Tort Claims Act. Actually the facts show that the damage which is claimed was caused by fire, which, under the evidence, presumably was started by Corporal McMillan. The paragraph gives the impression that under such a state of facts there was no jurisdiction. Actually, the evidence would permit a recovery in this case.

I believe there is a distinct difference between the statement in the report and the facts in this case, and I should not like to see a similar statement included in other reports, in accordance with with which the Department of the Army would merely take the position that, because under the evidence a recovery would not be successful, there is no jurisdiction under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 599) for the relief of Cpl. Robert D. McMillan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", strike out "$2,003.20" and insert "$1,806.72", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cpl. Robert D. McMillan (Army serial No. RA-17053963), the sum of $1,806.72, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damage to or loss or destruction of his personal property in a fire that occurred at the Branch United States Disciplinary Barracks, Milwaukee, Wis., on February 24, 1950; the said claim of Cpl. Robert D. McMillan being a claim that is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EFTYCHIOS MOURGINAKIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 676) for the relief of Eftychios Mourginakis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Eftychios Mourginakis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RITO SOLLA

The bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of Rito Solla was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DARYL L. ROBERTS, ADE E. JASKAR, TERRENCE L. ROBBINS, HARRY JOHNSON, AND FRANK SWANDA

The bill (H. R. 2018) for the relief of Daryl L. Roberts, Ade E. Jaskar, Terrence L. Robbins, Harry Johnson, and Frank Swanda was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETRA FUMIA

The bill (H. R. 3836) for the relief of Petra Fumia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEE SUI SHEE

The bill (H. R. 4099) for the relief of Lee Sui Shee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FILING OF CLAIMS UNDER THE WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6896) to extend the period for the filing of certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948 by World War II prisoners of war, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, page 1, after the word "before", strike out "November" and insert "August."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MARTHA SCHNAUFFER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3876) for the relief of Martha Schnauffer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martha Schnauffer may be

admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Martha Schnauffer Schockley."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2802) to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2650) to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

The bill (S. 1878) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this bill, as reported, would amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, by setting a single standard of valuations for losses under war-risk insurance and requisition transactions. Present law uses different terminology for those two types of losses with resultant confusion and uncertainty. The pending bill would also provide for a review de novo by the courts in all cases where the valuation set by the Secretary of Commerce would be rejected by the owners or insured.

SECTION 1

The first section of S. 1878, as reported by your committee, has the effect of removing the terminology in existing law which sets up a confusing double standard of valuations in war-risk insurance transactions as distinguished from valuations pertaining to requisitions. It would do this by repealing from the present law—section 1209 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936—the words "but with respect to any vessel which is insured under the provisions of this act, the amount of the claim adjusted, compromised, settled, adjudged or paid shall not exceed the vessel's fair and reasonable value as determined by the Federal Maritime Board."

This section then makes the single standard of valuation in section 902 of the act apply to insurance transactions and grants a right to the insured to reject the valuation, accept 75 percent of it and sue in the courts for the difference between 75 percent of the valuation offered him by the Secretary of Commerce and the amount the insured believes is the true valuation under section 902. If the court finds that in accepting the 75 percent payment, the insured has already been overpaid, he must refund the excess over the proper valuation as found by the court to be due under section 902. Now that a single standard of valuation is contained in this bill and that the insured is granted a right of review by the courts, it becomes necessary to make clear that the reference in several appropriation acts—to the effect that the valuation in war-risk-insurance transactions is to be the same as under 902 (a) as interpreted by the General Accounting Office and that otherwise the money is not to be used to pay such valuations—does not apply to court judgments which are usually paid through specific appropriations. Accordingly this appropriation rider is declared inapplicable to court judgments. Premiums under policies issued are adjusted on the basis of the valuation as finally determined and of the rate provided for in the policies.

SECTION 2

Section 2 of the bill, as reported, makes minor adjustments in section 902 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to remove a doubt which exists under present law whether the Government could recover the excess, in a requistion case, in the event that the court found that the 75 percent initial payment by the Secretary of Commerce on a rejected valuation exceeded the just compensation proved in section 902. The pending bill would clearly allow the Government to recover the excess in the payment.

SECTION 3

Section 3 of the pending bill would amend the first sentence of section 902 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, by making the same provision for court review and recovery of excess payments applicable generally in all cases where just compensation is authorized by section 902.

SECTION 4

All war-risk insurance now extant is amended in conformity with section 1209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by this bill, unless the insured, within 10 days after enactment of this act, objects to such amendment.

A full explanation of these provisions is submitted in the committee report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1878) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1209 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1289 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) The Secretary, in the administration of this title, may issue such policies, rules, and regulations as he deems proper and may adjust and pay losses, compromise and settle claims, whether in favor of or against the United States and pay the amount of any judgment rendered against the United States in any suit, or the amount of any settlement agreed upon, in respect of any claim under insurance authorized by this title.

"(2) In respect of hull insurance, the valuation in the policy for actual or constructive total loss of the vessel insured shall not exceed the amount that would be payable if the vessel had been requisitioned for title under section 902 at the time of the attachment of the insurance under said policy: *Provided, however*, That the insured shall have the right within 60 days after the attachment of the insurance under said policy, or within 60 days after determination of such valuation by the Secretary, whichever is later, to reject such valuation, but shall continue to pay premiums upon such valuation at the rate provided for in said policy. In the event of the actual or constructive total loss of the vessel, if the insured has so rejected such valuation, the insured shall be paid, as a tentative advance only, 75 percent of such valuation so determined by the Secretary and shall be entitled to sue the United States in a court having jurisdiction of such claims to recover such valuation as would be equal to the just compensation which such court determines would have been payable if the vessel had been requisitioned for title under section 902 at the time of the attachment of the insurance under said policy: *Provided, however*, That in the event of an election by the insured to reject the valuation fixed by the Secretary and to sue in the courts, the amount of the judgment will be payable without regard to the limitations contained in the 11th paragraph under the heading 'Maritime Activities' in title III of the Department of Justice, State, and Commerce Appropriation Act, 1954, the 10th paragraph under the heading 'Operating Differential Subsidies' in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, the corresponding paragraphs of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, although the excess of any amounts advanced on account of just compensation over the amount of the court judgment will be required to be refunded. In the event of such court determination, premiums under the policy shall be adjusted on the basis of the valuation as finally determined and of the rate provided for in said policy."

SEC. 2. Section 902 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1242 (c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) If any property is taken and used under authority of this section, but the ownership thereof is not required by the United States, the Commission, at the time of the taking or as soon thereafter as the exigencies of the situation may permit, shall transmit to the person entitled to the possession of such property a charter setting forth the terms which, in the Commission's judgment, should govern the relationships between the United States and such person and a statement of the rate of hire which, in the Commission's judgment, will be just compensation for the use of such property and for the services required under the terms of such charter. If such person does not execute and deliver such charter and accept such rate of hire, the Commission shall pay

to such person as a tentative advance only, on account of such just compensation a sum equal to 75 percent of such rate of hire as the same may from time to time be due under the terms of the charter so tendered, and such person shall be entitled to sue the United States in a court having jurisdiction of such claims to recover such amount as would be equal to just compensation for the use of the property and for the services required in connection with such use: *Provided, however,* That in the event of an election by such person to reject the rate of hire fixed by the Commission and to sue in the courts, the excess of any amounts advanced on account of just compensation over the amount of the court judgment will be required to be refunded. In the event of loss or damage to such property, due to operation of a risk assumed by the United States under the terms of a charter prescribed in this subsection, but no valuation of such vessel or other property or mode of compensation has been agreed to, the United States shall pay just compensation for such loss or damage, to the extent the person entitled thereto is not reimbursed therefor through policies of insurance against such loss or damage."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 902 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1242 (d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) In all cases, the just compensation authorized by this section shall be determined and paid by the Commission as soon as practicable, but if the amount of just compensation determined by the Commission is unsatisfactory to the person entitled thereto, such person shall be paid, as a tentative advance only, 75 percent of the amount so determined and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such amount as would equal just compensation therefor, in the manner provided for by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 28, secs. 41 (20) and 250): *Provided, however,* That in the event of an election to reject the amount determined by the Commission and to sue in the courts, the excess of any amounts advanced on account of just compensation over the amount of the court judgment will be required to be refunded."

SEC. 4. All war-risk insurance issued under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which is in force on the date of the enactment of this act shall, as of the beginning of such date, be deemed to have been amended to conform to the requirements of section 1209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by this act unless the insured, within 10 days after such date, objects to such amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SHIP MORTGAGE ACT OF 1920

The bill (S. 2407) to amend the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this bill would amend the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1003) by adding a new provision to section 30, subsection K. This bill would extend the jurisdiction of the United States district courts, sitting in admiralty, to permit the holders of mortgages on foreign ships to bring foreclosure proceedings in those courts.

Under the law as it now stands, the holders of mortgages on United States-flag vessels may use the Federal admiralty courts for foreclosure purposes. However, the holders of mortgages on foreign vessels are required to bring foreclosure proceedings in equity courts, a much more cumbersome and drawn out matter which unlike admiralty court foreclosures does not assure the purchaser at the foreclosure sale that he will obtain title good against the rest of the world. The United States holds over $1 million worth of mortgages on vessels registered under foreign flags.

There was no opposition to this bill. The United States Maritime Law Association, the American Bar Association, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Justice favored its enactment. The Department of State has stated that it has no objection to this bill.

After public hearing, the committee adopted an amendment to S. 2407 as proposed. That amendment was suggested by the Department of Commerce and acquiesced in by the other proponents. The effect of the amendment is to subordinate the preferred mortgage lien of a foreign ship mortgagee to maritime liens for repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, or other necessaries, performed or supplied in the United States. This amendment was proposed in order to avoid any opposition which might have otherwise arisen from shipbuilders, ship suppliers and the like here in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2407) to amend the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, on page 2, line 14, after the word "other", strike out "necessaries" and insert "necessaries, performed or supplied in the United States," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 30, subsection K, of the act of June 5, 1920, as amended, known as the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920 (41 Stat. 1003), is hereby amended by adding at the end of subsection K the following provision:

"Foreign ship mortgages: As used in subsections K, L, M, and N of this section, the term 'preferred mortgage' shall include, in addition to a preferred mortgage made pursuant to the provisions of this section, any mortgage, hypothecation, or similar charge created as security upon any documented foreign vessel (other than a towboat, barge, scow, lighter, car float, canal boat, or tank vessel, of less than 200 gross tons) if such mortgage, hypothecation, or similar charge has been duly and validly executed in accordance with the laws of the foreign nation under the laws of which the vessel is documented and has been duly registered in accordance with such laws in a public register either at the port of registry of the vessel or at a central office; and the term 'preferred mortgage lien' shall also include the lien of such mortgage, hypothecation, or similar charge: *Provided, however,* That such 'preferred mortgage lien' in the case of a foreign vessel shall also be subordinate to maritime liens for repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry-dock or marine railway, or other necessaries, performed or supplied in the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4153 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

The bill (S. 2814) to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this is a thoroughly noncontroversial bill. It was requested by the Treasury Department, with the Department of Commerce supporting the bill completely. It is a highly technical bill.

The basis of the proposed change is to remove certain penalties hitherto applying against ships with small engineroom space. Under present law, unless such engineroom space is above 13 percent of gross tonnage, the deduction for nonrevenue producing tonnage from the gross tonnage of vessels is considerably less than for vessels with larger engineroom space. This is costly, as port charges and taxes are levied on basis of net tonnage.

S. 2814 applied to all crafts documented as United States-flag vessels, and to certain foreign ships.

There is a question of revenue involved, inasmuch as every vessel, United States and foreign, pays a tonnage tax on entry into United States from a foreign port—2 cents per ton if from a Western Hemisphere port adjacent to the United States, and 6 cents per net ton from other foreign parts—but not more than five times in a year.

United States vessels pay port charges in foreign ports, much higher than here, which makes doubly important the proposed more liberal deductions from gross tonnage under this bill.

The net effect on tonnage tax collection by United States will be negligible if this law is enacted, because ships have been constructed to take advantage of maximum tonnage allowances. The purpose, and the effect of the bill if enacted, will be to remove the restrictions on vessel design, so that advantage can be taken of new propelling machinery and enginerooms designed with safety and seaworthiness the prime objectives, rather than mere size of engineroom.

The Treasury Department suggests this as an interim system. Negotiations have been under way with Great Britain for a general revision of the admeasurement system, and a bill similar to S. 2814 is now before Parliament. Other maritime nations are expected to follow suit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2814) to amend section 4153 of the Revised

Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, line 6, after the word "this", strike out "act" and insert "proviso", and on page 3, line 4, after the word "this", strike out "act" and insert "proviso", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (f) of section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 46, sec. 77 (f)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(f) In the case of a vessel which is screw propelled in whole or in part, the following deduction shall be made for the space occupied by the propelling machinery:

"(1) Thirty-two thirteenths times the tonnage of the propelling-machinery space, if the tonnage of that space is not more than 13 percent of the gross tonnage of the vessel and if that space is reasonable in extent: *Provided, however*, That, in lieu thereof, the deduction shall be one and three-fourths times the tonnage of the propelling-machinery space, in the case of a vessel the construction of which was commenced on or before the date of enactment of this proviso, if the owner so elects;

"(2) Thirty-two percent of the gross tonnage of the vessel, if the tonnage of the propelling-machinery space is more than 13 percent and less than 20 percent of the gross tonnage of the vessel; or

"(3) Thirty-two percent of the gross tonnage of the vessel or one and three-fourths times the tonnage of the propelling-machinery space, whichever the owner of the vessel elects, if the tonnage of that space is 20 percent or more of the gross tonnage of the vessel."

SEC. 2. Subdivision (g) of section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 46, sec. 77 (g)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(g) In the case of a vessel which is propelled in whole or in part by paddle wheels, the following deduction shall be made for the space occupied by the propelling machinery:

"(1) Thirty-seven twentieths times the tonnage of the propelling-machinery space, if the tonnage of that space is not more than 20 percent of the gross tonnage of the vessel and if that space is reasonable in extent: *Provided, however*, That, in lieu thereof, the deduction shall be one and one-half times the tonnage of the propelling-machinery space, in the case of a vessel the construction of which was commenced on or before the date of enactment of this proviso, if the owner so elects;

"(2) Thirty-seven percent of the gross tonnage of the vessel, if the tonnage of the propelling-machinery space is more than 20 percent and less than 30 percent of the gross tonnage of the vessel; or

"(3) Thirty-seven percent of the gross tonnage of the vessel or one and one-half times the tonnage of the propelling-machinery space, whichever the owner elects, if the tonnage of that space is 30 percent or more of the gross tonnage of the vessel."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIMITATION OF OFFICERS IN ARMED SERVICES

The bill (H. R. 7103) to establish limitations on the number of officers who may serve in various commissioned grades in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we may have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should be very glad to give an explanation of the bill.

First, the enactment of the bill will not result in any additional expenditure of funds.

Second, it will provide a better method of congressional control over the military structure which has long been needed.

Mr. President, under the present situation, the officers in any grade are limited by numbers. The Senate Armed Services Committee, through a subcommittee under the distinguished leadership of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], went into the subject with a great deal of care and established certain numerical limitations on the numbers of officers in the various services. More recently, the House committee studied the question for 6 months to try to work out a percentage basis rather than a flat numerical basis. If the distinguished Senator from Florida will turn to the act, which is the last act in this book [indicating], he will see that the officer strength in the five top grades in the various services is fixed in comparison with the total officer strength. The bill does not propose to try to fix the officer strength in comparison with the enlisted men strength. That, perhaps, theoretically, would be the best way of doing it. But the bill fixes the officer strength in proportion to the various grades of officers and the number in those grades.

In addition to that, the armed services, at the first of each year, not later than January 31, will give to the Congress the numerical list of officers the armed services expect to have in that fiscal year. In that way the nominations for promotions which come before the Senate will be considered by a more orderly method than has been followed in the past, since we shall know the number of officers in the various grades.

The bill applies to the Regular forces as well as to the active Reserves. The purpose is to control temporary promotions. We now act on the basis of the number of generals, the number of colonels, and so forth. The bill would permit promotions on a percentage basis rather than on a flat scale. It would give specific and realistic numerical control over the promotions in all the services.

The bill would also repeal the so-called Van Zandt amendment to the act limiting voluntary retirement.

In the past few years we have had difficulty with the so-called Davis amendment which, instead of starting promotions at the top, prevented a great many of general officers from receiving legitimate promotions. We ran into a great deal of difficulty. The purpose of this bill is to eliminate those difficulties and place the promotions on a sliding scale, and notice will be given to the Congress as to what is intended during the year.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the bill, then, intend that, based on the number of men in any particular branch of the service, there shall be a certain percentage of officers in relation to the number of men?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It does not do that. As I stated, that is theoretically the perfect method of handling it. The bill undertakes to make the basis the total number of officers. For instance, the number of generals is seventy-five one hundredths of 1 percent of the officers, and the bill attempts in that way to limit the number of officers and the number who can be in any 1 grade of the top 5 grades.

Mr. SMATHERS. There are certain percentages worked out for the grades of general, lieutenant general, colonel, and so on down. Is that correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill provides a sliding scale of definite numbers based on percentage.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does it mean that there will be fewer generals and fewer high-ranking officers, and perhaps more officers with field rank than there have been?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think there will be any great change in the number of general officers and the number of colonels. The number will be down rather than up, I hope. It means the proportion of generals to the proportion of other officers will be on a sliding scale. If it is determined that the whole number shall be reduced, the number of generals and colonels will be reduced.

I believe, Mr. President, it is a good bill. It is not a perfect bill, but it is a step in the right direction. The senior minority member of the committee [Mr. RUSSELL] approved of the bill. My colleague, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], will agree with me that it is a good bill but not a perfect one. It is a step in the right direction, as I have said.

PROPORTION OF OFFICERS ON PROPORTIONAL BASIS

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Might not the Senator's bill work in reverse? They might promote more generals in order to promote more officers of junior rank.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I correctly understand the Senator's question, the bill does not apply to Reserve officers unless they are in active service.

Mr. MALONE. But do we not have a National Guard built up with officers who are in the service on full time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Reserve officers' promotions are separate.

Mr. MALONE. If it was desired to have more officers of a lower grade it would be necessary to make more generals in order to keep the proper proportion, according to the terms of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On January 31, of each year, the Department of Defense will send to the Congress a list of what

it believes will be the proportion of officers during the next year. That is on the basis of the proportion shown in the bill. So many officers will constitute a certain number of generals, a certain number of colonels, a certain number of lieutenant colonels, and a certain number of majors. For instance, with an officer strength of 50,000 in the Army, there would be 350 generals, 3,352 colonels, 6,940 lieutenant colonels, and 9,350 majors.

Mr. MALONE. I have no intention of objecting to the bill; I merely desired to understand it. My suspicion is confirmed that in order to have more officers of lesser rank, more generals would have to be appointed. In other words, the point is being reached where there will be more chiefs and less Indians.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would answer the Senator's statement by saying that that is not so.

Mr. MALONE. If the number of officers are not limited except in proportion to the generals—and the number of generals are not limited, just what does the bill accomplish?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Massachusetts that his 5 minutes under the rule have expired.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts may be granted an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MALONE. My question has not been answered. The question is, Cannot more junior officers be appointed through the simple procedure of recommending that more generals be appointed, which officers are not limited?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that the bill controls the top five grades; it does not control grades below the rank of major.

Mr. MALONE. What are the top grades and what are the lower grades in relation to such promotions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The lowest grade is that of major.

Mr. MALONE. A major's duties have always been somewhat of a mystery?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Lieutenants and captains would not come within the quotas contained in the bill. In other words, as I understand—and I believe my understanding is correct—the bill in itself would not place a limitation upon the number of lieutenants and captains who could be promoted; it would place limitations on the number of majors and those of ranks higher than that of major.

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that I have no objection even to a limited number of promotions of majors. But without doubt the approval of promotions of officers is one of the things that the Senate knows least about. This bill does not seem to add much to the information.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that I think the Committee on Armed Services does go into the question of proportions. What has been done in the past has been to bring the number of general officers within the so-called Senate formula. The Senate formula actually provides for fewer officers in the top grades than does the formula contained in the statute. All promotions in the past 2 or 3 years, to my knowledge, have been kept within the so-called Senate formula. The Senate formula is based upon numbers; the statutory formula is based upon proportions or percentages.

We believe the bill is fairer to the officers and fairer to Congress because it provides better opportunity for officers to advance.

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that any additional information on this subject will be helpful to the Senate.

I do not object to the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand, the bill does not affect Reserve officers at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It does not affect Reserve officers unless they are on active duty. If they are on active duty, and are above the rank of major, and up to the rank of general, it does affect them, because they are officers of the armed service.

Mr. SMATHERS. I take it the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is aware of the fact that today most Reserve officers complain that they are being made subject to discrimination in the matter of promotions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is no question about that. I have heard that statement. I only hope it is not so well-founded as some persons who have not been promoted would seem to indicate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the able chairman of the committee can give assurance to Reserve officers that the Committee on Armed Services intends to investigate the matter, so as to make certain that Reserve officers can obtain a basis of promotion which is fair, equitable, and as generous to them as it is in the case of the promotion of Regular officers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The committee will begin hearings on such a bill on Thursday next. An attempt will be made to draft and submit as fair a bill as possible. I think the two big problems still remaining for the Committee on Armed Services this year are, first, to devise a program of Reserve training, with respect to which the committee is endeavoring to stimulate the Department of Defense into submitting recommendations; and second, to prepare a plan for the promotion of Reserve officers.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am certain the chairman of the committee recognizes that the Reserves are the basis of our defense. Actually, they are the foundation of our defense. If men are to be kept active in the Reserves, it is necessary to give them an equal opportunity for promotion with the members of the Regular Army.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7103) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY IN MARION COUNTY, IND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the regular call of the calendar. Order No. 1197, H. R. 232, is now to be considered.

The bill (H. R. 232) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POTTER. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] proposes to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. POTTER. I will accept the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I do not object to the consideration of the bill. My amendment simply provides for the reservation of Federal mineral rights. It is a common reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be considered, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

(4) All minerals rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act and described in subsections (1) and (2) of section (1) shall be reserved to the United States.

Mr. MORSE. For many years I was a member of the Committee on Armed Services. The amendment I have offered was a common reservation, which was included in the transfer or conveyance of military land. I find it difficult to believe that the committee which has jurisdiction of the bill would wish to depart from a policy which, to my knowledge, has been followed by the Committee on Armed Services in a great many cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INCREASED MAXIMUM PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES

The bill (S. 3200) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maxi-

mum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, I hope there may be an explanation of the bill. The measure is a very important and very costly one.

Mr. POTTER. The purpose of the bill is to permit the heads of departments and agencies, who authorize the performance of official travel, to increase the per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence from the present maximum of $9 to a maximum of $12 a day, in those instances where such amount is needed to defray the normal living expenses of Government employees performing travel on official business and away from their designated posts of duty.

The committee which considered the bill realized that in certain sections of the country $9 a day would be adequate. However, it is known that for a person in the employ of the Government who has to travel to New York, Detroit, Chicago, or other large metropolitan centers, it is impossible to live upon $9 a day.

The bill allows discretionary power to be placed in the hands of the Administrator to determine when official travel will cost more than $9 a day. There is nothing mandatory about the proposed legislation. It provides that discretionary power shall reside in the administrative officer who authorizes the travel.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Can the Senator from Michigan give an estimate of the cost of the proposed legislation?

Mr. POTTER. The Bureau of the Budget has informed the committee that it is most difficult to determine what the cost would be. There has been a suggestion that the cost would be $30 million. I am convinced that the cost would not be that much. We sincerely hope and believe that the administrative agencies will use great discretion in permitting this allowance. But it is unfair to Government employees who are engaged on official business to be forced to pay out of their own salaries their living expenses when they are required to travel to New York, Boston, or to other places where it is impossible to live on the $9 a day which is now allowed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I take it that the distinguished Senator from Michigan does not believe that the cost would be $30 million?

Mr. POTTER. No, I am convinced that it would not be that much.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. How much does the Senator feel would be the cost?

Mr. POTTER. The Senator's guess is as good as mine. The Bureau of the Budget stated it is difficult to ascertain, with any degree of accuracy, how much it will cost. Certainly the maximum will be $30 million. I am thoroughly convinced it will be far, far less than that amount if the act is administered judiciously.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the Senator understand the cost will be between $20 million and $30 million?

Mr. POTTER. I would not want to set the minimum at $20 million. I hope it will be less than that.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the Senator think this is the kind of legislation which should be passed on the call of the calendar?

Mr. POTTER. I do; absolutely.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the pending bill increase the travel allowance for judges, or are the allowances for judges excluded from the operation of the bill?

Mr. POTTER. Travel allowances for judges are excluded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator considered the fact that the travel allowance for judges is only $10 a day?

Mr. POTTER. I believe the travel allowance for judges is $15.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know that in the past bills have been introduced to increase such travel allowance to $15. I have held up such bills by individual objection. However, travel allowances for civil-service employees of the Government are proposed to be increased now to $12. It would be manifestly improper to keep travel allowances for judges at the rate of $10 a day, if that is the provision of the law which now prevails.

Mr. POTTER. It was my understanding that in 1940 the travel allowance for judges was $10 a day, and that in 1953, by Public Law 222, such allowance was increased to $15.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That must have happened when I was not present on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3200) was considered, ordered to be engrossed, a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166, as amended; 5 U. S. C. 836) is amended by striking out "$9" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12."

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with a bill which was just passed on the call of the calendar, Calendar No. 1202, Senate bill 3200, I am amazed, when I read the bill, to discover that the travel allowance for civilian employees and heads of departments is proposed to be increased. In other words, a man working for a committee would get under the bill a travel allowance of $12 a day, but a Senator who is a member of the committee would get only $9. It does not make any sense to me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered and that the bill go over for a week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question?

Mr. LANGER. I will state it again. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Calendar No. 1202, Senate bill 3200, was passed, be reconsidered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, that is a proper request, and there is no objection.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I understand that completes the call of the calendar.

I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business. I shall then ask unanimous consent that when the Senate recesses today, it do so until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

I understand there will then be several speeches to be made, but, under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, there will be no further business of the Senate.

I therefore ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6342) to amend the Public Building Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings thereon by executing purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Did I correctly understand the announcement of the majority leader the other day with regard to certain other bills to be that such bills would not be considered until the Senate disposes of the lease-purchase bill tomorrow?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. There is a unanimous-consent agreement on the lease-purchase bill. When consideration of the bill is completed certain other bills will be called up.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EFFECT OF OIL IMPORTS ON PRODUCTION OF COAL AND OTHER FUELS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on March 31, 1954, I discussed the distress of the coal industry and the injury inflicted upon it by heavy imports of petroleum and residual oil from Venezuela and other foreign areas.

I also reported on appeals made to the State Department by representatives of the coal and other industries

during 1953, and the State Department's cool reception to these appeals, in which the welfare and interest of our coal mining and other industries were ignored.

In the same address which I made on the floor of the Senate I listed 30 distressed areas in 9 States in which coal mining is the dominant and major source of employment and livelihood for thousands of families. Since the address was made, the United Mine Workers Journal has disclosed correspondence with the State Department subsequent to the correspondence which I referred to on March 31, 1954.

EQUAL ACCESS TO AMERICAN MARKETS

Mr. President, no objections have ever been voiced to imports of petroleum fuels, residual oil, and other materials, on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. The objection is to imports of petroleum fuels, residual oil, and other products without a duty as the Constitution calls for a tax on imports making up the difference in wages, taxes, and other factors of cost of production between this country and in the chief competitive nation. There has been no objection to giving foreign producers equal access to our markets, but no advantage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "State Department Brushes Off Coal Protests, Yet Defends Job-Destroying Oil Imports," appearing in the United Mine Workers Journal of April 1, 1954, which outlines the correspondence with the State Department on this important subject as it relates to oil.

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

STATE DEPARTMENT BRUSHES OFF COAL PROTESTS YET DEFENDS JOB-DESTROYING OIL IMPORTS

Indifference amounting to almost total neglect of the interests of the vital domestic coal industry, while at the same time a tender regard is maintained for the welfare of a dictatorship nation (Venezuela), has again been demonstrated as the policy of the United States Department of State in relation to the serious question of residual-oil imports which in recent years have cut deeply into the coal industry's market, especially on the United States east coast.

Aroused by growing unemployment in the coal industry and total losses aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars to coal and railroad management and labor, scores of Members of Congress from the coal States have written vehement protests to the State Department against its current policy of opposing any effort to place restrictions on the flood of residual oil pouring into east-coast ports.

The response from the State Department has been mostly in the nature of a brush-off by the cookie-pusher brigade of Foggy Bottom (the local name for the section where the State Department is located), who have at times sought to defend their position with distorted figures and outright falsifying statements as to the economic consequences of their America-last policy.

HARDSHIP FOR KENTUCKY MINERS

In a recent letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Representative CARL D. PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky, told of the impact on the mines and miners in the eastern Kentucky region he represents due to the loss of markets for coal because of the cheap residual fuel which has been substituted for coal in its traditional market. The Perkins letter was but one of many which he and other Congressmen have addressed to Secretary Dulles without yet obtaining any constructive action to protect the coal industry from this type of unfair competition.

Supplementing his protest on the residual situation, PERKINS also urged that Secretary Dulles, in negotiating trade policies, make some effort to regain our foreign markets for coal. He pointed out that Congress, on the recommendation of the State Department, has voted billions of aid for Europe, yet its doors are closed by restrictions on American coal.

Specifically, PERKINS referred to West Germany which has limited United States coal imports by a permit system, although United States coal could be delivered there as cheaply as Europe is now buying coal from Iron Curtain countries such as Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

Emphasizing the need of developing coal markets both abroad and at home, PERKINS said:

"Foreign markets will go a long way in bringing relief to the coal industry in America, and especially to the distressed coal area in eastern Kentucky. Thousands of coal miners and their families are being fed daily by our own Government in the coal mining area that I represent in eastern Kentucky. This is also true in the State of West Virginia. The plight of the coal industry has reached such a depressed stage that some affirmative action must be taken by our Government. There could be no greater stimulant for the industry than some action on your part to improve foreign markets."

Wholly ignoring PERKINS' plea for action on the question of exports of coal to Europe, the State Department in reply, over the signature of Assistant Secretary Thruston B. Morton, forwarded some mimeographed material which attempted to justify the Department's economy-crippling policy by stating that restrictions on residual oil would be detrimental to our foreign relations; the Department's statement completely overlooked the well-known fact that Venezuela is a military dictatorship which has suppressed free trade unions, the press, and the opposition.

Yet, the Department believes it is important to assist this kind of government to maintain itself in power even at the expense of severe economic losses to our home industries and the potential destruction of a large segment of our coal industry which is so vital to national defense.

In the mimeographed material of the State Department, the amazing statement is made that imports of residual oil displace only 8.8 million tons of coal per year although it is admitted that the equivalent of 32 million tons are being dumped on our shores each year. Only by a fantastic process of mental acrobatics do they arrive at the conclusion that the equivalent of 32 million tons represented by oil imports is of little or no consequence to the coal industry. The same statement also attempts to minimize the increase in residual fuel imports although admitting that it increased from 100,000 barrels per day in 1944 to 373,000 barrels per day in 1953, a 273-percent increase for that period.

The State Department also indulged in some strange economic reasoning when it cited declines in coal consumption by railroads, retail yards, and exporters, and then cites the current business decline as another factor in decreased sale of coal. Just how these economic factors, which would prevail whether or not residual fuel was being admitted to this Nation, excuse the excess dumping of the waste fuel at suicidal prices is not explained.

In other words, the Department of State, in effect, is saying that because coal has suffered some loss in markets due to other causes not easily controlled it should not complain about losses due to residual fuel which could be easily controlled. Obviously, while coal has suffered some losses from these other factors, the total situation would not be nearly so serious if it were not for the residual oil which further slashes into coal's market.

Another factor which the State Department lightly passes over in its mimeographed sheets is that of prices, and it ignores the well-known practice of the oil industry of pricing residual fuel oil below the price of crude oil and coal. In the 4-year period when residual imports were rising by leaps and bounds from 45 million barrels in 1946 to almost 140 million in 1953, the price of residual kept dropping because of the surplus this excess dumping forced onto the market.

The story of how residual set out to capture coal's market in New England utilities illustrated most graphically one unethical method of oil company operations. Prices were suddenly slashed in mid-1952 and early 1953 by 45 cents a barrel which resulted in a great increase in residual imports. It is notorious that the oil companies can afford to sell residual at little or no profit because the big money is in refined oil.

Residual oil imports on the east coast have continued to rise even though the total energy demand has decreased, to the extent that coal is being driven off the market. It is impossible for coal or any other domestic fuel to compete with residual under the present unlimited import and cutthroat price policies. As against the erratic prices of foreign oil, coal prices are relatively stabilized, and are under intense competitive pressure.

Contrary to the State Department's argument that most residual does not compete with coal, the facts are that residual imports directly supplant coal. Substantial losses have been traced to the switch of manufacturing plants from coal to this waste oil, and the rise in sales of residual fuel in New England were closely paralleled by a decline in the sale of bituminous coal.

Meanwhile, the Foreign Oil Policy Committee, with which the UMWA is affiliated, carried the battle against importation of ruinous residual (waste) oil to cities throughout the eastern and midwestern parts of the country. In a series of regional meetings participated in by district presidents, international board members and other representatives of the UMWA, the FOPC laid the groundwork for stepped-up legislative activity to convince members of the 83d Congress of the justice of the demand for quota restrictions on the cheap waste product that has created widespread unemployment throughout the coal-producing regions in both the mining and railroad industries.

Cooperating in the campaign against residual oil imports are the UMWA, the National Coal Association, the American Coal Sales Association, and representatives of the railroads, railroad brotherhoods, and independent oil producers.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, while the United Mine Workers Journal confines its discussion to imports of oil as it affects the coal industry, the facts are, as outlined in the remarks made by the junior Senator from Nevada on the floor of the Senate on March 31, such imports included perhaps 500 products of sweatshop labor, and vitally affect such products as motorcycles, electrical equipment, crockery, machine tools, watches, minerals, sewing machines, and hundreds of other products which are produced by small businesses in this Nation, the failure of which businesses would contribute to unemployment and the reduction of the tax income of the Nation.

MEETING THE THREAT IN INDOCHINA

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, while many of us have been concerned with real and alleged cases of disloyalty within our country, the Soviet Government and its associated Communist powers have been moving steadily toward their announced objective, which is the conquering of the world for communism. This should be obvious; yet it seems necessary again to point out the truth that we can be 100 percent successful in repressing communism in America without stopping the onward march of that movement in the world as a whole. The end result and purpose of the Soviet power is to capture and enslave all of Europe, Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the islands of the sea, leaving us surrounded and helpless, so far as travel and communication with the rest of the world are concerned.

The latest step in that relentless march is the threatened breakdown of French resistance in Indochina, leaving, as the next steps, further advances in southeastern Asia.

Before we can cope with this continuing problem, it is well for us to remind ourselves that we have lessons to learn. One of the most important of the lessons we have not yet learned is that the end of fighting is not peace.

It was we, ourselves, the American people, who insisted that our soldiers be brought home from the war in Europe just as fast as transports could be loaded and set sail for our shores. How much wiser it would have been to have kept substantial forces in Germany and Austria until agreements that were to the benefit of the peoples of central Europe could have been worked out. Instead of that, by our hasty retreat we left them helpless to surrender and enslavement. Eastern Germany might have been saved. Such citizens of Czechoslovakia as were inclined toward the Soviet power by their fear of Germany, could have looked west, instead of east; and the enslavement of the Czechoslovakian people could have been prevented.

The next item on the list of failures is to be attributed, not to our own people, but to the shortsightedness of the United Nations, strongly supported by our own State Department. General Van Fleet had the Chinese Communist armies defeated, out of ammunition, and in disorderly retreat. Korea up to the narrow waist, could have been saved for the Koreans. Our own influence and reputation in Asia could have become strongly positive, instead of highly dubious. We would have been in a position to negotiate a peace for the people of China and the people of Korea. Yet General Van Fleet was forbidden to achieve victory.

What we finally accepted was a barren truce; and here, again, as a people we were all too credulous in our joy at the signing of that truce. It would mean an end to active fighting which might better have ended with a Van Fleet victory. But it solved nothing. It left us with all of our troubles in that troubled area intact. Again we had an experience with an end of fighting which is not a peace, and which, in fact, by enabling Communist China to entrench in Korea and by convincing the Communist rulers that we were not really serious in our resistance, made it possible for the efforts of the Communists to be shifted toward the south, where the free world is again facing their strength in Indochina.

Now the Soviet Government, through its spokesmen, is again suggesting the same kind of so-called peace in the south that it achieved in Korea.

The first thing that needs to be done is to state to the world the purposes of America. This can be done by our President and by our Secretary of State. We may hope that those purposes are as follows:

It is our purpose to stop the conquering advance of communism over the globe.

We propose to do this to help people, not to support a simple contest of power between two great powers. Wherever nations have been subdued to Communist power, the people have been enslaved, the promised improvement in their living conditions has turned out to be false, and they have been treated, not as living souls, but as human chattels, like the beasts of the field.

These purposes we must explain to the world, but particularly to the people and Government of France, so that a confidence in our purposes may be enkindled where it does not now exist.

Since this conflict is fundamentally one in the aid of people, it is of the deepest importance that we come to understandings with the people. To sign agreements with rulers is not enough. Ultimately the people rule.

We have particular evidence of this in Indochina. The people are quite unconvinced of any real desire or purpose on the part of the French Government to give them liberty. Indochina is an area of jungle, whether the water jungles of the Red River Valley or the mountain jungles of Dien Bien Phu. It is impossible to win in a war in such territory if the people are opposed, or even if they hold themselves neutral. Only active assistance from the people will permit a victory. Lacking that, France has been unable to win. Lacking that, it would be impossible for us to win, even with an effort as massive as the one we made in Korea.

It is the function of our administration, and particularly of our President and Secretary of State, to make clear and to demonstrate that our interest is in the people of Vietnam and Viet Minh. It must be clear that it extends to protection against invasion of Laos and Cambodia, and that, according to our understanding, the peoples of these countries are primarily seeking freedom.

Furthermore these purposes must be made clear to the neighboring countries and to Pakistan and to India. We can seek the help of both Pakistan and India, and can give clear evidence that our interest in helping Pakistan to arm is so that it may play its part in meeting the global menace of communism, and not to arm it against its neighbor, India. India itself must be urged to join in the common enterprise.

The enterprise is also one in which Australia and New Zealand have a vital interest. Communist infiltration spreads like a brush fire; and its foreordained course is not merely westward, but likewise to the southeast, through the islands of the sea, to the great British dominions south of the Equator.

The situation changes rapidly from day to day. A French victory in Dien Bien Phu hangs in the balance. Should resistance successfully be maintained until the coming of the rainy season, there might well be in that fact such a spur to French morale as would parallel in that distant spot the lift which came from the successful resistance at Verdun, in World War I.

This would enable the French people and the French Government to retreat with honor to a position which gives assurances of freedom to the nations of Indochina. With this as a possibility, it should furthermore be possible for our administration so to present the gravity of the situation to the other nations concerned as to lead to a joint enterprise backed by more strength of conviction of danger than was the case in Korea.

If we can hold off until the rainy season, that will give respite for the basic negotiations which are essential to any effective intervention.

The President cannot properly be asked to tell the Congress in detail what the administration is going to do. He can properly be asked to state in no uncertain terms to us and to the world what our purposes are in our present interest and in any future intervention in southeast Asia. More than this, the President cannot do and ought not be asked to do.

Finally, Mr. President, should armed intervention seem to be necessary and hopeful, the President must, and I am sure he will, come to Congress to have such action authorized.

WAR IN THE JUNGLES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as a guest at a private party in the company of a large group of Democratic Senators some weeks ago, I heard the Vice President, Mr. NIXON, "whooping it up for war" in Indochina. Then I thought he was expressing a private opinion. Now that the editors of the Nation have exposed his off-the-record war-in-the-jungles speech, I feel free to speak.

In a few days I expect to make a more extended statement on "Mr. NIXON'S war," but now I shall content myself with just two sentences.

I am against sending American GI's into the mud and muck of Indochina on a blood-letting spree to perpetuate colonialism and white man's exploitation in Asia. The Monroe Doctrine and Asia for Asians ought to be the foundation of our foreign policy.

Mr. President, I now wish to address myself to an entirely different subject, and a more pleasant one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONE in the chair). The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

COLONIAL AIRLINES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, 24 years ago yesterday, April

18, Colonial Airlines commenced operating Ford trimotor aircraft between New York and Montreal. In the intervening years, though its route structure has been extended and though many additions and changes have occurred in the original pattern, one factor has marked its operation since the beginning: Colonial Airlines has concluded 24 years of service without serious injury or fatality to any passenger or crew member.

During these 24 years Colonial has operated 724,591,004 passenger miles, and their fleet of Douglas aircraft have made 758,030 landings and takeoffs.

This record, as far as can be determined, cannot be duplicated by any domestic or international air carrier.

The record is all the more striking because the routes flown by Colonial cover some of the worst terrain, weather-wise, that can be encountered anywhere on the continent, whether it be winter, summer, spring, or fall.

There have been periods in the past when the management of Colonial has left much to be desired, but insofar as I know the present management is doing an excellent job.

At the present time Colonial operates daily flights from Washington to Lancaster, Reading, Allentown, Scranton, Binghamton, Syracuse, Ottawa, and Montreal; and from New York to Montreal via Poughkeepsie, Lake Placid, Albany, Glens Falls, and Burlington. Both routes join at Massena, N. Y. Additionally, Colonial's international operations include daily service to Bermuda.

I regret that the recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board that Colonial Airlines be authorized to merge with Eastern has been denied. I feel very certain that such a merger would have been in the public interest. This proposed merger would have obviated payment of subsidies to support Colonial service over part of its route. I repeat, Colonial service is very important to the whole area which it serves.

THE FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I request the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments to take notice of some quite serious charges made in the other body of the Congress last Thursday with respect to the Federal prison system.

The Bureau of Prisons and all of its personnel were roundly excoriated and an investigation was demanded. As Senators know, I am chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Federal Penitentiaries and have the able assistance and cooperation on this committee of the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and the able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. The Senate made available to us at the outset of this Congress $5,000 to carry out our duties. We thought we had been carrying out our responsibilities in this regard diligently and faithfully. We have held some hearings and both the senior Senator from Missouri and I have visited and inspected a number of the Federal penitentiaries. I have been a member of this committee for a great many years, and have inspected penitentiary after penitentiary during those years.

Also, we have requested and obtained extensive information from the Bureau of Prisons. We have examined a number of reports which have been submitted to our committee and each of us has had a considerable correspondence concerning various matters affecting these institutions. But apparently, if one is to believe the Representative, we have failed miserably in our duties. I wish, therefore, to take a little time to comment on his remarks.

Let me say at the outset that neither I nor any other members of our committee or the Attorney General have any desire to cover up or gloss over any situation that is in need of investigation by either body of this Congress. It is, however, reasonable to request that before the taxpayers' funds are spent on such projects and the confidence of the public in one of the most important branches of its system of law enforcement is shaken there be submitted enough specific data to make out a prima facie case of the need for such an investigation. Although the Representative must know of the existence of our committee, he has not referred any of the alleged communications or complaints he has received to us, nor has he referred any of them to the Attorney General, and he has not consulted or ever met the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, Mr. James V. Bennett. I am also informed that the Representative has never visited a single one of the 26 Federal institutions although one of them is less than 3 hours by automobile from his hometown and another is located on Bladensburg Road, near this city.

I say that the Representative must know of the existence of our committee, because in his remarks in the House he has taken some of the testimony before our committee and, using it out of context, completely distorted its meaning and intent. In the course of his remarks, the Representative said:

> We have an increase in sex perversion which James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, winks at because, to use his own words, and I quote: "Moral standards and the general public attitude toward that type of offense has changed to the point where people don't fight against it as much as they used to and as a result there is more of it." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that any man who takes refuge behind such a low level of moral standards is unfit for the office he holds. Is it a wonder, in the light of Mr. Bennett's attitude, that sex perversion is increasing in our prisons?

Mr. President, that quotation is taken from Mr. Bennett's remarks at a hearing before our committee which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 1, page 1314. In the course of the hearings the following colloquy took place:

> Senator WELKER. I shall not interfere any more, but do you have any publications or any documents that would show any increase in homosexuality?
>
> Mr. BENNETT. It is on the increase, and quite alarmingly so. However, I don't think that I could show that the number of congenital homosexuals are on the increase * * *. I don't think that group is increasing, but I do think, Senator WELKER, that moral standards and the general public attitude toward that type of offense has changed to the point where, well, people don't fight against it as much as they used to, and as a result there is more of it. Kinsey says that at least 60 percent of the men in institutions have some sort of experience of that kind while they are in the institutions. Our whole policy has been toward fighting it every time and every way we can. We suppress it, and when we find a fellow of that kind we lock him up or we discipline him, and we try to remove the fellow who is the temptation.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that Mr. Bennett states that his whole policy has been to fight homosexuality every time and every way he can. He points out that the Federal prisons suppress it and discipline those who engage in it. Mr. President, I know this to be true, because I have had the opportunity of visiting Alcatraz, and when I was there I tried to carry out my duties conscientiously by checking the reasons for commitment of men to that institution. I found that—and I know this to be true—a considerable number of the men in that institution are there because they are aggressive homosexuals. I also know from my visits with the wardens of the other institutions that none of them condones such practices, and they do everything in their power, as Mr. Bennett says, to suppress it.

But the point I wish to make here is that the Representative took out of context from one of our hearings a portion of a sentence and tortured it into a meaning that has not the slightest resemblance to the original. It is also clear from this quotation that the Representative knew of the existence of our committee, yet he has sent us none of the complaints he says he has received. He has not consulted me, and I understand he has not consulted either the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from Missouri. Since we are adequately staffed and financed, it would seem reasonable that before the Representative demanded another and an overlapping investigation at very considerable expense he would do us at least the courtesy of a telephone call. I shall send him a copy of these remarks, and offer fully to investigate any complaints he may have and will pledge to him that any of those who appear before our committee will be protected and no reprisals permitted. We also, of course, have ample authority to take the type of sworn testimony the Representative thinks necessary. So I invite him to submit his information to me. If he does not care to deal with me, he may submit it to either of my colleagues on the committee.

That is the principal purpose of my rising in the Senate this morning, but I would like to comment on one or two other of the statements made by the Representative. I cannot go into them all but he does make much of what he calls coddling of convicts and tries to alarm the American people by saying that Communists are being treated softly. He calls our prisons country clubs. Does a prison have to be dirty, inefficient, or serve sloppy food to escape being a called a country club? Nor do I know just what the Representative means when he speaks of coddling criminals or what he has in mind the Prison Bureau should do

with those committed to custody. Does he advocate that we reinstitute the lash, the cuffing of men to the bars of their cells or that the great United States Government have its own Siberia? Let me be specific in this regard and quote the Representative once more. He says:

In Alderson, W. Va., is located the Federal Reformatory for Women. This is another country club. According to information given me, two women prisoners, with records of adherence to the Communist cause, are in favored positions. One as a trusty has worked in the accounting department for 3 years. The other has spent 2 years in the storehouse. They were incarcerated for violation of the Smith Act. The names of these women are in my possession, Mr. Speaker, and should the House approve my resolution, they will be made public in direct testimony.

I have somewhat the advantage of the Representative, I admit, because I have also visited the Federal Reformatory for Women at Alderson in the course of my official duties. It is a thoroughly modern institution, scrupulously clean, excellently maintained, and has a fine program of work and rehabilitation. Women, among other things, are employed on the farm and operate a large dairy that is a model of sanitation.

I may say that when I visited that institution no one knew I was going to be there. When I arrived there at 4 o'clock in the morning I went into the dairy barn and I saw the women at their work. The floor of the dairy barn was so clean that anyone could sit on it without soiling his clothing.

I went into a number of the buildings, examined the food, and talked with a number of inmates. I know that if there had been any special privileges given to anyone I would have heard about it at that time because these institutions are like a goldfish bowl and anything that is improper soon comes to light. The warden of this institution is Miss Nina Kinsella, and she is ably assisted by a staff of perhaps 150 officers, all of whom are protected by civil service and not afraid to speak their minds. And you can be sure, Mr. President, that neither the warden nor anyone else would permit any favoritism to any Communist. All assignments are made by a classification committee at this and other Federal institutions and no single person at the institution, much less anyone in Washington, has control over this matter. Also let me say the Representative does not need a committee to expose the names of the two Communists he has in mind. That is public information. A simple inquiry of the kind I made of the Bureau of Prisons would have given him this bit of public information. There are only two Communists there. One of them is Mrs. Regina Frankfeld and the other Mrs. Dorothy Rose Blumberg. They have not been at Alderson as the Representative says, in one case, for 3 years, and in the other, for 2 years. They have been there only since January 29, 1953. Neither is a trusty and neither has a favored assignment.

Obviously charges that Communists or any other prisoners are favored in Federal prisons maligns every one of the 5,000 employees of the Federal Prison Service. I want to pay a compliment to them here and now. I have met hundreds of them. From my observation and that of my colleagues they are as clean-cut, hard-working, and conscientious a group of public employees as will be found anywhere. We have found their morale to be excellent notwithstanding that they are woefully underpaid. The take-home pay of the average prison officer is only about $65 per week. I hope soon this will be remedied. They are hazarding their lives every day for the safety and protection and well-being of the institution where they work and they deserve our commendation and support. Most of them are veterans who have shown by their deeds their hatred of communism. All during the time that prison riots were occurring throughout the country these employees, under the leadership of Mr. Bennett, maintained good order and discipline in the Federal prisons. There was only one short-lived disturbance in the Federal system during the rash of prison riots that occurred a couple of years ago. This was at the Chillicothe Reformatory and was promptly brought under control in a few hours without loss of life, concession to the inmates, or extensive property damage.

Mr. President, with all the riots and the destruction of property and lives that occurred, one would think that a Member of Congress would compliment the way the Federal prisons have been operated by those in authority, and particularly by Mr. James V. Bennett.

Mr. President, and mind you, most of the Federal prisons are overcrowded and the population is now the highest in its history. The hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee will show also that the Prison Bureau is operating on a budget that relatively is the lowest in its history.

I know personally many of the wardens of these institutions. They are an able and courageous group of career officers. Other members of our committee also have met them and commented on their ability and integrity. They are on duty long hours and are, of course, constantly under tension. Irresponsible charges that the prison system is rotten to the core strikes, of course, at the patriotism, the devotion, and the integrity of every warden, staff member, and officer. I know this is not true.

Our committee knows it is not true, Mr. President. I want the American people to know that it is not true.

Perhaps the Representative has received some complaints from employees who formerly served with the Bureau of Prisons. Some of these in all probability come from persons who were disciplined or may have been forced out of the service.

Mr. President, our committee does everything possible to see to it that when an employee in the prison service is not doing a good job, or perhaps is drinking, or perhaps is guilty of some other act which shows he does not have the interest of the institution at heart, he is removed from the service. Of course such employees have the right of appeal under the civil service. We have made it plain that derelictions of duty cannot be tolerated by the United States Government in a service of this kind, and our committee does not propose to countenance such actions. That has also been the attitude of James V. Bennett. Lack of alertness, alcoholism, abuse of prisoners, or other derelictions of duty cannot be tolerated. But if any civil-service employee has a just grievance, there are plenty of places where he can go to get his remedy.

Perhaps, also, the Representative has received some letters from prisoners and former prisoners. I daresay a number of Senators have received letters of that kind, because it is the policy of the Prison Bureau to permit any prisoner to write his Representative or Senator about anything. There are but few prisoners I have found who do not harbor some hostility against the Government, and most of them project their hostile feelings on their immediate environment. But the Prison Bureau recognizes this and allows them to ventilate their feelings. Mind you, Mr. President, a special mailbox, for instance, is maintained at each prison so that letters can be sent to Washington or to any appropriate Federal court without inspection by the wardens. Prisoners can write to any Federal judge. How could there be a fairer system than that?

But, Mr. President, are a handful of such complaints as the Representative may have received any justification for the kind of broadside he makes? And why does he not refer them to Attorney General Brownell? I am sure he will get a courteous response and a complete investigation. Mr. Brownell has amply demonstrated that he will not cover up anything. He is a fine, able, and conscientious gentleman who will tolerate no shady practices. Mr. Brownell has asked the Representative to send him the basis for his charges, and yet none has been forwarded to him. Apparently some of those which the Representative mentions have come to the attention of the Attorney General and he has investigated them and found them to be without merit, because he publicly reiterated his full confidence in the Prison Service and Mr. Bennett, its Director, following the charges.

Just one more point, Mr. President, and I am through. The Representative says his proposal for an investigation was motivated by soft parole policies that permit the release of scores of hardened criminals to prey on our citizens. Now let us look at the facts, which incidentally are in published reports and available to the Representative. Current reports show that only 35 percent of all Federal prisoners are paroled. That does not sound like soft parole policies to me. Of course, not all of those released make good, but figures of the Parole Board show 82 percent do not violate the confidence placed in them. I doubt that there is a parole system in the United States that has a better record. And it is because President Eisenhower, on recommendation of Mr. Brownell, has picked 6 able men and 1 fine woman for the Board. I know because every one of them was before our committee for confirmation. I personally went over their files. This Board now has been given exclusive and

final jurisdiction over all releases on parole from every Federal penal institution, including the National Training School for Boys. Formerly release of juveniles committed to the school for minority sentences by the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia was in the hands of a separate board but that is no longer true.

Human behavior is pretty hard to predict, and it is much easier to find fault when looking backward than it is to face up to the responsibility of making decisions on the basis of future prospects. And, Mr. President, I think it should be remembered that more than 25 percent of the nearly 20,000 men and women in Federal prisons have served in the Armed Forces of our country. Some of them were committed for military offenses, and some got into trouble when they experienced difficulties in adjusting to the requirements of civilian life after years under the rigorous conditions of combat. I for one believe that their service to this country should be seriously considered by the Parole Board in determining whether they should be released before the expiration of their sentences. Yes, there are going to be some who again will violate the laws. No Parole Board member is omniscient. But I believe even more persons would violate the laws if they were held to the end of their sentences and discharged scot free without the supervision parole provides.

Why is it necessary for us to show our lack of confidence in a Parole Board that has been in office less than a year, or to begin investigating President Eisenhower's appointees before they have had a chance to build a record? I do not know of any proposal to change our parole or prison laws. As a matter of fact, the Federal Parole and Prison System has had the reputation of being among the finest in the world. Prison officials from all over the world come here to visit it. Governors of more than a dozen States have requested Mr. Bennett's assistance and guidance in developing their own systems. Federal judges from every section of the country have again and again expressed their confidence in the prisons to which they sentence offenders. Various congressional committees and other official groups have commended the system from time to time. Our committee will continue its visits and inspections, and Senators may be certain we will report promptly any needs or shortcomings.

Mr. President, I speak from the bottom of my heart, from 8 long years of experience before I came to the United States Senate. For 4 years, as attorney general of my State, I was in charge of the penitentiary in North Dakota; and for another 4 years, as governor of my State, I was again in charge of the penitentiary.

During all the years I have been in the Senate, a part of the time as chairman of the Subcommittee on Penitentiaries, of the Judiciary Committee, I do not know of any service I have rendered to the country which has been more conscientious, or in which I have taken greater interest, than that in connection with the Subcommittee on Penitentiaries.

As a Member of the Senate, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Penitentiaries, I have at various times visited one penitentiary after another. I submit that the charges made by the Representative, in my opinion at least, are entirely without foundation. If he has letters or affidavits, he should submit them to the Bureau of Prisons or to Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, or to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], or to myself, the senior Senator from North Dakota, for perusal. I promise a fair hearing, with no reprisals, to those who may have sent complaints or affidavits.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, following the excellent and comprehensive reply by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to say to the Representative from Virginia that I, too, had expected to take the opportunity today not only to rise in defense of a man whom I have always thought to be one who needed no defense, but also to pay tribute to a man who should, rather, have in fulsome measure the gratitude and encouragement of the Nation. James V. Bennett is a dedicated man of the highest ideals, character, and motives. He is a man of unquestioned patriotism, and of the highest degree of both practical and technical competence in the field of penology and institutional management.

When I first came to the committee, I asked for assignment to the Subcommittee on Penitentiaries, a request which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary was good enough to grant, because for many years I have had a great interest in the problems of penology, penal institutions, parole, probation, and law violation in many of its aspects, particularly that of rehabilitation of the offender, as well as the proper protection which should be afforded society against those who violate our laws.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Would the distinguished Senator from Missouri agree with me that there has been no discrimination as to race or color?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have devoted, thus far, 7 full days, 1 day to each of 7 institutions. I have gone to them early in the morning and have remained until late at night. I have, to the best of my ability, undertaken to familiarize myself with what really goes on in the institutions. I have been in such institutions before, in connection with previous public offices which I have held and duties which I have had. I have talked with the custodial personnel. I have visited with everyone, from the inmates themselves to the wardens and the various officers of the Federal institutions, reformatories, and penitentiaries. I have seen every evidence of an effort on the part of these officials to do away with all unfair discrimination; indeed, it is practiced on the outside of the institutions to a greater degree than I have seen it practiced inside any of the institutions.

I have said to Mr. Bennett, I have said publicly at the hearings of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, of which I happen to be a member, and I am glad to say now upon the floor of the Senate, that I think Mr. James V. Bennett and the dedicated men and women who are serving with him and under his direction and supervision in the Federal system of prisons and reformatories constitute, to my mind, one of the most unselfish, competent, high-minded group of men and women I have ever seen in the Federal service.

I could undertake to go into the subject with the greatest particularity and detail, because I have been to these places, and I have tried to understand what is being done and how it is being done. On some occasions, I have gone without previous notice to the institutions which I visited.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator from Missouri found a single case where either a man or a woman had been beaten or abused when placed in a solitary-confinement cell; or has he had a single complaint, at any time, from those in solitary confinement, or from anyone who claimed to have been beaten?

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that I am glad to bear out that there is a mailbox in the yard of each of the institutions, marked for letters to Senators or Representatives. The mail may be dropped in such boxes by any inmate in the yard and sent unopened to the Senator or Representative to whom it is addressed, or to the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Or a Federal judge.

Mr. HENNINGS. Or a Federal judge.

I have been in the disciplinary cell blocks. I have sat in on classification hearings. I have sat in on protests of inmates regarding violations of the rules. I have talked with many of the inmates. In fact, in one institution I found a man I had known before. I took him into the warden's office and talked to him. In no instance was there either an implication or a direct statement that there has been brutality in any of the institutions. By brutality, I do not necessarily mean by physical means only; I mean by mental coercion and the other forms of inhuman and cruel mental treatment, which are well known to those who have had experience in dealing with violations of law and with institutions for law violators.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that in many instances the committee has brought before it witnesses who have been released from the penitentiary, who have served their time, and who therefore would have no purpose whatsoever in lying about conditions in the institutions? Is it not true that by speaking with such witnesses, we are able to determine the exact conditions that existed in those penitentiaries when they served time there? Furthermore, would not such former inmates, above all others,

be inclined to tell us the truth about bad conditions, if they existed?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from North Dakota is eminently correct. We all know that in any system of penology there are many defects. The whole subject of penology is a very complex, devious, and exceedingly difficult one. I do not know what the solution is; far from it. But I believe I know enough about the subject to realize that it presents enormous difficulties and problems.

There is the problem of custody, which is the primary problem of any penal institution. When we go beyond the custodial obligation and duty which the warden and his officials owe to the public, we get into the field of rehabilitation and the making of an intelligent effort to restore those who have been convicted to the population, so they can become good and useful citizens.

Without wishing to question anyone's motives, and as one who has read a great deal on this subject for his own enlightenment, and as one who has been a prosecutor in a large city, and as one who has undertaken for many years to work in the area of underprivileged young men and women who get into trouble, I think the Representative from Virginia has gone beyond his depth, in an effort to attract attention to something—we know not what.

I should like the chairman of our Judiciary Committee to invite him to come before the Subcommittee on Penitentiaries, to tell us of what he may complain and what knowledge he has, since he has made what seems to me to be an unprovoked attack upon a fine Federal official, and has failed to specify and document and give substance to the charges which he has laid.

Mr. President, I shall now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

MISSOURI BASIN COMMISSION AND COMPACT BOARD

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board which would be responsible for the comprehensive development of the land and water resources within the Missouri Basin. The bill includes a provision that would grant consent to the Missouri Basin States for the establishment of an Interstate Compact Board, to assure a method whereby the various States would formally participate in the program, share in planning, review proposals of the Commission, and exercise a distinct function in approving or disapproving the programs and budgets for resource development which the Commission would submit to the Congress.

The general nature of the land and water problems of the Missouri Basin are, I am sure, well known to most of my colleagues in the Senate. I have, from time to time, spoken in the Senate and elsewhere about this transcendingly important matter, and a number of my colleagues—among them the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]—went out into the area and saw at firsthand the devastating effects of the terrible floods in 1951 and 1952.

I feel so strongly about the urgency of this problem, not only because it is so important to my own State of Missouri but because the Missouri Basin comprises one-sixth of the total land area of our country. The problems of such a vast area are, of course, not local, not just regional, but national, and even the world is affected because the devastating floods and droughts of this area cripple the production of food and fiber in an area of 529,000 square miles in the very heart of America.

I have long felt that the only solution to the many issues of land and water development and utilization in the basin is to be found in a comprehensive, overall, integrated approach that would resolve the jurisdictional and factional disputes which have for many years barred effective action. It is quite apparent, I believe, that the piecemeal job we have been doing in the basin just cannot work and will not work. Because of my own convictions in this matter, and in the face of repeated disastrous floods in the area, in August of 1951, I introduced a bill, together with 15 cosponsors, to establish a Missouri Basin Survey Commission to make a full and comprehensive study of the question, to formulate an integrated program based on the land and water needs of the area, and to make specific recommendations for carrying out that program. The Commission was established by Executive order of President Truman in January 1952, and the President appointed an 11-man bipartisan group, headed by Mr. James E. Lawrence, of Lincoln, Nebr., editor of the Lincoln Star. It was my privilege to serve as Vice Chairman of that Commission. The other congressional members included the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]; Representative ASPINALL, of Colorado; Representative HOPE, of Kansas; and Representative TRIMBLE, of Arkansas. The public members were Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association; Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota; Dean Person, of the University of Wyoming; and Harry J. Peterson, of Minnesota.

The Commission's assignment was to prepare recommendations "for the better protection, development, and use" of the land and water resources of the Missouri River Basin. Our recommendations appear in full in the 300-page report, Missouri: Land and Water, which was submitted to President Eisenhower in February 1953.

In setting up the Commission, President Truman had emphasized the appalling flood losses of 1951. The scope of the Commission's study, however, was far broader than flood control. It included irrigation, navigation, and hydroelectric power development, as well as all other major and minor phases of land and water utilization and improvement. In effect, the Commission was directed to reevaluate the basin's resource problems with a view to charting the future course of resource management and improvement.

Specifically, the Commission was instructed to—

First. Review existing and proposed resource development plans.

Second. Conduct on-the-site surveys and hold public hearings.

Third. Consider costs and benefits and the economic soundness of proposed development plans.

Fourth. Consult State representatives and regional and local organizations and groups.

Fifth. Consider the proper division of financial responsibility between the Federal Government and the States for resource development.

At the same time, the Commission was asked to submit recommendations on the kind of organization needed to carry forward effectively the development of the basin's resources.

At 17 hearings the Commission heard more than 400 witnesses. In addition, Federal and State resource agencies reported on the activities in which they were engaged. In addition, the Commission met in executive session with spokesmen from those agencies.

As a result of our extensive hearings throughout the basin and our further detailed study over many months, it was apparent that there had to be some agency with authority to determine the scope of operations of the various Federal agencies and to bring these agencies together in a cooperative working relationship with the States for development of resources in the basin. At the same time, we felt—and it is my own strong belief—that there must be as much State and local control as can be achieved on a workable basis.

The bill I am introducing today would, I believe, achieve these results and would provide a sound basis for the orderly development of the great land and water resources in the Missouri Basin.

In the Missouri Basin, where land and water projects form the Nation's largest, most ambitious program for the development of natural resources, progress has been increasingly handicapped by the lack of an adequate organization. The program needs leadership armed with authority and responsibility which match the size of the tasks.

Lacking this, the program has been marked by readily evident and growing weaknesses ever since the Federal Government undertook the assorted projects which were consolidated in the original Pick-Sloan plan of a decade ago. Today's program is an expanded version, but even with the revisions in the plan, largely in the form of additional projects, the program is still lacking in central, responsible leadership.

CONFLICT OF SOVEREIGNTIES

The resulting shortcomings and failures illustrate the sources as well as the chronic character of the organizational problems. Most of them have grown out of the complex array of sovereignties.

Within the Federal Government itself, various agencies have been given by Congress the authority necessary to accomplish specified, basic tasks. Naturally, with such authority, various agencies have assumed jurisdiction over

particular aspects of resource development. This approach has served a useful end by assuring skills of a high order for the technical aspects of the work in progress. At the same time, however, when jurisdiction has operated to exclude or subordinate other agencies—and local people, for that matter—the program has suffered from the delays of extended controversies, the frustration of unresolved disputes, and from inadequate or even deficient planning. Technical competence in limited fields has often been purchased at far too high a sacrifice in balanced development and local participation.

The interplay of Federal and State sovereignties has been far less of a source of conflict. But past experience, particularly where such a conflict has resulted in an indefinite postponement of projects that had originally been pressed as essential, points to the need for establishing a sound basis for a greater degree of genuine partnership between the Federal Government and the States in essential resource tasks. Similar improvement, Mr. President, is needed in the working relationships between the States themselves. The basin's limited supply of water and limited number of reservoir sites present many problems of water utilization with potential disagreement between upstream and downstream requirements and wishes.

MVA VERSUS INTERSTATE COMPACT

The problem, of course, has had its proposed solutions. Probably the best known, in view of the widespread public comment they have stimulated, have been rival proposals for a valley authority and an interstate compact.

In either case, responsibility for the resource program would be entrusted to the new body. In the case of the valley authority, it would plan, build, and operate the public works necessary to the program. The scope of the operations which would be undertaken by the agency to be created by interstate compact has never been spelled out with the same degree of clarity. To some degree, the interstate compact has been advanced as a countervailing proposal for the protection of the States of the basin, and to shield Federal agencies from the very real threat of a curtailment in their authority and operations that is implicit in a so-called valley authority.

In any event, acid tones have flavored the debate, both in and out of Congress, on MVA versus an interstate compact. By its virulence, as well as its persistence, the discussion clearly indicates a deep-rooted public conviction that the Missouri Basin program should be placed in hands more capable of giving it responsible, centralized direction and supervision than is now the case.

Moreover, the defects in the present program, chiefly in planning, are receiving increasingly widespread public recognition. Here lies a real danger. In the absence of responsible direction and coordination, an unfavorable public attitude, outside the basin, as well as inside it, could call a halt to the program, irrespective of the genuine merit of its various parts.

FEDERAL SHORTCOMINGS

The report of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission, entitled "Missouri: Land and Water," has pinpointed deficiencies that have hampered the entire resource program. Our report emphasized, in particular, Mr. President, the inability or the unwillingness of Federal agencies to work together, to use jointly their most effective techniques, and to agree upon financial fundamentals. As a result, the basin's resource program has suffered delay and confusion.

One outstanding example is the failure of Federal construction agencies to agree on the proper division of the cost of major multiple-purpose dams on the main steam of the Missouri—at Gavins Point, Fort Randall, Big Bend, Oahe, and Garrison. Their total cost has been estimated at $1.1 billion.

The question at issue is the share to be borne reimbursably by power and irrigation and, conversely, the share to be assessed nonreimbursably to flood control and navigation. The disputants are the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The former favors a larger assessment to reimbursable costs; the latter, a larger assessment to nonreimbursables. The amount in dispute is half a billion dollars—about the value of the entire TVA power system.

How the issue is finally settled will have a big bearing on power rates and water charges and on the financial feasibility of many projects. But the fact is that today the Federal agencies do not possess the organizational machinery—nor does the basin itself—to resolve this issue which will have such widespread effects on the people of the basin and the use of its resources.

There are other serious shortcomings stemming from the lack of a cohesive, responsible organization. In particular, agencies have failed on significant occasions to work in unison with each other. This marked incapacity, especially apparent in crucial planning operations, was demonstrated in the Salt-Wahoo Basin of Nebraska and the James River of the Dakotas. In the Osage River Basin, in Missouri, the breakdown was precipitated by the inability on the part of a Federal agency to work in harmony with the State.

The Survey Commission report also refers to the problem at Tuttle Creek, in Kansas, where there has been great controversy over placing reliance for all flood protection for the Kansas Citys—both Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans.—on a single-purpose dam. In the basin of the Kaw, planning has been primarily occupied with the construction of big dams, as the basic protective works, even though there is some question whether the potential sites could provide the degree of protection considered necessary to hold the flood of 1951. In a word, more comprehensive planning might well have provided a better answer for the critical problem in Kansas City.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

Organizational flaws have given rise to still another weakness which is far less dramatic, but nonetheless significant. Only limited participation is accorded the States and local communities. Ordinarily they are offered an opportunity to review a specific project. But the chance comes late in the planning day after the project has crystallized and after it has become part and parcel of the program of the sponsoring agency. Thus, the State's participation is often limited to the choice of being for or against a given project. Under an organization adequate to deal with the overall basin program, the States and the localities would participate from the inception of the planning.

Our Commission recognized, in detail, the basic character of the organizational problem. In one recommendation after another, we made what I thought was a conscientious, and I believe, thorough effort to deal with and to ease every possible conflict of sovereignty.

GOAL: COORDINATION

Within the area of the Federal agencies, the Survey Commission report studiously avoided recommending an authority that would supersede or replace the existing agencies in the exercise of their authorized resource functions. Instead, we felt that responsibility for carrying out the basin program should continue to reside in the agencies presently charged with the task.

To this end, our report recommended a Missouri Basin Commission which would have authority to coordinate the activities of the several agencies. Coordination would begin at the planning stage and carry through beyond the installation of the projects. In exercising the authority necessary to assure coordination, the new Commission would be responsible to Congress for submitting project proposals and for the preparation of a unified budget for the resource-development program. The budget, brought together in the basin, would be presented through the White House just as it is today, but not in its many fragmented and often unrelated parts. In addition, our report emphasized the planning responsibilities which would be vested in the new Commission.

RECOGNITION OF THE STATES

Our Survey Commission studied the issue of State sovereignty very carefully. One important and unique recommendation in our report was that each State, by formally refusing consent, could prevent the operation within its boundaries of the new Commission. In addition to this extraordinary proviso, the Survey Commission suggested that the Governors should constitute a permanent advisory board for the guidance of the program—in planning, in execution, and in the after years of operation and maintenance. The States, moreover, would have a voice in selecting members of the new Commission.

These several recommendations testified that our Commission wanted to do everything possible to assure State participation. In fact, the minority proposal for an interstate compact, the sole dissent from the formal Commission recommendation—the only other dissent was from a finding—was aimed in the same direction. The Survey Commission, in effect, was unanimous in recognizing the need for according the States

a greater role than they now have in the task of resource development.

COMBINING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

In looking back over the work of our Commission, and in view of the wide agreement among the Commission members, I have felt that the recommendation on organization could be modified to provide an area of responsibility for an interstate compact. The bill which I am introducing today, therefore, is designed in an effort to insure that the full advantages and benefits of both the majority and minority proposals would be combined in the basin program.

The Survey Commission recommendation on organization and the dissent would be, in effect, combined.

The proposed Basin Commission would have the same source of authority and same duties as the majority of the Survey Commission has recommended. As a federally created body, the new Commission would have authority for the direction, coordination and control of overall activities of the Federal Government within the Missouri Basin relating to resource development. In particular, the Commission would be responsible for activities relating to watershed management, land conservation, flood control, forestry, irrigation, electric power, domestic and industrial water supply, navigation, stream-bank stabilization, pollution control, mosquito control, drainage, fish and wildlife, and recreation.

In addition, by the proposed interstate compact, the States could establish a board which would have a clearly defined scope of operations. As the instrumentality of the several States in the basin, it would be invested with State sovereignty. Under the authorization of the compact, the States would formally participate in the program, sharing in the planning, reviewing proposals, and approving or disapproving the formal programs and the budgets which the Commission would present to the Congress in behalf of the Federal resource agencies, the States, and the basin as an entity.

INSTRUMENT OF PERSUASION AND COMPROMISE

Under its charter sanctioned by Congress, as proposed in my bill, the Interstate Compact Board would actually exercise a limited veto over the recommendations of the Commission. It would operate in this way. If the Interstate Board disapproved of a Commission recommendation, the Commission would be required, at the time of making its recommendations to Congress, to set forth the Board's disapproval and the basis thereof. Furthermore, disapproval by the Board could be the basis for automatically restraining the Federal body temporarily from taking further action. In the interim, the Board and the Commission would have both the opportunity and the responsibility to work out a mutually satisfactory recommendation.

Machinery of this kind would assure realistic participation by the States without trespassing upon the responsibilities of the agencies authorized and directed by Congress, and accountable to the Congress, to carry out specific tasks. Moreover, the Interstate Board would open the way for the States to accept and carry out successfully an ever-larger share of the resource development work. The States could cooperate in programs of research and education aimed toward pollution control, recreation improvements, and zoning programs. The Board likewise could become the vehicle by which, in the future, the States could participate in sharing the costs for resource developments.

COADMINISTRATION

I believe there are a number of advantages in the plan for the joint administration of a basin resource program, especially in the Missouri Valley, under the cooperative direction of a Federal commission and an interstate compact board. Only by pooling Federal and State authorities can the Missouri Basin have a resource program that would be sufficiently comprehensive to meet the many and diverse needs of the area. The Federal activities would be supported, for the first time, in a coordinated program, by the regulatory powers which the States may exercise in dealing with the utilization, protection, and improvement of natural resources.

Competent legal authorities have raised the question that the interstate compact proposal of the Survey Commission minority may be unconstitutional because of its provision for direct participation by the United States Government. On the other hand, the nature of the Compact Board proposed in my bill, and the coadministration of the new Commission and the Compact Board, would insure that the States have an adequate voice in all the problems of resource development without the danger of running afoul on a question of constitutionality. In fact, in my judgment, the very protection which this bill would accord the States against Federal encroachment, is one of the most important reasons for combining both the majority and minority Commission recommendations in this modified proposal.

This proposed plan of resource administration is, I believe, required in order to meet the many complex needs of the Missouri Basin. It takes into account the separate problems of resource planning, program execution and operational management, and unites them in an orderly and effective program. The proposed new Commission and Compact Board would integrate, rather than replace existing Federal activities. It would maintain an appropriate balance between authority, responsibility, and interest at all levels of government and, at the same time, provide a workable plan for bringing harmony between regional and local interests and those of the Nation.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board to provide coherent and unified direction for the development of the Missouri Basin's natural resources, to give responsible direction to the resource development activities of the Federal Government in the Missouri Basin, and for coordinating those activities with resource development activities of the States.

The bill (S. 3325) to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board to provide coherent and unified direction for the development of the Missouri Basin's natural resources, to give responsible direction to the resource development activities of the Federal Government in the Missouri Basin, and for coordinating those activities with resource development activities of the States, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from time to time much has been said in the Senate with reference to the fiscal and monetary policies of the present administration. A little more than a week ago I addressed myself to the monetary and fiscal policies of the Eisenhower administration, pointing out what I considered to be the weaknesses of the hard money and tight-credit policy of the administration.

During the debate there was considerable discussion of the effect of the hard-money policy upon the American economy.

I pointed out that it was my view that the Treasury Department's high-interest policy was one of the most colossal blunders of all time insofar as the fiscal management was concerned.

I wish to bring the record up to date. I have in my hand a news item published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 16, 1954. It is one of several articles on the subject I have read recently in newspapers. The article I have before me is entitled "Treasury To Sell Billion Dollars' Worth Tax Bills." It was furnished by the New York Herald Tribune News Service and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald. It reads as follows:

TREASURY TO SELL BILLION DOLLARS' WORTH TAX BILLS

The Treasury announced last night it will sell $1 billion worth of 52-day tax anticipation bills, maturing June 18 with payment due April 27.

This is the second issue of June "Tab's" and brings the total to $2,500,000,000.

The announcement marked another postponement of the Treasury's wish to raise new money by an issue of longer term.

I believe the final paragraph is quite revealing. It reads as follows:

It appears more and more obvious that the Treasury won't make any effort to raise long-term money until the recession is clearly over.

Mr. President, I call attention to the article only because there has been extended debate in the Senate, as well as public discussion generally, as to whether there is actually a recession. I note now that the Treasury Department has decided it will not move forward on so-called long-term financing until the recession is over.

That is a belated acknowledgment of the facts of economic life. At least the announcement and recognition of those facts are now evident.

I also hold in my hand an article entitled "Discount Rate Drops in Two More Federal Reserve Districts." It is an Associated Press article, published in the Washington Evening Star of April 16, 1954. It reads as follows:

DISCOUNT RATE DROPS IN TWO MORE FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICTS

NEW YORK, April 16.—The New York and San Francisco Federal Reserve Banks have lowered the discount rate to member banks from 1¾ to 1½ percent, effective today.

The action follows a similar move by the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank on Tuesday. The other nine Federal Reserve districts are expected to follow suit within the next week.

Directors of the New York bank were closeted for many hours before the announcement was made yesterday. An official said the action definitely establishes an "easy money" policy by the Federal Reserve. Financial circles generally regard such a policy as inflationary, tending to raise bond prices and lower interest rates throughout the economy.

The discount rate is the interest charge at which commercial banks may borrow from the Federal Reserve and, in turn, make loans to business or individuals. In practice, commercial banks do not take advantage of this method of raising cash unless there is an overwhelming demand for loans which cannot be met in any other way.

Since most commercial banks currently have an abundance of loanable funds on hand, Wall Streeters were inclined to view this latest move as more psychological than practical. "It's part of the Government's antirecession program," said one local banker.

The immediate effect on the Treasury bond market was to boost prices. The Government's 30-year 3¼'s climbed ⅜ of a point at 109¾ bid. At this quotation, the issue yields only 2.69 percent. Corporate bonds held steady.

I have read the full text of the dispatch, and I shall comment on it in a moment.

The Minneapolis Morning Tribune of April 15, 1954, published an article entitled "Federal Reserve Acts to Stimulate Large Borrowing." The article is datelined Washington and originated with the United Press. It reads as follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE ACTS TO STIMULATE LARGE BORROWING

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Reserve Board has approved a new interest rate reduction in a move to stimulate the money and credit market.

The Board agreed to let district reserve banks cut their discount rate from 1¾ to 1½ percent. The discount rate is the interest reserve system banks pay on money borrowed from district reserve banks.

(Oliver Powell, president of the Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank, said Wednesday the question of a change in interest rate would be considered by the banks operating committee. District banks decide separately whether to follow the allowed reduction policy.)

Banks theoretically should be more willing to make large business loans when they know they can get money at a relatively low interest rate.

Federal Reserve loans to member banks last week totaled $179 million as against $733 million a year ago. Apparently the Board seeks to induce member banks to increase borrowings from the Reserve System.

It is up to the members banks themselves whether they pass along the lower interest rates to large borrowers.

Mr. President, it is very obvious that the well publicized and premediated and predetermined policy on hard money and tight credit is now being liquidated. It is a policy which had very serious effects upon the economy, as we have pointed out.

There is no doubt at all that one of the main reasons for the business dip or recession was the tight credit and high interest rate policy.

I believe it is quite clear that the amount of the bank loans to private enterprises has been substantially lower. I believe it is equally clear that the interest charges have been substantially higher. Both have resulted in a lag or decline of economic activity.

I am happy that the Federal Reserve Board is now getting its house in order, and I am delighted to note that the advice which some of us gave to the administration officials about a year ago is finally, in part, being followed, or at least being recognized as having some semblance of validity.

It is my view that had the Treasury Department followed sane and sensible interest and credit policies many of the difficulties which we are now encountering in the American economy would not have happened at all.

I make note of one further newspaper article. It is entitled "Production of Steel Drops Again After 1-Week Advance." It is an Associated Press dispatch, published in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1954. In part, it reads as follows:

CLEVELAND, April 12.—After a 1-week gain, steel production resumed its downward trend last week, sinking 1 point to 68 percent of capacity, the magazine Steel reported yesterday.

The concluding paragraph of the article is very interesting. I believe it is a good barometer of the economic difficulties with which we are now faced. It reads:

Steel buying for railroad use is at an extremely low level, the magazine continued, because of the drop in railroad business. Freight-car loadings this year are running 12 percent below those of the same period last year and 16 percent beneath 1952.

Mr. President, if there is any accurate, objective measurement of economic activity, it is freight-car loadings. Freight-car loadings for this year are down about 12 percent as compared with 1953, and are down 16 percent as compared with 1952. So, Mr. President, the so-called fearmongers, or the prophets of doom, as some of us have been called, were no fearmongers or prophets of doom at all, but rather were objective reporters of economic facts and economic developments. It is encouraging that at long last—and I say, "at long last," with too great a period of time having gone by—there is now official recognition of the dimensions of the economic recession which has beset us and which continues to beset us.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no doubt at all in my mind that the issuance of the bonds at 3½ percent interest, to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred, which reflected a jump of three-fourths of 1 percent in the interest rate over the last issue of bonds, certainly caused tight money, fear, distrust, and a general slowing down of business. But, in addition to that, will the Senator from Minnesota not agree with me that this unwise move had two other effects: One is that it placed on the market bonds bearing an unnecessarily and arbitrarily high rate of interest, bonds which now, within less than a year, are selling at a premium of nearly 10 points? They are selling now at about 110. That is one effect, and it gave a profit of 10 points to the great financial institutions.

It had another very deleterious effect. The 2½ percent Government bonds immediately went down to a discount of nearly 10 points. The 2½ percent bonds went below 90.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is, of course, quite accurate.

Mr. LEHMAN. And that gave the great financial institutions, insurance companies, and banks the opportunity of selling their holdings at 90, taking a loss, which they could write off from their corporation income-tax payments. Then they were able to replace their bonds, if they wished, with purchases at about the same price on which they have not yet been under the requirement of paying any corporation tax whatsoever; and, of course, there is no telling when that day may come.

So the Government has lost in two ways, in addition to suffering the strangulation of the industrial and business progress of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When the Senator says they wrote off their losses, he means they wrote those 2½ percent bonds off as a loss for income-tax purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what we commonly call a tax switch. By this procedure millions of dollars were made by some of the large banking institutions of which the American public is literally unaware. That is the great, mysterious kind of high finance which seldom makes headlines, but, believe me, it has a great impact upon the economy of the country.

No Member of the Senate is better qualified to discuss the subject than is the distinguished Senator from New York, who has had a fine reputation and a wealth of experience in the financial world.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has complimented the distinguished Senator from New York because I think he understands financial problems better than does anyone in the United States. In my opinion, there is no one more qualified on that subject than is the Senator from New York. It has been a great source of inspiration to me to serve with him in the Senate and to see that at all times he has expressed the importance of protecting the finan-

cial interests of the people of the country from certain selfish interests that would take advantage, just as banking houses and investment companies took advantage of the Eisenhower hard-money program.

Once again it needs to be clear in the RECORD that the people who profited from the cruel hard-money policy inaugurated and initiated by the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury happened to be members of great wealthy groups. What the Senator from Minnesota has previously brought out in his speeches to the Senate, I think, should be again brought home to the American people by saying to them, "You did not profit from the hard-money policy, but the people who reaped the bonanza were the big banking houses and financial institutions which took advantage of the inflationary program of Eisenhower in the field of fiscal policy."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon. He has expressed the factual developments of what has been the fiscal policy of this administration. He has expressed it in clear and unmistakable language, and with the preciseness which is very much a part of his work in the Senate. I think the average consumer knows that the tight-money-high-interest policy has cost the American community literally hundreds of millions of dollars. The impact of the rising interest rates not only slowed down the economy, but placed a premium cost upon whatever financing took place. As I have pointed out, one of the results was upon public construction. School boards and school districts had planned for the construction of new school facilities, thinking that the bond issue might bear interest anywhere from 3 to 4 percent, only to find out that the new high-interest policy had worked its way all the way through the economy, creating a rise in the interest rate upon municipal or public bonds, thereby cutting down on school construction. If it did not cut down on the actual number of buildings to be constructed, at least it cut down on their size.

I shall never forget how the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] portrayed in the Senate the effect of the rise in the interest rates on housing loans. He said it amounted to losing 1 bedroom out of a 3-bedroom house. The sum of $14,000 would pay for a GI's 3-bedroom home before he went to Korea, but when he came back, that amount of money would purchase only a 2-bedroom house, because of the increased cost of handling the interest charges.

Mr. President, I wanted to use what time I had today in speaking not only on one subject, but I wanted to discuss several subjects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

PLANS OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT TO BRING HOME MORE TROOPS FROM THE FAR EAST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the technique of the Senator from Minnesota. This is the first time I have heard him say he was going to give a report to the Senate on the basis of a series of developments. I am delighted that he is following the precedent already established by the representative of the Independent Party.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am following the precedent, but I am afraid I shall not do as well as does the Senator from Oregon either in the substance or in the presentation, but I shall try.

Mr. President, within the hour I noticed on the ticker tape in the Senate cloakroom, which is available to Members of the Senate if not to the public, a dispatch which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department plans to bring more troops back from the Far East.

That was disclosed tonight in testimony on the new defense budget, made public by a House Appropriations Subcommittee.

Secretary of Defense Wilson was testifying about changed circumstances following the end of shooting in Korea and the buildup, with American aid, of South Korea's Army, to a 20-division strength. Then he said:

"Well from the point of view of not having an active war we still have too many troops in the Pacific. We expect to bring some of them back as conditions permit."

That apparently will be in addition to the two divisions of Army troops being brought back from Korea and to be deactivated upon return home.

Elsewhere in the testimony, Wilson said: "We certainly cannot look forward to keeping about 10 or 11 divisions permanently deployed in the Pacific."

Wilson was asked if the Reds had reduced their forces anywhere in the world? He replied:

"The Chinese have withdrawn some troops from North Korea, we think."

Wilson said that in Europe now are about 300,000 men—and with them 200,000 dependents.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Eisenhower administration a question. I can think of no better place in which to ask it than in the public light of the United States Senate. On Friday last, at least according to the press, in a speech delivered before the newspaper publishers and editors, gathered in their annual meeting in Washington, D. C., the Vice President of the United States mentioned that as one of the possibilities, or as a probable eventuality, the United States may be compelled, by the circumstances of events in Indochina, to commit American manpower, American ground forces, in Indochina.

Mr. President, we now have before us, as I have read, a statement by the Department of Defense, which says it plans to bring back more troops from the Far East. The Secretary of Defense also indicates that circumstances have changed. Not "being engaged in an active war," he says, "we still have too many troops in the Pacific." It is this kind of statement, as compared with the statement made by the Vice President, that makes our allies and the folks back home confused.

How could the Secretary of Defense be talking before a House subcommittee on appropriations on one day about bringing back more troops from the Far East, and the Vice President of the United States, who is a member of the Security Council, be talking about the probability or the possibility, if circumstances so necessitate, of sending troops into Indochina?

Furthermore, I may say that in recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Secretary of Defense indicated to the members of the committee that no troops were being brought back from the Far East. The two divisions which have been heralded in the press as being deactivated and as coming home from Korea, are not home from Korea. One of the divisions still is in Korea, and the other division still is in the Far Pacific area.

I think the American public deserves and should have clarity, candor, forthrightness, and honesty in statements pertaining to matters of great international and national importance. If there is any fact which is clear today, it is that the administration's positions in reference to foreign policy and national security are confused and confusing.

I have some questions I desire to ask. First, Mr. President, why has not a transcript of the Vice President's speech before the convention of editors been made public. We have obtained every version which possibly could be conceived of in the various newspapers of the country. Statements are even going around that in the Vice President's comments, in answer to questions, there was some doubt as to whether or not the truce in Korea was a good thing.

As I say, this is what I have heard by way of the grapevine. I do not wish to obtain my information as a Member of the Senate by rumor, by "think piece" news stories, by press or radio commentary. I do not want to learn the administration's policies by reading the newspapers.

I happen to be a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which is one of the important committees of the Senate. I desire to receive my information directly from responsible officials in the committee room. I happen to think it is just as important for United States Senators to know what the policies of the administration are as it is for any editor to know them, with due deference to the capable and patriotic people who are editors and publishers of our newspapers.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Minnesota is speaking on a subject I shall discuss later this afternoon. But at this time I wish to interrupt him to ask a question. Is the Senator aware of the fact that at the meeting of newspaper editors and publishers, which was held in Washington, concern was expressed in some of the reports of speeches about a withholding of information by the Government from the American people. I was glad to observe that the press assembled expressed some adverse evaluation of that policy. But does the Senator think a few amusing aspects are observable in the discovery that a major speech, discussed among a large convention of newspapermen, was, apparently,

to have been made off the record, without a full disclosure on the part of the newspaper editors to the American people about a policy so important as the one announced by the Vice President?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oregon, of course, is correct.

I may point out to my distinguished colleagues that a problem which is so complex as this one, a problem which involves so serious a situation, and which is so filled with explosive potentialities as is the situation in Indochina, is one which should be discussed in the full light of day before the American people. At least, it should be discussed in full and complete candor with Members of the Congress. If I had my way, there would be a meeting of the Senate sitting as committee of the whole, every Senator being present, with the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, right in this Chamber, for the purpose of answering our questions. Every Member of the Senate has a right to know the facts about the critical international situation and all the facets and factors which are involved.

From what I have heard by way of the grapevine, we shall be called upon just as certainly as we are gathered in the Senate, to give to the President of the United States a go-ahead sign, an unqualified endorsement, to do as he sees fit. I do not know whether this is the official policy of the administration, but at least it is being talked about. As one Member of the Senate, I say that if these things are talked about, they ought to be talked about to the Senate; they ought not to be talked about merely to people who are reporting the news, with all deference to the fine people who report the news.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have heard that the Vice President made an off-the-record speech, to which the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota has referred, which has confused the people of the United States and frightened them, in many instances, and made them very much concerned with regard to its meaning. Certainly it has confused and frightened our allies abroad, on whom we must rely to a very considerable extent, and without whom we cannot possibly make an adequate defense of the freedoms of the world.

Members of the Senate have a very real responsibility. They must reach decisions. They are accountable to the people of the Nation, who have sent them to Congress as their representatives. They cannot possibly evade their responsibility.

I am certain that the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that the Vice President of the United States has no constitutional responsibility, either of an executive or of a legislative nature, save through his membership on the Security Council. He, of course, cannot speak officially either for the Executive or the Congress, although many people will think he does so. He can speak only in his private capacity. He has no responsibility, while Members of the Senate have a great, a deep, responsibility to make decisions which the Senate and the Congress of the United States alone can make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my friend, the Senator from New York, that I am not criticizing the Vice President for having made the speech. That is my first point. From all I gather and from what I have heard, he gave a very responsible, considered, mature, and intelligent speech, in the sense that it was given in sober reflection and with careful consideration. I am sure that the Vice President was announcing administration policy, because apparently plenty of people in the administration knew of the speech. What is more, the Vice President is a member of the National Security Council.

I must say to the Senator from New York that I believe every elected official has a responsibility. I think I know what the Senator from New York means, that the Vice President is not an executive officer, so to speak, nor does he have a voice in the legislative chamber, save in a situation where there is a tie vote. However, I do not wish to have the Vice President excluded from all our deliberations. I wish to make it quite clear that I am not criticizing the fact that the Vice President made a speech, no matter what kind of speech it was. What I am saying now, and what I shall continue to say, is that when the committees of the Congress are given information by the executive officials of the Government, within a week, or at least within a reasonable period following the information, some administration spokesman gives a speech which goes far beyond the information which was given to committees of the Congress.

I recall, for example, the speech of Mr. Dulles to the Overseas Press Club, a very fine speech, and one which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] praised, and the junior Senator from Minnesota joined in praising. Again, I am not criticizing what was said in the speech. What I am saying, however, is that what was said in the speech was not said before a committee of the Congress; at least, it was not said before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I feel that if all we have to do is get information as to the security of this country from reading the newspapers, then we can easily conserve our time by doing away with some of the committee meetings. The truth is that we get a clearer statement of policy, or at least the latest development in policy, from the speeches of responsible public officials to public groups than we do from testimony before committees of the Congress. I say that is poor relations with the Congress. I say that in these critical days it is not a question of whether one is a Republican or a Democrat. We face the issue of peace or war. The issues before us relate to the security of the people of the United States and of the free world. In such a situation it is very important that there be the closest working relations between the Congress of the United States and the executive branch. It is not good enough to import such information only to a few chosen leaders of the Congress. One may not happen to agree with some of the leaders. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have one vote. I have the privilege of sitting in that committee by the will of the Senate. I feel I have a right, as a Member of this body, to know what the administration's policy is as well as the majority leader or any other Member of the Senate. I am not satisfied that the White House or the Defense Department or the State Department may call someone over for a noon lunch, a morning breakfast, or on a certain hour on Monday to see what the situation is. We have machinery in the Senate. We have a committee system, and certain committees of the Senate have certain responsibility for certain legislation and executive responsibility. It is to those committees that the information should be brought to the forefront.

I think there is entirely too much official information withheld from the public, and then given out to the public in a garbled fashion 2 or 3 days after it was first communicated in private.

Mr. President, if it was right for the American press to disclose to the American people that a highly authoritative source in this administration made a very significant speech, and then to reveal the nature of that speech; then it was right to have identified that source on the day of the publication; and, furthermore, to have printed the text of the speech.

As a Member of this body, I am going to insist that the text of the speech, which, by the way, is in the possession of newspaper editors and the State Department, be made available to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Senate of the United States.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator from Minnesota has expressed the thoughts of the Senator from New York, although in a somewhat different way. I have no objection to the distinguished Vice President speaking wherever or whenever he wishes or to speak to such groups as he wishes to address; but when he does that on a subject which affects not only the interest, but possibly the very survival of this country, I want to know for whom he is speaking. He should make that perfectly clear or state that he is speaking in his private capacity. I do not want simply to draw the inference that he is speaking for the President of the United States or for the Secretary of State. If he is speaking for the President of the United States, we should know that. If he is speaking for the Secretary of State, we should know that. We should not have, merely by implication, to form a judgment that he is speaking for the President of the United States. Later, a communique issued by the State Department, will say that the speech of the Vice President of the United States is not contrary to the policy of the State Department. That however does not show that he is

speaking for the President or that the State Department necessarily approves of his speech in detail. I feel very strongly that it is about time that the Senate of the United States and the people of the United States be taken into the confidence of our high executive officials. I repeat, the Senate of the United States has a very great responsibility in this and in all other matters affecting public policy of the United States.

Frankly, I do not have the least idea what the situation is in Indochina. I do not have the least idea what the situation is in other parts of the Far East and the Pacific, save as I may form a judgment from the little crumbs which come out from behind closed doors or in off-the-record speeches which may or may not have authoritative sponsors.

Last week at a public meeting I made a vigorous plea for bipartisanship, real bipartisanship, the kind of bipartisanship we had under President Roosevelt and under President Truman, when we had great Republicans in high positions, men like Stimson, Knox, Hoffman, Patterson, Lovett, and many others.

I also made a plea that the Senate of the United States, not only through 1 or 2 or 3 of its leaders, be made acquainted with situations of a critical character involving foreign policy, and be made familiar with those situations in a way that will enable Members to form a sound judgment. That has not been the case in the past, and there is no indication that it is going to be the case in the immediate future unless the Senate asserts itself.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for pointing that out so clearly and in demanding the Nixon speech be made available to the Members of the Senate. After all, it was made available several days ago to members of the press, even though on an off-the-record occasion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I have not been one of the Members of this body who has spent his time in criticizing the Secretary of State or the pronouncements of basic foreign policies of the President of the United States. I have unusual sympathy for the Secretary of State, if for no other reason that I remember, because of the abuse which his predecessor used to take. I have felt, in view of the way Mr. Acheson, the predecessor of Mr. Dulles, was abused, the least we could do in this body was to be kindly, considerate, and understanding of the Secretary of State. His job is a tremendous one. I can think of no more difficult one than to be Secretary of State to the President of the United States under present world conditions.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I suppose undoubtedly the sympathy the Senator feels for the predicament in which Secretary Dulles finds himself is due somewhat to the fact that all through the Acheson administration Mr. Dulles was one of his first lieutenants, his right arm, which helped implement a good many of the policies of the United Nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, and I thank the Senator from Oregon for his observation.

Mr. President, I feel that a few questions need to be asked. It is my intention later in the week to go in more detail into this matter. However, now that I have opened the discussion in reference to the foreign-policy statements of our Government, I should like to ask several questions.

First of all, did the administration mean it when its leading spokesmen said there would be no more peripheral wars, no more Korea? I recall that during the last year and one-half administration officials have made statement after statement to the effect that it was the policy of the administration not to have what we call struggles or wars on the periphery of the world—the Korea kind of struggles. If that is the policy of the administration, then how do we join with that policy of no involvement in peripheral struggles, the continuous flow of news from high administration sources that it may be necessary for the United States to enter, full scale, into the Indochina conflict? Those two statements simply do not match or jibe.

Another question I should like to ask is this: How does the doctrine of "massive retaliation" fit into the realities of the international situation, as we see it today? Is the theory of "massive retaliation" to be made a reality, in view of the Indochina problem? If there is to be "massive retaliation," upon whom is it to be made? If there is to be "massive retaliation" upon someone, how will it affect the problem in Indochina?

At this time I should like to point out that it appears to me that much of the confusion that seems to be prevalent in our own land, as well as in other areas of the world, is due to conflicting statements.

I think the dilemma of this administration in the field of foreign policy is a very serious one. On the one hand, there has been a long-term attack on the part of some Republican leaders—not on the part of all of them, thank God, but only on the part of some of them—against the so-called Acheson-Truman foreign policy. When the Republican administration came into power, it felt it had to do two things: First, pay lip service to the validity or alleged validity of the former attack on the so-called Acheson-Truman foreign policy; and, second, meet the problems of the day with actual, meaningful policies. Those two are in actual conflict.

Going back further, Mr. President, let me refer to the President's message to the joint session of Congress in 1953, when he said the 7th Fleet was to be removed from the Straits of Formosa, so as "to unleash" the Chinese Nationalist forces stationed on Formosa. Well, the forces were "unleashed," and no one has been bitten. So far as I know, the 7th Fleet is still in the Pacific. The statement simply did not jibe with the facts.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. For the sake of the historic record, let me point out that what the President did not tell us at that joint session, however, was that in the release of the 7th Fleet, he did not in fact release the Generalissimo's troops, because it was understood that the Generalissimo would not make any move without clearance on the part of our Government. But the President did not tell that to the American people. We had to worm out that information some weeks later. However, the fact is that when the 7th Fleet was so-called "released," it was not with the understanding that the so-called Generalissimo was free to do whatever he wished to do regarding attack on the mainland of China; but weeks later we found that he was not to be "unleashed" unless we unsnapped the hook from the collar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon; he is correct.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it seems to me that many statements by administration officials have been designed to meet the political situation in the United States and to placate and please some of the emotions of our people, but have not been designed to meet the realities of the international situation that plagues the world. In that connection I shall give documentation and examples.

I recall that in early 1953, the Secretary of State, along with the director of the then Mutual Security Administration, now the Foreign Operations Administration, took a tour in Western Europe. I recall that press dispatch after press dispatch came to the United States, noting that the Secretary of State and the Director of Mutual Security had told the French that if they did not ratify the EDC pact, foreign aid would be sharply curtailed or cut off. Even datelines were suggested—such as April 1 or May 1. However, every American knows that while those statements were printed in the press, that was not the official policy of our Government. It was headline news, but was not to be implemented by administration policy, because the same Secretary of State and the same Director of Mutual Security requested of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a rather substantial authorization for foreign aid and military assistance, and a large part of it was to go to the Republic of France.

I think we remember that not long ago the Secretary of State said that if the French did not take action upon the European Defense Community, it might be necessary to have an agonizing reappraisal of the whole Western European defense system and America's relationship to it. I would have the Senate note that only within the last weekend the President of the United States has not only indicated but has stated unequivocally that American troops will stay in Western Europe for an indefinite period of time. The agonizing reappraisal statement has been lost in the reality of the Presidential

statement about the commitment of American troops to Western Europe.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Minnesota will read very carefully the six points that were made in that statement, I think he will find that while the expression "indefinite term in Europe" is used in the news broadcasts, and so forth, that term is confined to an indefinite period within the terms of the NATO agreement; and the NATO agreement is not for an indefinite time or term, without a period for reappraisal and a definite termination date.

I would wish to check up on just what the date is, but the term is a number of years. If my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, will read those 4 or 5 paragraphs, I believe he will find that what I have just said is correct, because I myself was misled by the term "indefinite," as I read it in the press and as the representatives of the press stated it to us when they discussed the question with us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I am not criticizing the President for his previous statement. If I have any criticism, it has now been revealed in the Senator from Massachusetts understanding, or the possibility of misunderstanding, over what the President really meant. This is my point, Mr. President: It does not require any unusual effort for one to state what he means. It does not require any unusual effort to define "indefinite" or "definite." All I am asking is that we have a clearer definition of what our policy is, and what we intend to do.

I should like to point out further that too often statements are made which seem to please public opinion back home in the United States, or at least some sections of American public opinion, but only throw uncertainty, insecurity, and confusion into the development of a strong foreign policy with our allies. This is too much of a price to pay for political acceptance. Everyone knows that it is most difficult to be responsible in the field of foreign policy without endangering one's political popularity. Foreign policy is one of the most difficult assignments of an administration; and the administration which goes down in history as a great administration is one which is willing to run the risk of being unpopular in making great international decisions.

I think I am fair when I say that the American people and many of our allies have been led to believe that the day of any involvement in localized peripheral struggles was over. We have been led to believe such by statements from as high sources as the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. I repeat that the recent statements of the Vice President of the United States and of the rumors which run rampant in this Chamber by reason of conferences with leaders, indicate that our Government is giving serious concern to the necessity, or at least the feeling of necessity, for more American involvement in Indochina with armed forces.

Let us see what the situation is so far as we know it. There is no problem of manpower in Indochina. The allied forces, the French and the Associated States forces, are over 500,000. The Communist forces are approximately 250,000, in round numbers. There is no manpower problem.

So far as military equipment is concerned, the allied forces, the French and the Associated States, have all the air forces. The Communists have none.

The French have the naval forces. The Communists have none.

So far as supplies are concerned, I want the RECORD to report here that our Government has made available $1,200,000,000 worth of economic and military assistance to Indochina in the past year. We are going to make as much or more available during the coming year. The junior Senator from Minnesota has supported such appropriations.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude this comment. So far as the junior Senator from Minnesota can see, the military factors, such as supplies, airpower, naval power, and manpower are concerned, all are decidedly in favor of the Associated States and France.

What is the problem? Apparently the problem is twofold. First, what is the objective for which the native population would fight?

Second, as a supplement to that question, there is the question of the will to fight for the objective, coupled with effective leadership.

It is my view, at this stage of the proceedings concerning the war in Indochina, that the sending of American manpower into Indochina would not remedy these two problems or weaknesses, namely, the lack of an objective for which the natives would be willing to fight in the hope of its fulfillment, and, secondly, the lack of political leadership among the native population associated with the French—leadership which would give them the kind of direction which they need for this struggle.

In connection with Korea, regardless of what one may think of Syngman Rhee, he is a vigorous leader, with 50 years of militant leadership for the freedom of his people. One of the real problems in Indochina today is that there is no one associated with the allied or free side who is identified in that manner with the aspirations for freedom of the Indochinese people. I must say that Bao Dai, the Emperor and Chief of State of Vietnam, has exemplified great qualities of courage. But let us face up to it. For a long period of time—at least up until recent months—he has been clearly identified all too often in the minds of the Vietnamese as having been a French puppet. While this may not be true, no amount of military manpower from this country could remedy that situation.

Finally, before this Nation of ours even as much as talks about committing American forces in Indochina, I suggest that the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, or the President of the United States announce to the world what our policy toward Indochina is. Are we for a free Indochina or are we not? We do not need any equivocation on that score. Our leaders have had the courage to talk about the possibility of sending American men into Indochina. Surely if we have that much courage, and if the situation is that grave, if it requires that kind of dramatic performance on the part of our Government, the least our Government should say to the world, and particularly to the people of Indochina, is what we believe to be the legitimate objective of the struggle, namely freedom and independence. What is the objective of the struggle? Is it only to see whether or not the Communist troops in Indochina can be defeated? No, Mr. President. That is only a part of it. I hope the objective of any struggle in Indochina is the right of the people of Indochina to work out their own destiny in the area of freedom.

If we, as Americans, are not willing to make that statement, any troops which our country sends into Indochina will be looked upon only as replacements for the French. We will be taking up the decadent colonialism of the French and replacing it with the virile strength of young Americans, and we will be hated for it.

America must make its position clear. Let us face up to it now. We must stand for freedom and self-determination.

As one United States Senator, before I agree to any motion or resolution for any further involvement of our country in Indochina, I want it made perfectly plain that the Government of the United States has spoken clearly and unequivocally and forcefully to the French Government with reference to our views about the political independence of Indochina.

Secondly, I want it made clear that we have seen to it that the French Government has taken every measure within its capability for the training of native manpower in Indochina.

The record should be absolutely clear that there is not one French conscriptee in Indochina today. Every Frenchman in Indochina today is either an officer, or a member of the French Foreign Legion or of French colonial troops.

Before the United States goes into any military operation in Indochina the moral position of our country must be made clear. Our moral position in this struggle may be of crucial importance, because we will be watched. Let me make it crystal clear that I know Indochina is important. I know that everything the President has said and everything the Vice President has said about its importance is just as true as anything can be. To lose Indochina to the Communists may be to lose all of southeast Asia. It is unthinkable. It cannot happen. It will not happen.

However, Mr. President, let us not forget that in all of southeast Asia there is one spirit which is prevalent everywhere. It is the spirit of nationalism, of independence, the right of those people to stand on their own feet.

It will not do any good for a well-fed, educated, sophisticated American to say that those people are not ready for inde-

pendence. Those people are not asking for such advice. They say they are ready for independence.

King George III did not think we were ready for independence. So far as I have been able to find out, no member of the British Cabinet in 1776 thought that we were ready for independence.

The United States of America has been among the first to recognize the independence of the new-born nations in the world. We were one of the first powers to recognize the independence of the Latin American and South American countries when they broke from Spain. We were the first nation to recognize the independence of Israel. We were among the first nations to recognize the independence of Indonesia.

During World War II we made a policy statement with regard to the independence of India, at a time when Great Britain was our wartime ally.

When I hear Americans say that we must be careful and cautious in this situation and must consider the wants and wishes of the French, I am reminded that in the midst of the struggle during World War II, when Winston Churchill said he had not become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, our Government made its position clearly known to the people of India with reference to where we stood on the subject of a free and independent India.

These are some of the things that I believe need to be done. We are committing our supplies and our materiel to Indochina, and we must continue to do so. We may commit skilled manpower to work with the French in the troop-training program. We will do whatever is required. I am certain that Congress will do whatever is required provided it has the facts and its questions are answered.

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

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say, in response to my friend from Minnesota, that within 15 or 20 minutes, or perhaps a half hour ago, I talked with the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, with relation to sending our men into Indochina. I had talked with him previously this morning. He said he wanted to be absolutely certain of what he said. This afternoon he told me, after checking into the subject, that there was no change in the policy, so far as the Defense Department was concerned, of sending men into Indochina. He said that there were approximately 200, more or less, maintenance men in Indochina; that a few of them had been withdrawn and others sent in; that some Navy planes had gone in there, as the Senator and I read in the newspapers; and that there may be a few maintenance men there who are required to help on those planes. Secretary Wilson said that outside those maintenance men, which he hoped to get out as soon as he could, there had been no change in policy, and that the men who were in Indochina were there for maintenance purposes.

Since the Senator has been speaking I have talked with the legislative contact of the Senate in the State Department, Mr. Thruston Morton. He has assured me that, to the best of his knowledge, there has been no change in the policy of the Department of State at the present time with relation to Indochina.

I say that to the Senator from Minnesota because I have tried to get the responsible officials to give me, and I hope through me to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the facts as they are at the moment, so far as the policy with relation to Indochina and the sending of men there is concerned.

As an individual Senator, on no authority except my own, I would say that when the Senator makes the statement that if we send men there after the French leave, or to replace the French, we must make very clear what our policy is when and if we send men in there. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota on that point. I will say also that I am confident, from what Mr. Morton has said to me and from what I know, and certainly from what I would expect, that if there is any fundamental change, the Committee on Foreign Relations and I hope the Committee on Armed Services, if it is a question of defense and manpower, will be fully advised of any broad change in policy.

I make those statements to the Senator from Minnesota because on February 8, of this year, as reported at page 1506 of the RECORD. I made the statement that I had talked with Mr. Wilson again on that afternoon, and that he had assured me then that there were about 200 maintenance men in Indochina, and that he hoped to have them out of Indochina by June 12. Whether that date is lived up to or not, remains to be seen.

Certainly the policy with reference to maintenance men, who maintain our planes which are operated by the French, so far as Mr. Wilson knows, and so far as Mr. Morton knows, as they told me over the telephone this afternoon, is still the policy.

I trust that my statement will be helpful to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I am sure the Senator knows that I have the highest regard for his ability and experience and integrity and leadership in the Senate.

As the Senator from Massachusetts knows, I have not been a critic of the administration for having sent the planes and technicians to Indochina. I believe the administration did what it had to do under the circumstances. I believe the administration and the President and the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State did what the circumstances required to be done. I am not critical of the administration for the fine support they have given to the French and Associated States of Indochina. I know that the President of the United States has a problem which is grave, serious, and terribly difficult. He has my prayers and trust.

All I am saying is that it is really quite unfortunate that there seems to be this confusion as to just what our policy is. For instance, the Secretary of State called for a united front against Communist aggression in southeast Asia. He called upon the British and the French, and he wanted a statement on the united front before the conference at Geneva. I think it is fair to say now, Mr. President, that the best the Secretary of State has been able to obtain has been a polite statement from Mr. Eden, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Great Britain, and Mr. Bidault, Minister of Foreign Affairs in France, that they will consult. There is not going to be any united front before the conference at Geneva.

All I am saying is that the public imagination is whipped up too much, and hopes are aroused beyond what can be realized. The publicized statements are not supported by results.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senator from Minnesota has rendered a great service through the speech he has made on the Indochina issue. I want to congratulate him upon his statement even before he completes it. I think the Senator has succeeded in smoking out the administration, because we have assurances from the Department of Defense and the State Department that there is certainly not, as of now, any plan for military intervention in Indochina. I think the Senator has done very well in calling attention to the fact that the administration is still not of one mind, because it is a little difficult to reconcile the report made to us by the Senator from Massachusetts with the Vice President's speech, and it is difficult to reconcile some other statements with some of the facts we have been getting in recent weeks.

The fact is that the administration has not been consulting with Members of the Senate. We have not, as the Senator from Minnesota pointed out, had a true bipartisan foreign policy, and until we get such a policy, I hope other Senators will join with the Senator from Minnesota in continuing to do what can be done to smoke out the administration and make them take a position which the American people can understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was interested in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, but it seems to me that his words merely underscore the things we have been discussing this afternoon. They simply emphasize the very regrettable confusion which has been built up on the whole question of Indochina and the Far East, because of speeches made off the record and without being accredited to anyone in responsible control of the situation. They have caused confusion, fright, and distrust in the minds of the people of this country and of people abroad, our allies. We still do not know who is speaking for this Nation in matters of foreign policy. Is it the President? Is it the Secretary of State? Is it the Vice President? Is it the Secretary of Defense? Is it some Assistant Secretary in the State Department? We do not know.

But statements are made under the cloak of anonymity and, nonetheless, are given wide circulation which causes confusion and fright in the minds of the people.

It is something which, it seems to me, has been brought out very clearly by the Senator from Minnesota and, as a matter of fact, as I have before stated, it has been underscored by the statement made a few minutes ago by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, following the commendation of my activities by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I wish to complete my statement to the Senate this afternoon by saying just a few words concerning the Emergency Refugee Immigration Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

DELAY IN ADMITTING REFUGEES UNDER THE EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is time that the United States Senate took note of the fact that the will of the Congress is being ignored by the State Department and its representatives in connection with the emergency immigration bill which the Congress passed last July 1953. The bill called for the permanent admission for 214,000 additional refugees during a 3-year period. When President Eisenhower signed the bill he described it as "a significant humanitarian act and an important contribution toward greater understanding and cooperation among the free nations of the world." The President also explained his hope that the refugees would be arriving in the United States without unnecessary delay and would "soon come to our shores."

It is more than 8 months since the emergency immigration bill became law. To date, according to the most recent information I have been able to obtain, only 6 or 7 refugees have been admitted to our shores. This is a tragedy. It is a reflection of a lack of sympathy for the basic legislation on the part of those in the State Department who are responsible for the administration of the program.

This is a tragedy. It was intended to be a significant humanitarian act to aid refugees from communism—people seeking political liberty and religious freedom. Most of these refugees asking asylum from Communist tyranny and a new chance in life are freedom-loving Germans, Poles, or Czechs, many of them with families in this country they want to join. Others include orphans for whom relatives in our country want to offer a home and a hope. Failure to carry out the intent of the Congress to admit them is a reflection of the lack of sympathy for this legislation on the part of those in the State Department who are responsible for administration of the program.

The facts, the national interests and the humanitarian motivations which lead the Congress and the President to pass the emergency immigration bill last year are still present today. No appointed public official acting as the servant of Government has the right to ignore the will of the Congress and the President as expressed in law. No American is more eager than I to rid our Nation of subversives and to keep undesirable aliens from the United States. Members of the Senate will recall that I was one of those in the Senate who protested vigorously against the loose administration of our immigration practices along the Mexican border because of the threat to our security evidenced by the freedom of egress and ingress over the Mexican border into the United States. I expressed my fear that the border to our south was in fact an open invitation for subversives to enter our Nation and do their dirty business. It is, however, a total error and a dangerously misleading assumption to view every alien as a potential enemy and every immigrant as a potential spy.

It would appear as if the State Department through its security officer who was unfortunately placed in charge of the refugee program has exploited its fear of new immigrants into the United States as a device to prevent hardly any refugees from entering the United States during the first year of the administration of the program.

I serve notice to the Senate that unless we can receive assurance shortly from the State Department that it plans to take seriously the wishes of the Congress and conscientiously administered the emergency refugee bill so that we can in an orderly and sympathetic way admit the 214,000 refugees authorized by law, I shall ask for the Senate to take whatever proper legislative and investigative steps that are necessary to see that the program is better administered.

The President has recently stated that he hopes the logjam which has tied up the bill to date will soon be broken. I join with him in that wish. We need not only be wishful, however. The President has the authority to act to correct the administrative chaos. I ask him to do so now.

Mr. President, the State Department has already commented upon this statement of mine which was released to the press.

I have in my hand an Associated Press dispatch which reads as follows:

A State Department spokesman told a reporter there were a variety of reasons for the slow start.

One of the main reasons why refugees have been admitted under the act, the spokesman said, is that only relatively few American sponsors so far have complied with the necessary assurances and regulations.

These include assurances that the admitted person will be housed, employed, and cared for.

He said, for instance, that so far only 415 American sponsors have completed the forms and given assurances that a similar number of German refugees will be cared for if brought in.

In the same way, he said, only 147 assurances have been received for Austrians, 240 for Italians, and 1,800 for Greeks.

The spokesman also said that only recently did West Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands agree to participate in the program.

"These are time-consuming operations," the spokesman said.

That is what the State Department has to say.

What are the facts? The facts are that the gentleman in charge of this program did not even have the regulations prepared as late as December 1953.

I have received a letter from the State Department about this very matter. I wrote to the State Department and asked what steps were being taken to expedite action under the terms of the program. As late as the middle of December 1953, despite the fact that the bill had been made public law on August 1, 1953, the rules and regulations had not been completed by the State Department, so as to enable the countries which were to participate to have their programs ready to operate.

The reason there are so few assurances on the part of Americans who would provide homes and employment for the refugees is that only now have the regulations been written.

By the way, there are almost 2,000 assurances already completed, and only 6 or 7 refugees have come to the United States. I wish to make it quite clear that these are not simply what might be called any old refugees. These are persons who left East Germany when the Communists took over that country; persons who were driven out of Poland when the Communists took over Poland; persons who left Czechoslovakia and have been interned, so to speak, in camps in West Germany. They are freedom-loving, devoted, democratic, patriotic people.

It was the wish of the President, a year ago, that this program be acted upon by Congress. It was the will of Congress that the program be effectively and efficiently administered. I think it is fair to say now that the program has been gathering dust in the State Department, under the general jurisdiction of the security officer of the State Department, who found plenty of time to make Lincoln Day speeches, but did not have enough time to work on the refugee program.

I might suggest to the security officer that if he would attend to his business in the State Department and not engage in traveling around the country making political speeches, perhaps we would get along with the program he is supposed to administer.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Minnesota realizes, because he was as active as I was in the fight for humane, fair, and just immigration, that under the act, 209,000 immigrants are supposed to be admitted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And 5,000 orphans.

Mr. LEHMAN. And 5,000 orphans. They are to be admitted within a period of 3 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. But not less than 15,000 are to be admitted within the current year up to June 30. As the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, only 7, 8, or 9 persons have been admitted; not 1,000, not 2,000, not 15,000, not 60,000, as it had been hoped would be admitted.

As the Senator has pointed out, there are many difficulties, and among them is the fact that the regulations were not prepared and issued until very recently. Then, when they were issued, they were so harsh and so technical in character that I can assure the Senator that very few immigrants will be able to enter within any measurable time. In many cases, the regulations are enmeshed in the evils and the prohibitions of the McCarran-Walter Act, and until those difficulties are ironed out, as they must be ironed out, it will never be possible to have the temporary or emergency refugee act work to the extent that it was hoped it would operate.

But certainly it could work 10 times, yes 100 times, more rapidly than it has so far, if there were a will to make it work. There has been no will, there has been no determination. I do not believe there has been any real sympathy with the efforts of Members of Congress and of many millions of American citizens to make it possible for decent, freedom-loving, honest, loyal, thrifty people in reasonable numbers to leave the countries in which they have been harassed, particularly those behind the Iron Curtain, and to seek a new life in this country of ours.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from New York. I shall merely add that if there were as much will to administer the program as there was to have the bill passed, the program would be underway very shortly. I think we all recall the lengthy hearings held by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and the many compromises it was necessary to provide, in order to report the bill to the Senate and to make it acceptable to certain key Senators, and also to the majority of the Senators. I think all of us recall the great jubilation and sincere happiness which was felt when the bill was finally passed, because we all knew of the great suffering on the part of many of the refugees.

I have made this speech because I thought possibly it might have a stimulating effect in arousing the responsible administrator into more positive and, I may say, effective action.

THE HOUSING PROGRAM

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech:

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me provided he does not lose the floor, and provided my remarks follow his?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield under those conditions.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. President, this morning there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald an editorial entitled "Threat to Urban Renewal." I shall not read the entire editorial. I read a brief excerpt from it.

> The fact that weaknesses have been uncovered in FHA methods does not make the FHA any less essential within the framework of our national economic and social policy.

I think Members of the Senate realize the necessity of the housing program. Furthermore, I know that Members of the Senate desire to have a housing program in which there can be no repetition of the scandals which have occurred under certain titles of the program.

My purpose in placing this editorial in the RECORD is to call the attention of the people generaly not only to the particular section of the law to which reference has been made, but also to some of the provisions in the House bill which are referred to in the editorial as "jokers" in connection with slum clearance and public housing.

As one who has always supported public housing, let me say that as of the present moment I have heard of no scandals under that title of the Housing bill of 1949, such as we have heard about in connection with some of the other titles.

Mr. President, I hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will be able to write a bill which will leave no room for revision, and leave no room for some of the rather bad practices which have been uncovered in recent years.

In the interest of the buildings trades unions, and in the interest of good builders and good bankers, I hope they can be protected against the few who, for their own personal aggrandizement and greed, would destroy the program by misuse of Federal funds and by estimates of building costs which are not in keeping with the facts.

In conclusion, the chairman of the committee [Mr. CAPEHART] is doing an excellent job in investigating all the reasons and causes so that we may write a housing law that will be a credit to the Congress and all segments of the building industry. It is for this reason also that the committee has requested appropriations to enable it thoroughly to study and review all the titles of previous housing legislation and the housing bill now before the committee.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

THREAT TO URBAN RENEWAL

Scrutiny of the legislation under which the National Housing Administration has operated has become a must for Congress. If builders of large-scale rental projects were able to reap $500 million in windfall profits between 1942 and 1950, that portion of the law as well as its administration must have been defective. And the more recent abuses in connection with FHA-insured home-repair loans further suggest that the law itself needs tightening up. Certainly this chore ought to be attended to while Congress is passing a comprehensive new housing law.

While Chairman CAPEHART and the Senate Banking Committee are examining the law from this point of view, however, care will be needed to prevent extremists from using the abuses that have come to light to destroy the administration's housing program. The fact that weaknesses have been uncovered in FHA methods does not make the FHA any less essential within the framework of our national economic and social policy. The country still needs a mortgage loan insurance system, an FHA free from defects of the type that led to the present investigation.

The Senate Banking Committee also ought to give attention to the jokers that the House wrote into the administration's housing bill. One of these would forbid the use of Federal funds for redevelopment grants involving projects "for predominantly residential uses where incidental uses are not restricted to those normally essential for residential uses." This language is said to have been aimed at a coliseum that New York wants to build in a redeveloped area at Columbus Circle. Regardless of the merits or demerits of that project, the language of the amendment is broad enough to stop the redevelopment of southwest Washington and many other slum areas.

It is a gross mistake to assume that all slum properties cleared should be redeveloped for residential use. Some reclaimed slums must properly give way to schools, recreation areas, streets, office buildings, and so forth. The new use of the land should be governed by a comprehensive city plan that has been accepted as an expression of the community's best interest. In many cases the best interests of the slum dwellers themselves demand that they move elsewhere when a decayed area is redeveloped.

Washington has a special interest in seeing that this restrictive language does not stay in the housing bill. In all probability it would block the redevelopment of the southwest area as now visualized by planning officials and the Redevelopment Land Agency. We do not think that Congress would knowingly strike such a blow at "urban renewal" in Washington, but it could indirectly do so unless this provision is dropped.

The committee should also insist that enough public housing be authorized to make slum reclamation feasible. As Administrator Cole, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, said in a recent speech, people must have some place to go "when we come to pull the roof down over their heads." The House ignored this basic factor in the redevelopment equation. Unless the Senate insists that a modest public housing program continue in an orderly fashion, the entire fight against the slums may be lost.

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because of the time factor involved in connection with the issues he will discuss this afternoon, the representative of the Independent Party will make his report this week at this time. I have selected this time for other reasons, too. It would cause the greatest inconvenience to my colleagues in the Senate to make my report tonight. Of course, the situation involving absentees in the Senate today illustrates what I have pointed out so many times, namely, that one of the undesirable features of unanimous consent agreements to limit debate and vote as of a certain day has a decided effect upon the attendance in the Senate. That is why, as a matter of general policy, I think such agreements are unwise and are not conducive to efficiency in the Senate. But, be that as it may, I am very happy to speak for the RECORD today on three items which I propose to discuss very briefly.

POWER DEVELOPMENT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

The first item I propose to discuss deals with a great power problem in the Pacific Northwest.

The Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself, are submitting an amendment to H. R. 8367, the Army civil-functions appropriations bill for

1955 which would, first, provide sufficient funds to keep the Dalles and Chief Joseph Dams on schedule; second, provide for new starts on Ice Harbor Dam, Wash., and John Day Dam, Oreg.-Wash.

We wish to call attention to the fact that the President's budget would require a year's delay in the schedule of the Dalles and Chief Joseph Dams. The civil works appropriation bill as passed by the House did not remedy this situation. The proposed amendments would provide an additional $16 million for the Dalles and $3 million for Chief Joseph.

The Eisenhower budget and House-passed bills make no provision for new multipurpose dam starts in the Pacific Northwest.

John Day Dam, already authorized, is potentially one of the greatest electric-power producers in the Columbia Basin system. It is capable of generating 659,000 kilowatts. Ice Harbor, also authorized in the past, would produce 139,000 kilowatts. If a high Hells Canyon Dam is constructed the power output of these projects would be increased by 56,000 kilowatts and 65,000 kilowatts, respectively.

Our amendment would increase construction funds from $278,777,000 to $303,777,000.

Construction of Ice Harbor could be undertaken as soon as funds are made available. Only $700,000 is being asked for John Day Dam so as to complete planning and design. Substantial preliminary work must be completed on this project before actual construction would be possible. We said when we announced our amendments last week, "the fact that work remains to be done before construction of John Day Dam could be begun makes it imperative that funds be appropriated now to get the project in shape."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the amendment which we are offering to H. R. 8367.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE, for himself and other Senators, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 3, line 22, strike out "$278,777,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$303,777,000, of which the amounts hereafter specified shall be available for expenditure only for prosecution of the projects hereafter specified, as follows: $700,000, John Day project; $3,500,000, Ice Harbor project; $3,000,000, Chief Joseph project; and $16,000,000, The Dalles project."

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 8377

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now desire to speak with reference to the proposed amendments to H. R. 8377.

It is not sufficient to make appropriations for these projects. Authorizations for Columbia River Basin projects would be all but exhausted by the amounts in the House appropriation bill. We therefore are submitting an amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1950 to increase authorization for basin projects by $25 million, to be distributed as follows:

The Dalles	$16,000,000
Chief Joseph	3,000,000
Ice Harbor (new start)	3,500,000
John Day (new start)	700,000
General (for smaller projects)	1,800,000

The House has passed H. R. 8377, authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes, but it is limited to The Dalles. We urge prompt and favorable consideration by the Appropriations and Public Works Committees. Our area needs the power and the continuation of stream development on a regional, integrated basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H. R. 8377, intended to be proposed by Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, and myself.

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

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That paragraph (b) under the title 'Columbia River Basin' in section 204 of the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, as amended by Public Law 75, 83d Congress, approved June 22, 1953, is hereby further amended by striking out '$150,000,000' and substituting in lieu thereof $175,000,000."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in announcing our amendments last Friday, the sponsors of these amendments had something to say about the Libby Dam. It is unfortunate that Libby Dam in Montana is not ready for immediate construction. Its great storage capacity would mean additional power for downstream dams. We urge the administration and the International Boundary Commission to reach agreement with Canada so that this necessary project can be begun at the earliest possible moment.

We repeat that today the Columbia Basin needs new storage for power and flood control.

Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments which we are offering to the two bills already discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, appropriately referred, and printed.

The amendments submitted by Mr. MORSE were received, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in closing my discussion of this subject, I invite the attention of Senators to a very interesting news item appearing in Seattle Business of April 14, 1954, under the headline, "Chamber Trustees Adopt Hydro Power Policy—Recommendations Urge Regional Control for Area Power Facilities." It reads as follows:

Moving to forestall a power shortage so serious that it could cripple prospects for Washington's industrial growth by 1960, the chamber's board of trustee's last week adopted a power policy designed to assure adequate hydroelectric facilities for the future.

The board's action took the form of approval of a series of recommendations previously subjected to intense study by the State development division, of which George M. Dean is chairman.

Two basic policies were stressed as vital to the future development of power facilities, namely:

1. The Federal Government should dispose of all its present power facilities in the Pacific Northwest by selling them at their fair value to a non-Federal publicly owned entity or entities.

2. That the Federal Government recognize the right of Pacific Northwest States to control use of the waters of rivers of the area.

Mr. President, let me tell the Senate one of the things that concerns many of us who have been fighting for years past for the development of the maximum potential resources of the rivers of the Pacific Northwest, and of the entire country, for that matter. Under this administration we are going through a period in which there is a stalling on new starts. In my judgment, the administration is playing the game of going slow on the development of our resources in the Pacific Northwest, the development of which is sorely needed to meet the economic needs of our area, in the hope that such tactics will discourage a good many of the advocates who believe that such resources should be developed for the benefit of the people and not for the benefit of private utility monopolies.

Mr. President, there is a growing indication that such is the strategy of this administration under the so-called Eisenhower-McKay team. There is a policy which they have called "partnership," but which, for the most part, plays directly into the hands of the private utilities.

Therefore, I wish to say to such chambers of commerce as the Seattle Chambers of Commerce, whose statement I have read, that I do not think the people of the Pacific Northwest are going to be fooled for very long, if any considerable number are being fooled at the present time, as to where their interests lie. Their interests are not to be found in any phony program that proposes to turn over to private utilities these great public resources. Their interests are not to be found in an argument which proposes that we sell the people's capital assets in great public-power dams to private monopolies, which, in turn, can force the people to pay to them a contribution or a tribute in the form of high rates.

I am a little disappointed that a considerable number of businessmen in the States of Washington and Oregon have not been able to see, before it is too late, the handwriting on the wall, and fail to realize that what they really are doing is selling short the best, long-term economic interests of the Pacific Northwest, by going along with the proposals of Eisenhower and McKay to turn over to private industry these great public-utility projects.

Of course, we are going to fight that. The line on which we are going to fight it, Mr. President, will be the political line in the elections immediately ahead, in 1954, and 1956.

From the desk at which I stand today, I wish to tell the people of the State of Washington, as well as the people of the State of Oregon, that they are going to have to come to grips with the question of whether they will fall for some slight benefit which this administration may promise them, by way of some small project to be started now, provided they sell their birthright to the development of the natural resources of the streams of the Pacific Northwest for the benefit of all the people of that area.

In the 1954 and 1956 elections, we shall have to carry this fight to the people of the Pacific Northwest. Today, I say to them that if they follow the Eisenhower-McKay line in regard to the development of the resources of those streams, they will be giving away the heritage of future generations of American boys and girls for centuries to come, under a scheme whereby the tentacles of private monopoly will fasten onto the great natural resources which do not belong to Eisenhower or McKay or the Republican Party, but belong to the present generations of Americans and to many generations of Americans yet unborn.

Here, once again, we see the issue drawn. The Senators from Washington, the junior Senator from Oregon, and the Senators from Montana are proposing today, by means of the amendments they intend to offer, some projects, by way of new starts, that will make very clear where this administration stands, so far as protecting the public interest is concerned. With the economic conditions in the Pacific Northwest being what they are, and with the shortage of power being what it is, if the administration is for the public interest, then it will proceed to recommend new starts. If it is for the private utilities, the administration will continue with the delaying, stalling game it has been playing ever since Eisenhower came into office, a game which seeks to give to the private utilities the wealth of the people of the Pacific Northwest in our electric-power resources.

Mr. President, I desire to turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE INDOCHINA SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next issue I wish to raise this afternoon has been so adequately covered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in the very able speech he made on the Indochina issue, that I do not care to add much to what he has said. As I pointed out last week, on the floor of the Senate, and also on Saturday night, in Muskegon, Mich., I think the time has come when the administration must give the American people the facts, as it understands them, in regard to the Indochina situation. The administration should no longer talk to the American people in terms of trial balloons, even when the trial balloon is sent up by the Vice President of the United States in a speech to the Nation's editors. As the Senator from Minnesota pointed out this afternoon, the people of the United States are entitled to have the administration proceed on a bipartisan basis to take the elected representatives of the people into its confidence and give them the information—in an executive session of Congress, if necessary—they should have in order to reach a sound judgment in regard to the Indochina matter.

Mr. President, certainly the first promise that should be made to the world is that we are not going to proceed to support French colonialism in Indochina, but that if we go into Indochina, we shall do so on the basis of the historic American principle of protecting the right of self-determination on the part of weaker peoples. They must be guaranteed the right to determine their own destiny. Therefore, we must make very clear that whatever action we may take with respect to Indochina will be in conformity with the principle of all-out independence for the Indochinese, because we do not know what the position of the natives of Indochina would be if they simply had to make a choice between domination by the United States and domination by the French. On the other hand, for us to stand shoulder to shoulder with them, as freemen, against the onrush of Russian communism, will lend validity and strength to our position. There again, Mr. President, there arise a great many problems of strategy about which we must have some information, before we go into Indochina on any basis of military intervention.

I am disturbed by the reports we receive that if we were to pursue a course of military intervention in Indochina, and if the result were to be the beginning of an all-out, third world war, Indochina is not where such a war would be fought, anyway; and that there would be a serious question as to whether we could get our troops out of Indochina, once we sent them there.

As one of my colleagues said last week, in speaking on the floor of the Senate, we would not even have the facilities for a Dunkirk or a Pusan; we would not have sufficient terminal facilities to make it possible for our troops to get out of Indochina, if we once sent them there, and if an all-out war with Russia were to commence. So, Mr. President, we should move cautiously.

Of course, it is very nice to obtain assurances, this afternoon, from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, via the Pentagon and the State Department. But they are not enough for me, in answer to the problems outlined by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in his speech in the Senate this afternoon, and well known to every Member of the Senate.

So I believe it is time for the administration, on a bipartisan basis, to sit down, first, with the congressional committees; and then, as I suggested several days ago, in executive session with the entire Congress, because the present times are such that if we ever get into another war it will be without a declaration of war; and, although the executive branch of our Government, has, in the first instance, the responsibility of determining the foreign policy, we of the legislative branch also have the important function of checking on foreign policy matters with the administration whenever we find the administration following a course of action that is not in the public interest.

So, Mr. President, I wish to say that an announcement from the State Department and from the Department of Defense will not allay the fears of the American people tonight, because they want to know, first, whether it is necessary for our forces to go into Indochina; and, second, what will be accomplished if our forces do go there.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for what he has said about Indochina and the necessity for our stating, in advance, that we must insist that the native people of Indochina have their liberty and freedom.

Does not the Senator from Oregon also agree that if we should have to send our forces into Indochina—and, of course, we pray that will not be necessary—it should be well understood that there will be no limitation on the weapons and materials they will use in the fight in Indochina, and that they will use everything it is within our power to supply, so that we shall know we will win, and that we will not fight what is called a quantitative war, when we have been preparing for a qualitative defense?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my reply is that after 8 years of service on the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, I would not report, in speaking this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, a curbstone opinion in regard to what our military strategy should be. When I was a member of the Armed Services Committee, sometimes I would be at a complete loss to understand why we were following certain strategy that did not seem to me to make sense; but we of the committee would go into executive session with the Chiefs of Staff, who would confer with us and, figuratively, would take us by the hand through some of the intricate problems of military strategy, and would demonstrate to me very clearly that I would have been dead wrong if we had decided it was sound to follow a certain course of military strategy.

So I shall not give a curbstone opinion; but I say that if our forces go into Indochina, there will be only one justification for doing so—assuming that the facts support our going in—and that will be to protect freedom in Asia from going behind the Iron Curtain. That is true because, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has pointed out earlier this afternoon, although it is very easy for us to sit in Washington or anywhere else in the United States and assume that nothing that can happen to southeast Asia will affect us, yet the fact is that many things that can happen in southeast Asia can, in terms of history, affect the freedom of the United States. That is true because we must think in terms of historic perspective; we must recognize that great forces that have been let loose in the world will continue to play, I believe, upon operative facts for centuries to come. We need to keep in mind the fact that we of Western civilization constitute, after all, a rather small minority of the world's population, and that our land is a rather small portion of the world's total geographical area. So, just as our Founding Fathers thought in terms of history, we also must think about American boys and girls who will live many hundreds of years from now.

In this contest between freedom, on the one hand, and communism, on the other, it is possible for us to permit to be

let loose in the world certain forces that will put a large segment of the world in chains, so far as freedom is concerned, with the final result that future generations of boys and girls may find themselves in chains.

So I wish to make very clear that if we enter the struggle, and do so for the purpose of protecting freedom, and if that leads to a third world war, we must give them everything we have.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to discuss another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

SENATE COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last topic I wish to discuss—and my remarks on it will be brief—is Senate committee procedure. It is particularly pertinent that I discuss Senate committee procedure tonight, Mr. President, when one Senate committee is involved in the so-called McCarthy-Army row, which is about to proceed to its hearings.

The whole situation disturbs me. It disturbs me because I think fair procedure and sound procedure should exist in the Senate of the United States, as well as anywhere else in the country, in any governmental agency or body. So many times I have been heard to argue on the floor of the Senate in support of that principle, that one would think it would be so obvious that we would not have to argue any longer for it. However, it is quite obvious that we must still argue for it, because no legislative action has been taken to protect it. Of course that principle is that the substantive rights of witnesses before congressional committee hearings can be no better than their procedural rights.

Mr. President, this matter has some amusing angles. I say most respectfully and very good naturedly that it is one thing for us to rather blind ourselves to what happens, insofar as their procedural rights are concerned, to fellow Americans who appear before congressional committees. But when some of our colleagues become involved or when the staff of some of our own committees becomes involved, right away there is a clamor in the Senate to have some special procedures that will protect them, although we did not seem to be very much interested in protecting the same kind of interests on the part of other persons who were the victims of congressional committees that were under the direction of some of the same Senators or some of the same staff members.

So here we are, face to face with certain procedural principles which I wish to discuss in the RECORD this afternoon by way of refreshing our own memories and our own knowledge of what is fair play. The question is pretty basic. How many speeches have I heard on the floor of the Senate on this point in the 9 years I have been a Member of the Senate? How many times have I seen Senators rise on the floor of the Senate and, with oratorical eloquence, protest against some bill or some particular appropriation which would have the effect of making some Government agency or official the judge, jury, and prosecutor all in one? That is a good argument. Whenever the facts support it, we should prevent such an abuse of discretion. We ought to adopt whatever amendment is necessary to prevent anyone from being judge, prosecutor, and jury at the same time.

Yet somehow I cannot escape the fact that in the whole McCarthy-Army row we have a rather strange situation so far as the committee is concerned. I speak now very respectfully of members of the committee—at least in relation to their responsibilities on the committee.

It is not a question of McCARTHY and Cohn, or other staff members, who are involved in this matter. I am talking about one of the children of the Senate, a Senate committee. We all have responsibilities in connection with what our committees do. The committee also has some responsibilities. All members of the McCarthy committee have responsibilities, too. I wish to say most respectfully that I think we are in this difficulty in part because, for too long a time and on too many occasions this committee has functioned as a one-man committee. Let the record speak for itself. Too many times, in my judgment, the Senator from Wisconsin was allowed to conduct hearings all alone in various parts of the United States. Sometimes one got the impression, from reading the newspaper accounts, that counsel for the committee was conducting the hearing. I have not had the time to find out just to what extent counsel for the committee has been given rather sweeping powers, but there is reason to believe that probably he was given too much head. Probably he was allowed to do a great deal of investigating and examining when he needed to be checked by some Senators. That is why I think one of the proposals in my bill is so important, namely, that these investigations may not proceed without a majority of the committee present. It is a pretty good safeguard. Had we adopted a mandatory code of procedure a long time ago the McCarthy committee would not have been conducting so many one-man committee hearings. If there had been a majority of the committee present to check upon one another, as we Senators constantly do, there would not have been so many one-man hearings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for any check he wishes to impose on this discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not wish to impose a check. My good friend from Oregon is generously yielding, and this seems to be an excellent opportunity to make an observation and raise a question about the very subject which is being discussed. It is quite true that the committee has often functioned as a one-man committee. It does so under a committee rule which provides that, for the purpose of taking sworn testimony, one member shall constitute a quorum. Interestingly enough—and I am sure my distinguished friend from Oregon will have a full appreciation of the background—the rule goes back to the old Christofel case. Christofel was brought here and cited for contempt after an investigation. The rule was that a physical quorum of the committee had to be present. The case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and it could not be established that a quorum was present at all times, so the contempt citation fell.

It was in response to that case that the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee knows as the Jenner committee, which investigates, adopted a one-man rule. I think the House Committee on Un-American Activities has a one-man rule. The so-called McCarthy committee, which, incidentally, is a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, also has the one-man rule.

I approach the question from a different standpoint. I think more and more the subject must be ventilated to the public. I agree with my friend from Oregon that sometime, somehow, something must be done about it.

This morning when I reached my office there were five committee notices on my desk. Three subcommittees of the Committee on Apppropriations were meeting at the identical hour this morning. In addition, the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, met at 10:30. Also I was summoned to the McCarthy committee this morning at 10:30. There may have been other committee notices. I am certain that I had five notices of committee meetings at one and the same time, on this day in April in the year of our Lord 1954.

I remember reading, in the history of medieval times, about the so-called scholastic age, in which wise men intrigued themselves and each other by speculating on metaphysical questions such as how many angels could dance on the end of a needle at the same time. I am almost tempted to get into a metaphysical discussion. I am wondering how in the world Members of the United States Senate charged with committee duties can appropriately, adequately, and conscientiously discharge their duties and be at 5 places at 1 and the same time.

All this work is important. The Agricultural Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee met this morning. That is important. The Subcommittee on Independent Offices was taking testimony on the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission. That is important. The Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare was taking testimony this morning. Of course, that is important.

Finally, the Judiciary Committee could not muster a quorum and had to disband at 11 o'clock, although I loitered as long as I could, because there were things on the committee agenda which I wished to see disposed of.

I face a physical difficulty for one thing. I presume there are two ways to go about meeting it. One can evaluate the importance of the various duties, and the various things he must do at a certain time. Then he starts with No. 1 on the list, as the most important thing. If he can sneak away from one committee he wanders off to another committee. However, I think Senators ought to be equipped with the best variety of ball-bearing roller skates, in order that they may course through the halls a little

faster and get to the committees to discharge their duty.

Last week I participated in a television presentation, as well as a radio presentation. Actually the question had been raised at home as to where I was when the McCarthy committee was holding a hearing in New York. I was here. I was taking the place of some other members of the Committee on Appropriations and taking testimony on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

On occasion the junior Senator from Illinois was serving all alone in taking testimony on a bill which involved $17 billion of public funds. I am sure the people of the United States would look upon such procedure with a baleful eye. But I do not have the answer. I say frankly to my friend from Oregon that I do not know what the answer is, with the workload piling up.

If the Senator from Oregon will indulge me for a moment longer, let me say that in 1945 and 1946, when I served on the La Follette-Monroney committee to reorganize the Congress, I had hoped that when we had reduced the number of Senate committees from 33 to 15 or 16, and the number of House committees from 47 to 19, at long last it would be possible for Members of the House and Senate better to discharge their committee responsibilities.

The inevitable happened. The workload increased. The volume grows week after week and year after year. The net result was that the standing committees had to divide themselves into subcommittees. It was suggested in one of the subcommittees one morning last week that instead of subcommittees of 5, perhaps the number ought to be reduced to 3. That would be all right, I presume, if it would disengage Members from trying to attend so many meetings, and doing their job inadequately. I think this is one of the most difficult problems confronting the Senate today.

Obviously, when the membership of the body is smaller, the difficulty increases. When I served on two subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations in the House and when I served as the unofficial Mayor of the District of Columbia, I thought I was thoroughly overworked.

Today I serve on 5 subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, on 6 subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, and on 3 subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations. That does not include my membership on the permanent committee under the McCarran-Walter Act, and my duties as chairman of the Republican Campaign Committee.

I confess that I do not know what the answer is. However, it is enough emotionally and physically to tax any Member in trying to cover the waterfront.

I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me for such a long time.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for the contribution he has made. I do not know what the answer is. I should discuss a few suggestions which I am perfectly willing to have considered by the Senate, and many of them are suggestions I have discussed before. I know whereof the Senator speaks when he speaks about committee assignments and about the problems which confront my colleagues. Of course, I am not as much belabored as I used to be on that score. However, I do know committee work is a heavy load. In fact, it was only a few years ago, while I was on the floor of the Senate one afternoon, that a constituent of mine called me off the floor, at a time when there happened to be only, by actual count, seven Senators on the floor. It was early in the afternoon. She was rather upset. She said, "I am glad to see that at least you are earning your money."

I said, "What do you mean?"

She went on to explain that she had sat in the gallery and had seen only a few Senators on the floor. She thought it was a shocking thing.

I thought I would engage in a little educational work with that constituent. I said, "I will tell you what we will do. We will just find out what committees are meeting and you and I will go from committee room to committee room and we will count the number of Senators who are in committee. We will do that right now."

We proceeded from committee room to committee room as rapidly as we could go, and we counted 56 Senators who were sitting in various committees at the very time that 7 Senators were sitting on the floor and making a very unfavorable impression on the American people, who come here to watch our deliberations.

It was following that experience that I made a speech on the floor of the Senate, which I shall just quickly review now. At that time I made my proposal again for a schedule of Senate meetings, whereby we could meet, in the early days of a session, a couple of days a week, and later 3 days of the week, and still later, if necessary, 4 days of the week, as we got toward the end of the session, from 9:30 in the morning until about 12:30, with a period out for lunch, and then resume the session again at 2 o'clock and continue until such time in the afternoon or evening as we thought necessary and efficient under the circumstances.

I know such a schedule would not cure everything, but at least it would be taking a step in the direction of efficiently disposing of the business of the Senate. The rest of the days of the week would be devoted to committee meetings, but no committee meetings could be held while the Senate was in session.

As I have already stated, I believe we could also do a great job of improving the efficiency of the Senate if we adopted a rule of germaneness, under which we would not interrupt the consideration of the pending business on the floor of the Senate until a certain hour each day, perhaps 5 o'clock, at which time speeches could be made for the RECORD, and public policy issues could be raised by Senators, with the understanding that the Senate would work up to that time on the pending business each day, after which we would take up extraneous but very important subjects. We could provide for a discussion of such extraneous matters at 9:30 in the morning, continuing along that line until perhaps 11 o'clock if a morning hour rather than a late afternoon hour would be more acceptable.

One point that I believe is brought into clear focus as a result of the McCarthy-Army row is the increased interest on the part of the American people in the procedural operations of the Senate and the relationship of those procedures to their substantive rights as citizens.

To go on with the point I was discussing with regard to what I think this particular investigation is raising for our consideration, the Senator from Illinois is quite right that it is very difficult to have a rule which would require a majority of the subcommittee members to be present at a hearing.

However, I repeat that in the type of hearing which we have come to call an investigation—and I am not talking about the run-of-the-mill committee hearings—a quorum should be required. I am talking about those exceptional hearings—and they still constitute a minority—which we have come to call investigations into wrongdoing or alleged wrongdoing, in which the question of innocence or guilt is raised.

I say that when the question of innocence or guilt is raised, or when a charge of wrongdoing is made, we ought to have the kind of mandatory procedure which the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and I have been urging in the Morse-Lehman bill for quite some time.

One of the rules would provide that a majority of the members of a committee should be present, as a check on each other, and to prevent the abuse of so-called one-man committee hearings, as well as abuses on the part of members of the professional staff of the committee.

I have the very highest regard for the work that is done by most members of the professional staff of Senate committees. Yet we all know that, human frailities being what they are, we must impose checks upon all people—on members of the staffs, as well as on Senators.

Mr. President, I am inclined to believe that there is reason to believe that in the operation of the McCarthy committee some of the members of the staff have been at least overenergetic at times, if I may put it that way. There is need for a vigilant check upon staff members by a majority of the members of the committee, present in the hearing room, when examinations take place.

Because I understand it is one of the serious questions which the McCarthy subcommittee has been discussing in recent hours, there arises the question of the examination of witnesses. I am all in favor of the examination of witnesses. The Morse-Lehman bill would guarantee the right to cross-examine witnesses which, of course, would guarantee that the committee would produce witnesses. It would guarantee cross-examination under reasonable rules laid down by the committee.

The Morse-Lehman bill does not propose to take away from a committee all control over its procedures. I am talking about a rule of reasonableness which

the courts are constantly handing down in decisions on issues involving the question whether or not there has been an abuse of procedural rights in the administration of American justice.

Although a rule may be a harsh rule, or a rule which the court might not have imposed had it been the particular tribunal that imposed the rule, nevertheless the court will sustain the rule if it meets the test of reasonableness.

All that we seek is that the committee lay down reasonable rules and regulations governing the cross-examination of witnesses and that the right of examination under our system of justice be guaranteed before Senate investigating committees. I am talking only about the limited hearings that we call investigations, in which people in fact are placed on trial, although not in the legalistic sense.

That brings up the question of what should be the position and rights of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] in regard to the cross-examination of witnesses in the hearings.

I start out by saying that I do not think we can justify the principle of letting McCARTHY function to any degree as judge, jury, and prosecutor in this hearing. Of course, I happen to be one who believes that the McCarthy subcommittee should not conduct the investigation at all.

That was my position when the question first arose. The record is perfectly clear, I think, that the committee during the past year has been a committee the operations of which have been characterized by a lack of unanimity. That lack of unanimity has been nonpartisan. The Democrats walked out for a while and would not even participate in investigations conducted by Senator McCARTHY. But the committee continued to hold one-man investigations. There has not been complete agreement on the part of the Republican members of the committee. Also, we read, and I think reliably, that there has been a considerable amount of difference of opinion within the professional staff of the committee. We have been treated to the very interesting procedure involving a form of loyalty oath within the committee, where people are asked to pledge their loyalty, apparently to the committee or to the general counsel or to the Senator from Wisconsin—to whom, I am not sure—but, at least, it has been one of the symptoms of disunity within the committee. With that record of a lack of unanimity and of great differences within the committee, and, apparently, a divided opinion as to what policies should be followed within the committee, I doubt if the committee should continue to have the jurisdiction entrusted to it. I said at the very beginning that I thought it would have been better if the committee had not assumed jurisdiction over the McCarthy-Stevens row. In a good home when there is quarreling among the children it is necessary for the father to step in, in cooperation with the mother, and give some guiding, sobering advice in regard to the quarrels to see if amicable relations cannot be established. I felt at the very beginning of this row that the Senate, which, after all, has the responsibility for conditions in the committee, should have stepped in and said, "We are going to transfer the investigation of the charges against the committee to another committee." I do not believe anyone on the committee should have taken offense at that. In fact, I think they should have felt relieved if such a parental, friendly interest in the problems of the committee had been taken by the Senate as a whole.

I think what is involved is more than a row with the Army. That is one of the points I want to discuss. I do not think it is a disagreement which simply involves an issue between the chairman of the McCarthy committee, its counsel, and the Army. I think it goes much deeper than that. Therefore, I think the controversy should have been transferred to a committee, such as the Judiciary Committee or even to the Committee on Rules and Administration, although I should have preferred the Judiciary Committee or to a special committee.

The point immediately arises that some of the same Senators are members of the other committees. That would not bother me a bit, because when Senators sit on the Judiciary Committee they sit there with definite responsibilities to carry out the jurisdiction and the functions of that committee. The same is true with respect to the Committee on Rules and Administration. If the Senator from Wisconsin is on both committees, he ought to file, of course, a notice of disqualification in participating in a hearing involving himself.

I think he has placed himself in a position where, in the minds of many people, he will be judge, jury, and prosecutor. The fact that he is not voting in the committee is not enough of a procedural safeguard to guarantee that the committee will be protected from the charge that in a sense it is functioning as judge, jury, and prosecutor if the Senator from Wisconsin does not disqualify himself completely from exercising a voice in the committee's investigation.

I think, Mr. President, the jurisdiction over this question ought to have been removed from the investigations committee and placed in the hands of another committee. But that was not done; and, not having been done, I want to make it very clear that, in my judgment, a fair hearing, a hearing which meets the test of a fair procedure, can be conducted by the committee, provided certain safeguards are adopted.

Whether he likes it or not, the Senator from Wisconsin is on trial in the minds of millions of Americans as the hearing goes forward. Therefore, I think he should be completely on the sidelines. I do not think he should participate in the hearing. I think he needs a counsel. I think he should have the right to cross-examine witnesses through counsel. But I certainly think it should be considered that he is disqualified as a party at interest from exercising senatorial functions in the hearing when, after all, part of the investigation is an investigation into alleged misconduct on his part. I am not passing judgment on the allegations; I am only calling attention to the procedure. I think there is certain procedure which must ultimately be followed if we are going to meet the average American test of fair play. The parties to the dispute should not participate in the trial of the case, even though they may at the same time be Senators. I do not think there is any senatorial injury done to the people of Wisconsin or to the Senator from Wisconsin if the Senator does not participate in the hearing as a Senator, but only as one of the parties charged with wrongdoing. He is entitled to all the protection of representation by counsel.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am glad my friend from Oregon brought up the question of the desirability of some other committee of the Senate going into the question. I have puzzled over that a great deal. Under Senate rules there is real difficulty. In the first place, it should be emphasized that this is not a controversy between the Government Operations Subcommittee and the Permanent Committee on Investigations. It is a controversy between the Army and certain individuals. If we were going to bring that question to the Senate floor, it would have to be formalized, and a resolution would have to be submitted, and would have to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration in the first instance.

The question of jurisdiction is involved. The jurisdiction of all the standing committees of the Senate is very carefully defined. We would have to modify the rules of the Senate if we were going to give the Armed Services Committee or the Judiciary Committee authority to hear the controversy. When the resolution came to the floor, from that moment every aspect of the question would have been ventilated in the Senate, and it would have engaged the attention of the Senate for days and days on end, because when we deal with rather emotional and explosive issues, obviously a great many persons want to be heard. I would not prophesy how much time would be consumed in debating that kind of a question. Without having gone into the matters involved in the controversy in an orderly procedural way, I am not prepared to say. But it has been carefully examined into, and it has offered a good deal of difficulty.

Then, of course, there is another aspect, namely, that of conferring upon a coordinate committee the authority and the power to look into the conduct of a Senator or a member of his staff. I think there are real difficulties.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Illinois certainly is correct in saying that the complexities of the situation offer very serious difficulties. I mentioned the Committee on the Judiciary as the one which I think, because of its jurisdiction, after all, over the entire matter of judicial issues, to be probably the standing committee best subject to having this matter assigned to it. However, I am very frank to say that the matter is

sufficiently serious so that on this occasion probably a special review committee should have been selected, separate and distinct from all standing committees; a committee of the Senate especially created to hear this dispute exclusively, and to render a decision based upon a record made by the interested parties.

All I seek to emphasize, Mr. President, is that even the McCarthy committee, being given the jurisdiction—and, in effect, it has been given jurisdiction by the Senate—I think owes an obligation to the country of making perfectly clear that it does not intend to allow a member of a committee to function as judge, jury, and prosecutor. I should think that the schoolground fairness of the procedural principle I am talking about would appeal to all parties concerned, and that the committee would be allowed to proceed without any intervention by the parties themselves who are subject to the allegations of misconduct, into which allegations the committee is conducting the investigation.

This causes me to make the last point I wish to make on the subject this afternoon. I have not perfected it as to the parliamentary procedure to be followed, but I think it is only fair that I serve notice as to what is disturbing me about the situation, and as to what I tentatively think may have to be a course of action which the Senate should follow.

For 2 years I have voted for the funds for the investigation of subversive activities in the Government. The record is perfectly clear, as I have said once before, that a year ago, when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] was in charge of the floor leadership in requests for the funds, he and I engaged in a colloquy on one point, namely, that he make a prima facie showing for the amounts of money he asked for. He satisfied me that he had made such a showing. He made it very clear that he needed the personnel for which he had asked. He satisfied me that the committee needed all the money for which it had asked, and he substantiated, by way of a prima facie case, all the other items which were sought in the proposed budget. The record will show that I then called for a yea and nay vote a year ago, because I thought Senators ought to be on record. I saw a great difference between the power of a committee of the Senate or the House to investigate, and the issue as to whether or not in the conducting of an investigation a committee may engage in abusive practices. I so indicated in the Senate at that time. I said I was not going to sit here and to use the purse strings as a device for undermining the power of a Senate committee to investigate. I think it is a pretty precious power. I think it is a power, the wise exercise of which is of great importance to the freedom and the liberties of the American people.

I think that in the course of the heat and emotion which may prevail in a matter such as the McCarthy incident, it is too easy for people to say, "Why do you give them the money? You should not have given them the money in the first place."

In my judgment, a committee is entitled to the money it can show, by way of a prima facie case, it needs in order to conduct investigations falling within the jurisdiction of the committee. The Senator from Indiana, a year ago, did that very clearly.

That brings us up to this year. In my judgment, a prima facie case was made again this year for the financial items which were asked for. There had been, however, a year of experience with the McCarthy committee. Let us be frank about it. The committee had been subject to more and more criticism during the last year in regard to some of the investigations conducted by the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not think the Senate was in as strong a position this year as it was last year in regard to appropriating funds for that committee, at least until there were steps taken to provide for more procedural guaranties. Yet I do not believe any record was made which would have justified transferring the function of the committee to another committee. That is the point I wish to emphasize above all else this afternoon.

I would not this afternoon, if the request for the same amount of money were asked for, vote against the request if the same prima facie case were made for the dollars and cents claimed to be needed for each of the items.

But I have no hesitancy in saying that there is one thing I would do this afternoon: I would move to transfer the function of the committee in this field to another committee, until the matter of procedural difficulties in which I think the committee is involved should have been cleared up. It seems to me there is a great deal of difference between protecting the power of the Senate to investigate with the appropriations of funds for the investigation, and the parental duty of the Senate to guarantee reasonable procedures to American citizens who are being submitted to congressional investigation.

I shall await the outcome of the pending investigation, but I wish to say now, most respectfully, and with complete candor, but with good feeling on my part, that I shall watch the outcome of the so-called McCarthy-Army investigation very carefully. Unless I am satisfied at the end of the investigation that we can count upon an end to what I believe have been some very serious abuses practiced by the Senator from Wisconsin in conducting his investigations, I shall offer to the Senate a resolution to transfer the particular functions of this committee to another committee. I think the investigations should be conducted, but unless the procedure situation is improved, I cannot further extend my confidence to the committee, in view of the record which is being made in connection with the last incident, which seems to have been the straw that has broken the patience of many people.

Let me restate my position. I think that what is on trial, along with many other matters, is whether or not this committee should be further vested with the jurisdiction to conduct investigations into subject matters which have been under investigation. I think, certainly, that is the responsibility of the full Senate to decide. We have the right and the power to transfer committee functions from one committee to another. It may require an amendment to the Reorganization Act; but if there is a problem which needs to be solved, I do not care what steps need to be taken procedurally, so long as they are proper in order to correct the evil.

If I cannot be satisfied, on the basis of the McCarthy-Army row investigation, that this committee should be entrusted further with the investigative power, I shall offer a resolution to transfer the functions to another committee, along with the funds, because the power to investigate is something I shall continue to fight for in the Senate.

One final word: I listened to the Attorney General the other night when he made his national telecast and radio broadcast. I thought it was an interesting speech. But I kept asking myself the question, "Why do you not do something about it in the Department of Justice?"

When the Attorney General concluded his speech, I found myself not satisfied that the Department of Justice has been proceeding with the investigation of subversive activities throughout the country to the extent which would make unnecessary the investigations that the McCarthy committee and other committees have been conducting. I quite agree that the extent of senatorial investigations should be limited by the objective of securing information in regard to governmental departments which will be of assistance to the Senate in determining whether any legislative changes ought to be enacted.

Mr. President, we are not kidding anyone. We are not kidding the American people if we seek to give the impression that all these investigations are needed for that purpose. I think many people are taking judicial notice—and I think they have a right to take judicial notice—that the so-called gathering of legislative information is at least coincidental—and I think very incidental—to the primary objective of some of the investigations. I think to a considerable extent in some of the investigations we have been taking over the function of the United States Department of Justice. I think it is just that simple. I do not think we should be functioning as a quasi-judicial tribunal. I do not think we should be functioning as a legislative FBI. I do not think we should be functioning as a legislative attorney general. I think the Department of Justice ought to be doing a great many of the things which are being done in some of these investigations.

Here again, the question of judgment is involved. When we are proceeding with an investigation, and when we reach the point where we see that the road is leading us into fields which ought to be plowed by the Department of Justice, we should sit down with representatives of the Department of Justice and say, "We have gone far enough. We are going to stop here. We think you should take over."

I do not think that kind of working arrangement exists to the degree it ought

to exist, as between the Department of Justice and Senate investigating committees. I believe that we have more to do than to be masterminding the Department of Justice. If the Department does not have the minds to do the job, we ought to do what we can to see to it that persons are placed in positions in the Department of Justice who can do the job.

I have the feeling—and I wish to be fair about it—that growing numbers in our country are wondering if we are not going pretty far afield in some of the investigations, in the name of gathering information which will help us reach a legislative determination.

That leaves the question of seeing to it that we maintain safeguards which will prevent the Department of Justice, in turn, from investigating itself, or prevent the executive branch of Government from being placed in the position of investigating itself. There is no question that there is need for our exercising vigilance, as a check, with respect to the extent to which subversive activities may have wormed their way into the executive branch of the Government. But I think we can do it without going to the extremes to which we have gone.

I think we should call a halt on some of these investigation activities. If we cannot devise some reasonable procedures which will prevent a repetition of the abuses which I think too frequently have characterized some of the hearings of this particular subcommittee, particularly when it has been functioning as a one-man operation, then I think we should transfer its jurisdiction to another committee. I shall make that proposal in the future if I think the situation warrants it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 14), 1954:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Claude Henry Chorpening, O12088, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Rex Van Den Corput, Jr., O12700, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Eugene McGinley, O12318, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Edward John McGaw, O12631, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. James Malcolm Lewis, O12650, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. William Edmund Waters, O14700, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Numa Augustin Watson, O14968, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. James Robinson Pierce, O14979, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Oliver Perry Newman, O15016, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Harry McKenzie Roper, O15176, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Elwyn Donald Post, O15243, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Murphy Willems, O16176, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Russell Dewey, O15575, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Bertram Francis Hayford, O12272, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hobart Hewett, O12328, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Alanson Burnell 2d, O12337, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Parker Hollis, O15079, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Earl Shuman Gruver, O15259, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ira Kenneth Evans, O16215, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Peirce Ennis, Jr., O16436, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harry Purnell Storke, O16468, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Earl William Heathcote, O28800, United States Army.

Col. William Henry Nutter, O16095, United States Army.

Col. Ernest Victor Holmes, O16100, United States Army.

Col. Ernest Andrew Barlow, O16116, United States Army.

Col. William Holmes Wood, O16135, United States Army.

Col. Edwin Lynds Johnson, O16158, United States Army.

Col. John Franklin Bird, O16179, United States Army.

Col. George Patrick Lynch, O16226, United States Army.

Col. William Wheeler O'Connor, O16348, United States Army.

Col. Elmer Peter Hardenbergh, O28940, United States Army.

Col. William Clyde Baker, Jr., O16371, United States Army.

Col. Clerin Rodney Smith, O16388, United States Army.

Col. Lewis Sherrill Griffing, O16413, United States Army.

Col. Samuel Pickens Collins, O16444, United States Army.

Col. Robert Campbell Aloe, O16916, United States Army.

Col. Paul Alfred Disney, O17004, United States Army.

Col. Webster Anderson, O17101, United States Army.

Col. Clarence Jonathan Hauck, Jr., O18360, Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army.

Col. Robert George Butler, 017191, United States Army.

Col. Henry Ray McKenzie, O17623, United States Army.

Col. Hugh Mackintosh, O17716, United States Army.

Col. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., O17730, United States Army.

Col. Charles Edward Beauchamp, O18238, United States Army.

Col. Philip Ferdinand Lindeman, O272444, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Francis Thomas Pachler, O18483, United States Army.

Col. Cyrus Abda Dolph 3d, O19170 Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

Captain to major

CHAPLAIN

×McConnell, James Norman, 18799A.

First lieutenant to captain

AIR FORCE

×Hearn, Joseph Edward, 23000A.
Washington, Fielding Lewis, 25603A.
Lowry, John Joseph, 17575A.
×Mock, John Edwin, 17576A.
×Fernandez, Gonzalo, 17577A.
×Murphy, John James, 17578A.
Robb, Donald Oren, 17579A.
×Robertson, Edwin Wales, 2d, 17580A.
×Babbitt, Robert Paul, 17581A.
×Lerohl, John Kenneth, 17582A.
Weaver, Douglas Crowther, Jr., 17583A.
Coolbaugh, James Smith, 17584A.
×Knauss, Frederick John, 17585A.
Griffith, Wallace Hull, 17586A.
Crowe, Forest Willard, 17587A.
Pearce, Jack Vernon, 17588A.
Gray, William Wright, 17589A.
×Piepenbrink, John Franklin, 17591A.
×Murrin, Ralph Calvin, 17592A.
Pinkerton, Herbert Carson, Jr., 17593A.
×Heironimus, James David, 17595A.
×Litt, Donald David, 17596A.
×Simon, King D., 17597A.
Stevens, Leslie Robert, 17599A.
×Fox, Cecil Edward, 17600A.
×Griffith, Robert Blake, 17602A.
×Keck, Robert Edward, 17604A.
×Staszak, Leonard Anthony, 17605A.
×Novomesky, John, Jr., 17606A.
Scowcroft, Brent, 17607A.
Kaericher, Kermit Clifton, 17608A.
×Wojciehoski, Gerald Joseph, 17609A.
×Jarvis, David, 17610A.
×Bentley, Ralph Locker, 17611A.
Dicker, Gordon Kendrick, 17612A.
×Monahan, Thomas Vincent, 17615A.
Christensen, Leland Dale, 17616A.
×Larsen, Hewitt Chemnitz, 17617A.
White, Robert Wilson, 17618A.
×Hightower, Edwin Connery, Jr., 17619A.
×Harrington, George Fred, 17620A.
Odell, David Anicker, 17621A.
×Garrabrants, Edson Leonard, 17622A.
Kinevan, Marcos Emmet, 17625A.
×Cottongim, John Edward, 17626A.
Eberle, Harold Jacob, 17628A.
×Young, John Mackay, 17629A.
Reynolds, Clyde Calvin, 17630A.
×Helling, Donald Clement, 17632A.
×Sattem, Robert, 17633A.
Kuykendall, William Thomas, 17636A.
×Reckmeyer, William John, 17637A.
Scoville, Winston Ousley, 17640A.
×Pierce, Jack Francis, 17641A.
×Lamattina, Frank Joseph, 17642A.
×Stewart, Charles Carrington, 17643A.
Enos, James Walter, 17645A.
Johnston, Joe Dean, 17646A.
Hoffman, Robert Earl, 17648A.
Colburn, James Edward, 17649A.
×Kremser, Frank Joseph, Jr., 17650A.
Arnold, Howard Brown, Jr., 17651A.
Guice, John Thompson, 17652A.
×Brennan, Herbert Owen, 17653A.
Gausche, Dean Stevens, 17655A.

McClure, Richard Alexis, 17658A.
Cofield, Egbert Haildane, Jr., 17660A.
×Zimmer, Clifford George, Jr., 17662A.
×Dunham, David Michael, 17663A.
Moore, Robert Burns, 17664A.
Gould, Alan Henry, 17665A.
Carpenter, William Spencer, Jr., 17667A.
Tucker, Young Arnold, 17670A.
Breedlove, James Montgomery, 17671A.
×Hudgins, Andrew Leon, 17672A.
×Herrick, Park Brown, Jr., 17674A.
Ryan, James Edward, 17676A.
×Kain, Harry Richard, 17677A.
×Shields, Charles Edward, 17678A.
×Ciamprone, William Carl, 19656A.
Biggs, Buford Bernell, 17679A.
×Jacoby, Frederick Walter, 17681A.
Learmonth, Allen Franklin, 17682A.
Gregorie, Edmund Mortimer, Jr., 17685A.
×Bellovin, Milton, 17686A.
Palmer, Jack Merrill, 17687A.
×Coyne, John Martin, Jr., 17688A.
×Lilley, J. Robert, 17689A.
×Mallory, John Stevenson, Jr., 17691A.
Blanchard, Felix Anthony, Jr., 17692A.
Lajeunesse, Conrad Normand, 17694A.
Perry, Francis Raymond, 17696A.
×Ehrlich, Robert Maxwell, 17697A.
Stephens, John Ed, 23001A.
Wienecke, Edward Rudolph, 23002A.

MEDICAL

×Upp, Charles Wilson, 23174A.
×Currie, Edward Henry, 24132A.
Rosewall, Charles Robert, 24133A.
×Fullam, Richard Gerard, 24211A.
DeTreville, Robert Treat Paine, 22974A.
×Natanson, Alvin Sidney, 22972A.
×Cutter, James Arthur, 24134A.
×Burba, William Howard, 24212A.
×Cappelluzzo, Vincent Pompeo, 24213A.
Odland, Lawrence Thomas, 24135A.
×Wallace, William Earl, 24136A.
×Woosley, Homer Earl, Jr., 24137A.
×Didier, Edward Paul, 24218A.
×Bagli, Vincent Joseph, 24215A.
×Randolph, Charles Lankford, Jr., 24217A.
×Harmon, John Bertrand, 24214A.
×McCann, Robert Joseph, 24216A.
×Waldmann, Robert Paul, 24219A.
×McKeen, Charles Lewis, 23591A.
×Vaden, Otis Lynn, 24138A.
×Ward, Richard John, 24220A.
×Solomon, Robert Joseph, 24671A.

CHAPLAIN

Tomme, Wade Kennon, 23205A.
Schuck, David Bernard, 24682A.

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

AIR FORCE

×Fleenor, Charles Matsen, 23935A.
×Holy, George Edward, 24579A.
Jennings, Carl Scott, Jr., 24856A.
Johnson, Norman J., 24580A.
×Lorenzo, Donald William, 23936A.
×Gahl, Edward Chilcott, 23937A.
×Peartree, Joseph Ralph, 24582A.
×Sweeney, Leo Edgar, Jr., 24584A.
Allred, John Porter, Jr., 24583A.
Crossland, Robert Fitzhugh, 24585A.
×Hoster, Charles Stewart, 23938A.
Capers, William Theodotus, 3d, 22866A.
Johnson, Gene Ray, 22868A.
Leiffert, Donald Edward, 22870A.
×Wicker, Eugene Clayton, 22871A.
Lahlum, Otto Kenneth, 22869A.
Brown, Donald Dean, 25590A.
McQuillen, John Robert, 25591A.
Gray, Paul Leonard, 25897A.
Jeffers, Dale Sterlie, 22863A.
Daniels, Robert William, 22860A.
Armstrong, Charles Lee, 23939A.
×Smithwick, Edward Francis, 23940A.
×Kelgard, Philip Everett, 22927A.
×Ferguson, Robert Phillips, Jr., 24586A.
Smith, Wallace Reed, 25898A.
Johnson, Harlan Watson, 22426A.
Holland, Anthony Edward, 22425A.
Baker, Billy Neyl, 22424A.
Downhill, Jack Everett, 24587A.
Sampson, James Barton, 25899A.
Sweet, Albert Henry, 24596A.
Maloy, Frederick Leo, 23600A.
Courtney, Clifford Earl, 23599A.
Berggreen, Cole Jerome, 23941A.
White, Robert Michael, 24589A.
×Ashmore, James Walter, Jr., 23942A.
Honts, Anderson Brugh, Jr., 22864A.
Killion, Thomas Joseph, Jr., 25592A.
Danforth, Gordon Elmer, 22156A.
×Pierce, Rudolph Walter, 22310A.
×Aldrin, Edwin Eugene, Jr., 22091A.
×Radkowsky, Lawrence, 22312A.
Johnston, Verle LaFayette, 22230A.
×Johnson, Boyd Walker, 22228A.
×Shultz, Harold Dean, 22347A.
Prince, Edward Rudolph, Jr., 22308A.
Umstead, Stanley Milward, Jr., 22366A.
Ebrite, Ernest Edward, 22165A.
Griesmer, Donald Robert, 22190A.
×Schlagheck, Kenneth James, 22336A.
×Morgan, Bernard Stanley, Jr., 22276A.
McMullen, Thomas Henry, 22268A.
×Norton, Alfred Dobson, 22289A.
×Hemenway, John David, 22205A.
×Brenkle, Joseph Phillip, 22119A.
×Ekeren, Halvor Martin, 22166A.
×Clark, Edward Paul, 22134A.
×Hanaway, John Francis, 22198A.
×Post, Leo Fred, Jr., 22304A.
×Pahl, Philip Miller, 22295A.
×Waespy, Charles Matthew, 22370A.
×Gilbert, Ralph James, 22180A.
White, James Eugene, 22379A.
Chandler, Donn Fergus, 22131A.
Bailey, Harvey Thomas, 22097A.
×Larsen, Larry James, 22239A.
Neely, David Fenton, 22284A.
×Sherman, Thomas Webster, Jr., 22344A.
Jeans, Harley Earl, 22227A.
Jaffurs, Carl Charles, 22224A.
×Jackson, Thomas Leroy, 22221A.
×Graham, Fred Brown, 22189A.
×Cooper, Ralph, 22144A.
Bacon, Walter Julian, 2d, 22096A.
×Johnson, Loyd Merrill, 22229A.
McCormick, James Edward, 22261A.
×Moretti, William Gregory, Jr., 22275A.
×Cunningham, John William, 22153A.
×Halstead, Frank Charles, 22196A.
Richardson, William Lloyd, Jr., 22321A.
Guild, Samuel Murton, Jr., 22192A.
Veurink, William J., 22369A.
Lerner, Robert, 22245A.
×Brantley, Arnim Lavelle, 22117A.
Baulch, Henry Leigh, 22106A.
×Cullen, Gerald Thomas, 22152A.
×Headlee, Harold Edward, 22202A.
×Ramey, Jack Lloyd, 22313A.
Zurawski, Donald David, 22387A.
×Allen, William Anderson, 22093A.
Baird, Weldon Ralph, 22098A.
Hartman, Harry George, 22201A.
Irwin, James Benson, 22220A.
Smith, Paul Amos, Jr., 22351A.
Nall, Stanford, 22283A.
desIslets, John Charles Mousseau, 22157A.
Nicksay, Donald Alfred, 22286A.
×Skidmore, John George, 22350A.
Huff, David Webster, 22214A.
Haggren, Richard Alan, 22194A.
Trost, Frederick James, 22364A.
×Cole, Donald Conklin, 22136A.
×Mullaney, David Michael, 22279A.
×Reeve, Gerald Selah, 22317A.
Barnett, William Thomas, 22104A.
Higgins, Richard Chester, Jr., 22208A.
×Barnes, Daniel Spaulding, 22103A.
×Gaske, Marvin Colgan, 22177A.
Kendrick, Jack Ish, 22233A.
Crocco, Joseph Paul, 22151A.
×McGrew, John Ferries, 22266A.
Pinkel, Leland Carl, 22303A.
Hunt, James Charles, Jr., 22216A.
Westbrook, Donald Elliott, 22378A.
×Carson, Theo Kit, 22128A.
Niemann, Robert Frank, 22287A.
Henney, Frederic Allison, 22207A.
×Weaver, William Alexander, 22375A.
×Schlatter, David Myron, Jr., 22337A.
×McGarrah, James Eugene, 22265A.
×Wilson, William Boyd, 22384A.
Christner, Wallace Gilbert, 22132A.
×Brame, Horace Lane, 22116A.
×Stephens, Perry Lee, 22356A.
×Harding, Robert Chester, 22199A.
×Taylor, Everette, 22361A.
×Rasmussen, Richard Harold, 22315A.
Dickens, Samuel Thomas, 22158A.
×Corrigan, Joseph Patrick, 3d, 22145A.
×Hite, Kenneth Frank, 22211A.
Cole, Donald King, 22137A.
×Ritchie, John, 22323A.
×Mott-Smith, Tipton Pryor, 22277A.
×Brown, Gerald Allen, 22122A.
×Baird, Willett John, Jr., 22099A.
Flynn, Edward Dunne, 22172A.
Hendricks, Gerald Keith, 22206A.
Long, Ledyard, Jr., 22249A.
Ellis, Billy Joe, 22167A.
Berga, John Orrin, 22110A.
×Bretzke, Lou Enlow, 22120A.
×Craigie, John Harrold, 22147A.
Sisson, Frank Elliott, 2d, 22349A.
Kuhn, Peter Rowland, 22235A.
×Hillock, Joseph Patrick, Jr., 22210A
Giesen, Herman Mills, 22179A.
×Genter, Robert Edwin, 22178A.
Glossbrenner, John Leslie, 22183A.
Stelzer, Frank Alan, 22355A.
Jacobs, Robert Louis, 22222A.
×Hill, Max Lloyd, Jr., 22209A.
Conlin, Thomas Patrick, 22139A.
×Roy, Robert Walker, 22332A.
Peckham, Howard Louis, Jr., 22300A.
Landry, Barney McCoy, Jr., 22236A.
Conti, Julius Ronald, Jr., 22141A.
×James, David Russell, 22225A.
×Banks, William Oakley, 22102A.
Eppley, Lawrence Lee, Jr., 22168A.
×Price, Jack Lewis, 23307A.
Peake, Erwin Crockett, 22299A.
×Bregman, Robert B., 22118A.
×Quinn, William Michael, 22311A.
Gorschboth, Frederick Francis, 22185A.
Wiles, Howard Olen, Jr., 22381A.
×Langmack, Cecil Edward, 22237A.
×Dingman, Richard Gerry, 22160A.
Hall, David William, 22195A.
×Robbins, Raymond Arthur, 22324A.
Thomas, William Rex, Jr., 22362A.
Ryan, William Joseph, 22333A.
×Singer, Stewart Mitchell, 22348A.
Sprague, Carleton Keith, 22353A.
Scruggs, Seth Ward, 22339A.
Brewer, Donald Atwood, 22121A.
×Reed, Irving Butler, 22316A.
×Heidbreder, Leroy Kenneth, 22204A.
×Burke, Sidney Pat, 22127A.
×Johnson, Albert William, 22226A.
Rogers, David Eaithell, 22327A.
Gorski, Adam Allan, Jr., 22186A.
×Williams, William Alonzo, Jr., 22383A.
×Jacobs, Saul Antman, 22223A.
McCaffrey, John Francis, 22260A.
Ballard, John Garland, Jr., 22101A.
Truesdell, Willard Martin, 22365A.
Osborn, John Robert, 22294A.
×Rasmussen, Raun Jay, 22314A.
Buffington, Lewis Christian, Jr., 22126A.
Schuler, John Preston, 22338A.
×Roloff, Donald Henry, 22329A.
×Williams, Thomas Humphrey, 22382A.
Reig, Raymond Walter, 22320A.
Powell, John Cooper, 22305A.
McGann, Donald Albert, 22264A.
×Rollins, William Gordon, 22328A.
Dickson, Gerald Edgar, Jr., 22159A.
Brown, John Freeman, Jr., 22125A.
×Marsh, Harold Gene, 22254A.
×Marlow, Louis Gene, 22253A.
×Hampton, Frederick Jordan, 22197A.
Brown, Jack Darwin, 22123A.
×Young, James Russell, Jr., 22386A.
×Lessig, Raymond Harry, 22246A.
×Martin, John Floyd, 22256A.
Kalisch, Robert Burns, 22231A.
×Watsey Stephen, 22373A.
×Fernandez, Antonio Manuel, Jr., 22169A.
Croan, John Walter, 22150A.
Hutson, John Colcock, 22219A.
Lyden, Edward Miller, 22251A.
×Ferree, David Frederick, 22170A.

Frasca, William Hammersley, 22174A.
McIntosh, Robert Henderson, 22267A.
Anderson, Loren Albin, 22094A.
Giordano, Bruno Antonio, 22181A.
×Ciamprone, Vincent Pancrazio, 22133A.
Niven, John Walter, 22288A.
×Matthews, Peter, 22255A.
×Corrigan, Patrick Joseph, 22146A.
Dailey, Joseph Edward, 22155A.
×Shibata, George, 22345A.
Baltz, Dickey Lee, 22100A.
×Duke, Charles Bauer, Jr., 22163A.
×Vandenberg, Hoyt Sanford, Jr., 22367A.
Murphy, James Barber, 22280A.
×Lederle, John Hirst, 22243A.
×Rook, Theodore Chapman, 22330A.
×Hurd, Calvin William, 22218A.
Dozier, Wayne Manford, 22161A.
×Matson, Keith Wayne, 22258A.
Gordon, John Bennett, Jr., 22184A.
×Rynties, Anthony Durk, 22334A.
Bowden, Jackson Huffman, 22115A.
Cocke, Clyde, Jr., 22135A.
×Cuthbertson, William Hugh, 22154A.
Cook, Peyton Ellsworth, 22142A.
Grady, James Harris, 22188A.
×Milliman, Dain William, Jr., 22274A.
×Witmer, Charles Russell, Jr., 22385A.
Nelson, William Boyd, 22285A.
Brown, James Richard, 22124A.
Rehwaldt, Robert John, 22318A.
Hechinger, Robert Michael, 22203A.
McDonald, Robert Franklin, 22262A.
×Mehelas, John Nicholas, 22270A.
×Kay, Donald Jerome, 22232A.
Anderson, Robert Douglas, 22095A.
Perky, James Dargan, 22302A.
Gould, Robert Patterson, 22187A.
Samotis, John Alexander, 22335A.
Ortolivo, Basil Anthony, 22293A.
Crews, Alvan Macauley, 22149A.
Guidroz, Richard Paul, 22191A.
×Loughead, Robert Brierley, Jr., 22250A.
×Seagren, Leonard Warren, 22341A.
Billingslea, Clement Dixon, 22113A.
×Verner, Edward Wingfield, 22368A.
Ward, Clifford Lloyd, 22374A.
Forrest, Frank Reese, 22173A.
Olson, Robert Earle, 22292A.
Roberts, Louis Aubrey, Jr., 22325A.
Lawton, William Henry, Jr., 22242A.
×Sheridan, Philip, 22340A.
Smith, William Morris, Jr., 22352A.
×Meredith, Freddie Dan, 22272A.
×Murray, Daniel Crawford, 22281A.
×Miller, Paul Richard, 22273A.
Stockman, David Twogood, 22359A.
×Reichard, Fred Guillermo, 22319A.
×Hodgkins, Franklin Herbert, 22212A.
×LaPides, Jerome, 22238A.
×Larson, Robert Vernon, 22240A.
×Rose, Ernest Guy, 22331A.
×Collins, Mathews McCleave, 22138A.
×Starrett, John Paul, 22354A.
×Allen, John Edwin, 22092A.
Fischal, Frank Raymond, Jr., 22171A.
×Howard, Raymond Helttula, 22213A.
Cashman, Patrick Joseph, Jr., 22129A.
O'Brien, Charles Clark, 22291A.
×Greer, Donald Duane, 22164A.
×Drake, Walter Millard, Jr., 22162A.
Meadow, Charles Joe, 22269A.
×Maier, Paul Leslie, 22252A.
LeStourgeon, William Duexsaint, 22247A.
Meinhold, Robert Louis, 22271A.
Nyquist, Charles Wolfgang, 22290A.
×Richitt, Donald Anthony, 22322A.
Painter, Robert Dixon, 22296A.
Thorne, Anthony Stearns, 22363A.
Benjovsky, Victor Cokayne, 22109A.
×Muth, Robert Walker, 22282A.
×Roberts, Robert Martin, 22326A.
Walsh, Richard Ambrose, 3d, 22372A.
×Bartenfeld, Thomas Augustus, Jr., 22105A.
×Pardee, William Joseph, 22297A.
×Biddle, Everett Dale, Jr., 22112A.
×Weber, Oscar Werner, 22377A.
Kirby, Kermit Alexander, 22234A.
×Garofalo, Joseph Thomas, Jr., 22176A.
Martin, Paul Brice, 22257A.
×Lemelman, Mark Eliot, 22244A.
Hunter, Francis Robert, Jr., 22217A.
×Pruden, Kenneth Elmer, 22309A.
×Whitener, Carr Choate, 22380A.
×Stevens, Walter Clarence, Jr., 22358A.
Parmelee, James Wheeler, 22298A.
Birch, Paul Russell, 22114A.
Mularz, Joseph John, 22278A.
Berrier, John Theodore, 22111A.
Craven, William Patrick, 22148A.
×Glenn, Leo, Jr., 22182A.
Goumas, Melto, 22980A.
Archibald, Russell Dean, 23943A.
Boyne, John Joseph, 23944A.
×Owens, Wayne Edward, 24591A.
Conine, William Burton, 25900A.
Brown, Larry Frank, 24859A.
Watson, William James Henry, 24592A.
×Adair, Robert Ernest, 24593A.
×Dellinger, David Carol, 24595A.
×Clark, Roy Thomas, Jr., 24594A.
×Skipper, Francis Henry, 23945A.
Carr, William Edward, 22470A.
Ahrens, Conrad Frederick, 22478A.
Williams, Bernard Richard, Jr., 22467A.
Johnson, Eugene Allen, 22471A.
×Ferguson, Bruce Hart, 22474A.
Nichols, William Ludger, 22475A.
×Domian, Henry Albert, 22476A.
Johnston, Richard Andrew, 22483A.
Nutt, Waymond Cecil, 22484A.
×Parlett, Henry Wisner, 22489A.
Peterson, Donald Chris, 22491A.
Wethington, Jerry Dawson, 22480A.
Danielson, Walter Russell, Jr., 22481A.
×White, Simon Secrest, Jr., 22482A.
Frazier, Frank Daniel, 22487A.
Madison, Solomon Lee, 22479A.
Keelan, Dare Kendall, 22488A.
×Dowling, Cloyd James, Jr., 22485A.
×Browning, Howard J., 22473A.
Ottensmeyer, David Joseph, 22490A.
Love, Curtis Clinton, 22469A.
Caulfield, Patrick Henry, 25901A.
×Deese, Charles Glenn, 22459A.
Horton, Lemuel Douglas, 22418A.
×Noah, Joseph Watson, 22420A.
×Smith, Roy Wayne, Jr., 22421A.
×White, John Weaver, 22422A.
Burgess, George Megrew, 22417A.
×Logsdon, Harold Eugene, 22935A.
Thompson, Richard Leroy, 23946A.
Johnston, Sidney Fowler, Jr., 25903A.
Slaughter, Norman Elmont, Jr., 25902A.
Raley, Jackson Lee, 22934A.
Hegberg, Willard Wayne, 23601A.
O'Brien, Donald William, 25904A.
Lebish, Nathaniel Harry, 24860A.
Armstrong, William Oliver, 22507A.
Marshall, James Harold, 22533A.
×Kassor, Edward William, Jr., 22501A.
×Warner, Eugene Rankin Richard, 22504A.
×King, William Moreland, 22506A.
Norris, Paul Lee, 22517A.
Fryauf, Donald Frank, 22522A.
×Selers, William S., 22532A.
×Tiel, Robert Pryor, 22535A.
Dutton, Richard Allen, 22497A.
×White, B. D., 22499A.
×Thomas, Ralph William, 22502A.
×Wallace, Charles William, 22500A.
Collins, Billy Manning, 22498A.
×Huston, Evan E., 22515A.
Tinius, John Otto, 22519A.
Mullins, Jimmy Wayne, 22526A.
×Venable, William Pettit, Jr., 22529A.
×Ward, Robert Wharton, 22531A.
×Kuchera, Thomas John, 22534A.
×Shaw, Robert Brown, 22538A.
Hart, Joseph Leslie, 22505A.
×Shoults, Hugh William, 22496A.
Johns, Thomas Harry, 22511A.
×Martin, Fernand Frederick, 22518A.
×Bode, Waldemar Emerson, 22523A.
Church, Joe Litton, 22524A.
Connor, Vernon Leroy, 22541A.
×Penovich, George, 22495A.
Catlin, John England, Jr., 22510A.
Takasugi, Shoji, 22513A.
×Hill, Milton Dunsford, 22520A.
×Pickett, George Kenyon, 22521A.
×Burton, Duane Clark, 22527A.
×Maxfield, Daniel Paul, 22528A.
×Thompson, James Carlton, 22512A.
Courtney, Fred Dawson, 22516A.
×Carter, Robert Douglas, 22525A.
×McConnell, John Patrick, 22530A.
Marshall, Don L., 22537A.
×Ryan, B. W., 22508A.
×Staab, John Michael, 22509A.
Babcock, Earl Lee, 22536A.
McNair, Nimrod, Jr., 23947A.
×Boyle, James Michael, 24861A.
Faulds, Rodney Duane, 25599A.
Thogersen, Alton Jens, 25905A.
Baker, Albert Ralph, 25906A.
Sifers, Samuel Iba, Jr., 25907A.
×Howland, William Agnew, Jr., 23607A.
Rogers, Billy Frank, 23613A.
Bott, James Frederick, 23603A.
Smithson, Claud Joseph, Jr., 23615A.
×Blurton, Robert Lee, 23602A.
×Pontikes, Constantine Angelos, 23612A.
×Snyder, Philip Richard, 233616A.
×Fox, Arthur Edward, 23605A.
×Lindsay, Dean Edwin, 23608A.
×Brady, Charles Raith, 23604A.
×MacGinitie, Walter Harold, 23609A.
×Walton, Robert Lee, Jr., 23618A.
×Sims, Eaton Kittredge 3d, 23614A.
Gibson, William Herring, 23606A.
×Thompson, Walter William, 23617A.
×Phillips, Victor Frederic, Jr., 23611A.
McMillan, Lonnie Charles, 23610A.
Sawyer, Mary Ann, 25596W.
×Reynolds, Herbert Hal, 25595A.
Collins, Elizabeth Wheeler, 25593W.
Florio, Philip, Jr., 25594A.
Harness, Arminta Jean, 25909W.
Healy, Thomas Leroy, 25910A.
Reddoch, John Horace, 25912A.
Mellema, Robert John, 25911A.
Stouffer, Myron Ellsworth, Jr., 23022A.
Burkhart, Robert Earl, 23020A.
×Powers, William Edward, 23023A.
Barnes, Robert Dale, 23019A.
Dyer, Thomas Emmett, 23021A.
George, Harry Eugene, Jr., 23043A.
Post, Foster Andrews, 25597A.
Hall, Hollis O'Neal, 25913A.
×Flanagan, Stephen Matthew, 22877A.
×Plonowski, Francis Stanley, 22885A.
×Card, Albert Michael, 22887A.
Kavanagh, Francis Melvin, 22888A.
×Dodd, Randolph Lee, 22890A.
×Berry, Schuyler Pierce, Jr., 22893A.
×Selig, James Richard, 22899A.
×Dussault, Richard Eugene, 22902A
Hoyer, William Francis, 22905A.
×Helton, Daymond Estil, 22907A.
×Mazak, Edward Paul, Jr., 22875A.
×Brown, Edward Allan, 22909A.
×Barlow, Melville Robert, 22913A.
×Joppa, Richard Marvin, 22914A.
×Wieland, Richard John, 22915A.
Moore, Marshall Walter, 22920A.
×Collins, William Joseph, 22923A.
×Woodhouse, Edward John, 22878A.
×Fox, Harold Lavar, 22880A.
×Jones, Jacob Newton, Jr., 22874A.
×Karalis, Evangelis Harry, 22884A.
×Taylor, Richard Norman, 22876A.
×Joel, Nathan Leiner, 22886A.
Jones, Frank Grimes, 22891A.
×Williams, Henry Nelson, 22895A.
×Franzen, Marvin Herbert, 22897A.
×Robinson, Samuel Martin, 22898A.
×Sommer, William Regis, 22903A.
×Fehlings, Donald Meredith, 22908A.
×Scharff, James Harry, 22910A.
×Harris, William Edwin, Jr., 22912A.
Thomas, Henry Lowry, Jr., 22917A.
Artz, Robert Barry, 22918A.
×Wolf, Robert Kenneth, 22921A.
×Anderson, Richard McLemore, 22922A.
×Cady, Robert Pulsipher, 22883A.
Barnett, Lee Nelson, 22896A.
Fiebelkorn, John Albert, 22901A.
×Deen, Thomas Blackburn, 22906A.
×Penney, Francis Wood, 22919A.
Nelson, Earle Edward, 22882A.
×Smurro, William Edward, 22900A.
×Lindberg, James Palmer, Jr., 22904A.
×Davis, Hubert Porter, 22926A.
Coffee, Kenneth Harold, 22889A.
×Weller, Burton Lee, 22881A.

Karma, Arthur, 22911A.
×Blanchard, Robert Glenn, 22925A.
×Pinckney, Thomas Cotesworth, Jr., 22924A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Overfelt, Clifford Durward, Jr., 25340A.
×Haas, Raymond Otto, 24241A.
Ables, William Arlie, Jr., 25675A.
×Richardson, Toxie Wilton, Jr., 24242A.
×McIntyre, Walter Vincent, 24243A.
×Williams, William Leonard, 24244A.
Tribble, William David, 25341A.
×Freud, Sheldon Lee, 24245A.
Gray, Pat B., 25676A.
×Diedrich, Frederick John, Jr., 24246A.
×Bell, Herbert Edwin, 22542A.
×Etter, Hal Guy, 24247A.
×Long, Ralph Stewart, Jr., 24248A.
Collins, Harry Richard, 25342A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy, retired, to be a vice admiral in the line of the Navy, pursuant to the provisions of title 37, United States Code, sections 275, 276, and 277.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Merwin H. Silverthorn, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps, effective from the date of his retirement.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 14), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Thomas Potter Pike, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Wilbur Marion Brucker, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Laurence Ballard Robbins, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Snowden C. Ager
Dwight M. Agnew, Jr.
Robert J. Akens
Thomas L. Albee, Jr.
Peter C. Alecxih
Ramon C. Alvarado
Arthur J. Ammerman
Clell N. Ammerman
Alfred P. Amoruso
Eugene G. Anderson
Falvie B. Anderson, Jr.
Jack R. Anderson
Joe K. Anderson
Joseph F. Anderson
Walter S. Anderson
William P. Anderson
Matthew E. Anglim, Jr.
Theodore F. Ascherfeld, Jr.
Augustus T. Ashton II
James F. Austin
James W. Austin
Robert C. Austin
William M. Bacon
Thomas L. Baird
Gaylord B. Ballard
Lawrence D. Ballow
Thomas V. Banfield II
Thomas A. Banta
Michael G. Basford
Bradley A. Bassett
John P. Bayne
Derald R. Beal
John L. Beck
Walter R. Beck
Archibald B. Beckmann, Jr.
James F. Bell
Maurice R. Berdan
Robert L. Berg
Frank R. Berkhimer
Robert D. Biederman
William Biggar
Henry G. Billerbeck
Roland C. Bilyeu
Norman H. Bissel
Richard W. Blaes
George T. Bole
Richard P. Bordone
John W. Boyd, Jr.
Frank A. Brame III
Horace W. Brandon
John S. Brennan
Robert L. Brewin
Gordon A. Brill, Jr.
Robert R. Briner
Christopher H. Brown
Robert C. Brown, Jr.
Robert H. Brown
Eugene P. Brummett
James I. Brunell
Robert C. Bunger
Lawrence Burkhardt III
Richard F. Burns
Evenson M. Burtis
Melville R. Byington, Jr.
Mark W. Byrd
Jose C. Cabanillas II
Hamlin A. Caldwell, Jr.
Roderick A. Cameron
Donald S. Campbell, Jr.
John D. Campbell
John L. Campbell
Guy Cane
William A. Cann
Howard R. Canter
James H. Carson, Jr.
Gerald M. Carter, Jr.
Theodore C. Casimes
Ralph E. Chidley
George E. Chisholm II
Athol W. Cliff, Jr.
Walter J. Coakley, Jr.
Leonard I. Cole, Jr.
Irvin L. Coleman, Jr.
Byron H. Collier
Ferdinand I. Collins, Jr.
William P. Colvin
Lawrence S. Colwell
Robert G. Conaughton
Thomas W. Conboy
Robert B. Conklin
Samuel R. Connor
Edward C. Copeland
Robert L. Cornell
James P. Couillard
Herbert C. Crane
George H. Crawford
John W. Crawford
Roderick P. Crawford
William T. Crawford
William V. Cronin
Philip W. Cronk
William H. Croom, Jr.
Joseph D. Cummings
Marshall E. Cunningham
Richard A. Currier
Thomas L. Curry
Robert L. Cutts
Bernard F. Czaja
Bart M. Dalla Mura, Jr.
Richard J. Damico
Jerry D. Dancer
William D. Daniels
Ralph G. Davis
Edward H. Dawson, Jr.
Norman A. Deam
Herbert J. Dean
Donald D. Deem
John R. Delaney
Maurice H. Desseyn
Jamieson K. Deuel
Leonard "M" Dickey
Ricky W. Diehl
Lewis E. Diley
Jon C. Dilweg
Philip C. Donovan
John E. Dougherty, Jr.
George W. Dozier, Jr.
Carl C. Drenkard
Julian A. Ducat
Sylvester M. Dulke
Gordon V. Dunn
James A. Dunning
Alan J. Dworsky
Peter B. Easton
Theodore M. Edson
Ralph C. Elder
Donal W. Elliott
Frank B. Elsbree
Fredric G. Fagan
David E. Ferguson
Kenneth A. Ferrer
Peter B. Fiedler, Jr.
William B. Fields
Raymond McD. Fillerup
David A. Fitzwilliam
Robert M. Flaherty
William B. Fletcher III
Paul R. Foley
Donald L. Forbes
Clifton G. Foster, Jr.
Scott R. Foster
Walter B. Frick
Elbert L. Fryberger, Jr.
Truman H. Fugate
George M. Gans, Jr.
Gerald I. Gard, Jr.
Bennett Gardner
Jerry E. Garlitz
Richard T. Gaskill
Fred H. Gates II
Donald H. Gehring
Eugene L. Geronime
William C. Gideon, Jr.
Albert K. Glover, Jr.
Harold A. Glovier, Jr.
David L. Glunt, Jr.
Paul T. Gorman
Basil F. Gray, Jr.
William C. Gray, Jr.
Terry S. Green III
William C. Greenlaw
William E. Greer III
Bernard R. Greisen
Rodney D. Griffiths
Paul M. Grover, Jr.
James G. Grunwell
Allan R. Gunion
Robert S. Haines
Howard LeR. Hall
John D. Halpine
Louis H. Hamel III
Elton E. Hankins
Mark Z. Hanlon, Jr.
Jerry "L" Hamilton
Andrew L. Hamlin
Paul F. Happersett
William W. Hargrave, Jr.
John Q. Hargrove III
George T. Harper, Jr.
Richard R. Hartley
Robert L. Hatfield
Darwin L. Hatheway
John W. Havicon
James C. Hay
James V. Healy
George F. Heinrich
Robert M. Hemings, Jr.
Edward E. Henifin
George M. Henson
Oscar A. Herzer
Irvine K. Heyward IV
William C. Hicklin III
John F. Higgins
Leonard O. Hilder, Jr.
William W. Hill
David R. Hinkle
Allen Hobbs, Jr.
Walter B. Hocker
Edward J. Hogan, Jr.
Thomas W. Hogan, Jr.
William G. Holland
Richard G. Hollenbach
William D. Holloman
William C. Holman
Henry C. Holt IV
William F. Holtz
Thomas J. Hooley
Herbert A. Hope, Jr.
John Horner, Jr.
Charles L. Horowitz
Thomas B. Hudgins
Maurice W. Huffer
William L. Huffman, Jr.
Fred A. Hull
Kenneth E. Hume
Charles B. Hunter
William J. Hunter
Jonathan S. Hurt
Theodore Huttinger
Blair Ireland
Charles E. Jaco
David C. Jenkins
Joseph T. Jennings
Robert J. Jermstad, Jr.
Arthur D. Jesser
Eugene T. Johnston
Fox H. Johnston
James V. Jolliff
Carroll S. Jones
John P. Jones, Jr.
Robert F. Jones, Jr.
Stephen W. Jordan
John G. Juergens
John D. Keating
Edward S. Kellogg III
Richmond K. Kelly, Jr.
Lawrence R. Kilty
Richard B. King
Frederic H. M. Kinley
Leo D. Kinney
Frederick J. Kirby
George F. Knotts
James G. Kohoutek
Frederick J. Kollmorgen
Zygmont J. Kowalskey, Jr.
Chris Krahn
William J. Kratt
Edwin G. Krikorian
David S. Kruger
Jerold L. Krumwiede
Ronald J. Kurth
Walker W. Lambert
James F. Lamore
Elwood W. Land, Jr.
William J. Lane
Roy G. Langrind
Thomas J. Lawson
Charles W. Learned, Jr.
Richard Leslie
David E. Lewis
Ernest W. Lietzan, Jr.
John G. Link
Philip N. Livingstone
Charles L. Long
Waldon E. Lord
Donald E. Loring
William R. Lutz
John F. Lyding
Donald M. Lynne
Philip Lyons
Burnham C. McCaffree, Jr.
Robert T. McCaffrey
Francis J. McCarthy, Jr.
Gerald D. McCarthy
Parker W. McClellan
Benjamin D. McCubbins, Jr.
Ronald F. McDevitt
Guy A. McElroy
James F. McGill
Robert J. McGurk
George R. McKee, Jr.
James A. McKenzie II
Kent A. McKnight
Stephen P. McNally
Patrick "J" S. McNenny
Robert E. Mack
Raymond R. Maestri
James G. Mahorner
John T. Marshall, Jr.
John T. Marshall, Jr.
Edward H. Martin
Robert T. Martin
Carl L. Master, Jr.
Kleber S. Masterson, Jr.
Robert L. Merritt
Marshall R. Messinger
Donald J. Meyer
John R. Michaels
Ralph A. Millar, Jr.
Thomas H. Millen
Charles H. Miller III
Raleigh B. Miller, Jr.
Russell C. Miller
William C. Miller
Donald F. Mitchell
Arthur S. Mobley
Louis F. Moebus
Kenneth Montgomery
William J. Montgomery
Robert W. Montross
Joe Mook
Robert E. Moore III
Thomas W. Moore
Charles H. Morris
Edward H. Mortimer III
Donald A. Morton
Francis S. Mudgett
Richard G. Murphy
Thomas F. Murray
Richard C. Myers
Harold A. Nagel, Jr.
Owen W. Nash
William C. Neel
Floyd G. Nelson
John E. Newton
William H. Nicholls, Jr.
Louis C. Niederlander, Jr.
Walter C. Nix
William E. Oberholtzer III
John T. O'Brien
William J. Oldmixon
Charles F. Olsen
Jerome J. Olsen
Robert M. Olsen
Richard L. Olson
Robert J. O'Malia
Walter A. Orsik
Leo A. Orsino
Edward R. Oscarson
Richard G. Padberg
Eugene H. Parker
Richard E. Parks
Matthew F. Pasztalaniec
Julian C. Patrick
Lee R. Patterson
Raymond F. Pavia
William K. Peery
David J. Perault
Jack C. Perkins
Mell A. Peterson, Jr.
Paul A. Petzrick
Charles P. Pfarrer, Jr.
Marvin LeR. Philpot
Dallas Pickard, Jr.
Robert K. Pierce
James B. Pitman, Jr.
Eugene T. Polini, Jr.
Harold I. Pollack
Charles E. Pollard, Jr.
Robert W. Polsin
Charles P. Poreda
George W. Post
George E. Prochaska
Rudolph J. Prosser
Thomas J. Pruitt
Walter J. Quinn
Thomas A. Quirk, Jr.
John D. Raiford
Steve LaC. Ramos
James R. Ramzy
Albert D. Raper
David R. Raunig
Richard R. Read
John R. Reardon
Roger L. Reasonover, Jr.
John A. Reid
Wilson G. Reid
John E. Reisinger
Charles E. Reiss
Robert J. Rennell
James V. Reynolds
William J. Richter, Jr.
Arthur O. Riendeau, Jr.
John E. Riester
Robert F. Rigling
Robert R. Robertson, Jr.
George R. Robey, Jr.
William N. Robinson
William P. Rodriguez
Thomas D. Rogers
Robert B. Rogers
Howard G. Romaine
Charles C. Rose, Jr.

Rufus E. Rose, Jr.
Charles K. Rourke
Kenneth W. Ruggles
Charles F. Rutherford, Jr.
Ernest J. Sabol, Jr.
Wiley M. Sanders
Doral R. Sandlin
Norman M. Sassi
Robert E. Schlenzig
Robert D. Schoeckert
Peter van R. Schoeffel
Charles D. Schoonover
Richard P. Schroats
Lawrence A. Scott
Robert W. Scott
James A. Seabloom
John M. Seacord
Thomas U. Seigenthaler
John W. Sellers
Ralph M. Sesler
John J. Shanaghan
Edward R. Shannon
Walter B. Shaw, Jr.
Oliver V. Shearer, Jr.
Robert K. Sheehan
Robert G. Shields
Paul Shimek, Jr.
Clark W. Shorey
Lawrence A. Shumaker
Edwin A. Shuman III
Thomas U. Sisson, Jr.
Paul Skarlatos
Francis A. Slattery
Paul S. Slawson
Robert L. Smidt
William W. Smila
Allen Smith III
David G. Smith
Irvin LeR. Smith
Leighton D. Smith
Lloyd H. Snider
Edward C. Snyder, Jr.
Richard C. Soderholm
Mitchel S. Soltys
Curtis A. Sorenson
John Van D. Southworth, Jr.
Ernest A. Stamm
Charles E. Steel
Francis X. Steele
James C. Steele
Frederick C. Stelter III
Morris H. Stephenson, Jr.
Edward G. Stevens, Jr.
Donald W. Stevenson
William R. Stickling
Michael J. Stoffel
Bernard F. Storck
John Strachan
Paul D. Stroop, Jr.
Terence B. Sutherland
Harry J. Sweet
Anton R. Switzer
Edward H. Tandy, Jr.
Arthur C. Taylor
Timothy C. Taylor
Robert H. Thalman
John F. Tate
Edgar R. Terry
Richard L. Thompson
Nils R. Thunman
Herbert E. Tibbetts
Albin A. Tisdale
Robert G. Tolg, Jr.
Paul E. Treagy, Jr.
Herbert D. Trenham
George A. Trevors
Dennis R. Trone
Ralph A. Turner, Jr.
Donald M. Ulmer
Charles H. Ulrich
Alton L. Van Ausdal
Alexander A. Varbedian, Jr.
Evan J. Vaughan, Jr.
John L. Vaughan, Jr.
Van L. Vierbicky
Victor P. Viglino
Peter J. Vogelberger, Jr.
Bill R. Walker
Dallas L. Wallace
Don Walsh
Harvey T. Walsh, Jr.
Joseph A. Walsh, Jr.
David P. Watkins
Howard B. Watkins, Jr.
Thomas C. Watson, Jr.
Thomas P. Watson
Robert "M" Watson
Haven N. Webb
John E. Wells
Peter M. Wells
Maurice H. Werness
Denton W. West
Charles G. Wheeler
Donald J. White
William A. White
James B. Whitehead
Roy R. Wight
John B. Wildman
James F. Wiley
Eugene N. Wilfert
Donald McK. Wilford
Joseph B. Williams
James S. Willis, Jr.
Robert R. Wilmer
Robert D. Wilson
Hal D. Wood
Fred L. Wood
Leon G. Wood, Jr.
Noel T. Wood
Bruce J. Wooden
John L. Woodward
James R. Wright
Peter B. Wyckoff
Luther D. Yarger
Harold L. Young
Paul F. Young
Joseph J. Zable
Richard M. Zook

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

Richard A. Anderson
Steven J. Barczewski
Charles W. Bartholomew
William E. Burr
Austin L. Byers
Charles B. Chapman III
Kelsey D. Chase, Jr.
Shelby VanN. T. Clark
Joseph A. Derrico
Paul A. Dollard
Dean W. Ervin
Theodore V. Fekula
Niel P. Ferraro
Otto J. Fuka, Jr.
Philip G. Graessle
Robert A. Hall
John A. Harvilla
Alvin E. Hochmuth, Jr.
W. Pinkney Jones
Leonard D. McCarthy
Bruce D. McCurdy
Stanley P. Michna
James W. Moore
Frank R. Nolan
Chester R. Oberg
Lester E. Ostrom
Elias A. Parent, Jr.
Kenneth A. Peterson
Walter T. Richards
William H. Schulden
Maynard K. Shipley
Jay R. Smith, Jr.
George E. Swenson
James F. Topping
John E. Wagner
Edward K. Walker, Jr.
Chester E. Weymouth, Jr.
Jack A. White
Kenneth B. Wilson
William J. Yeager
George V. Zeberlein, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Richard J. Alger
Joseph N. Allen III
Louis W. Alter, Jr.
Kenneth J. Ball
Barry N. Bittner
Donald P. Bowen
Raymond G. Burke
John J. Cale, Jr.
Richard H. Childress
Anthony R. Correnti
Clyde D. Dean
Richard L. Dennis
Frank J. Dorsey
George F. Ebbitt, Jr.
Stephen S. Eisenhauer
George J. Ertlmeier
Ernest E. Evans, Jr.
John W. Everett
James R. Forte
Frederick J. Franco, Jr.
Phillip B. Friedrichs
Donald M. Fuliam
Robert E. Gibson
Edward C. Goodman, Jr.
Vincent P. Hart, Jr.
David L. Hess
Charles M. Isbell
John P. Koonce
John J. Law, Jr.
Kenneth M. McJunkin, Jr.
William E. McKinstry
Robert R. Marshall
Frederick A. Mathews
Stanley . Michael, Jr.
Robert L. Moon
William E. Morgan
Bryce A. Mutch, Jr.
Robert C. Oakes
James L. Owens
Ronald A. Pavey
David L. Pease
James Pepperdine
Karl E. Peterson, Jr.
Charles L. Phillips
James A. Prestridge, Jr.
Frederick E. Pyeatt III
Richard Raymond III
Andrew J. Reynolds
John H. Rodgers, Jr.
Richard D. Runyan
Glen Sanford
Davis Sayes
William Scullion, Jr.
Jay G. Sellers
Harold E. Shore, Jr.
Alois A. Slepicka
William G. Soden
Edward C. Tipshus
Thomas C. Wells
Earl F. Whipple, Jr.
Russell O. Williams
Fitz W. McM. Woodrow, Jr.
Peter Yadlowsky

The following-named (AROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Grafton D. Addison, Jr.
William W. Berry
James W. Bramlet
Richard H. Casey
Walter J. Decota
John A. Dickerson
Hugh L. Dougherty, Jr.
Louis C. Drake
John L. Fischer
Edmund G. Garbee, Jr.
Harold G. Golla, Jr.
Harold H. Hill
Paul R. Kneuer
Myron S. Kops
John K. B. LeDeaux
Arthur D. Levin
Peter H. Lyons
Bruce M. MacLaren
Francis N. Millett, Jr.
Robert L. Modjeski
James S. Morris, Jr.
John F. Mowbray
Robert E. Price
George W. Ralph
George A. Ramer
John J. Salesses
William P. Schubmehl
Robert R. Shuman
Joseph A. Siler
Jerry L. Sizelove
Robert W. Wentz, Jr.

The following-named to be ensigns (Aviation) in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William DeHart
John R. Emerson
John W. Greenlee
William O. Jones
Eugene P. Kinney
Frank LeR. Moody
Thomas E. Quillin

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Aubrey E. Ables
William A. Aumick
Paul P. Bascom
James R. Bauman
Donald C. Bennett
Michael E. Boylson
John F. Campbell
Dudley S. Chambers
Donald A. Cheney
Stephen Cleaver
Raymond P. Coe
John P. Cryer
Willie E. Cumbie, Jr.
John D. Cundieff
Ramsey L. Davis, Jr.
John W. DeLoach
Robert G. Doney
Maxley W. Drumheller
George W. DuCharme
Alvan N. Dunn
William E. Evrard
James W. Faddis
James G. Farrell
Michael J. Fitzgerald
James P. Forsyth
Frank R. Friddle, Jr.
Edwin F. Gatlin
Elvin G. Gluba
Arva F. Gordon
James C. Hayes, Jr.
James D. Hendry
Roy M. Hollingworth
Morris L. Humphrey
Robert C. Ike
David E. Johnson
Francis A. Joiner
Ernest F. Jones, Jr.
Joseph A. Jurkowski
Joseph R. Kabelka
Robert G. Kavanagh
Wayne Keele, Jr.
Clyde R. Keith
Arlington N. Kline
Robert K. Lehto
Jesse W. Lewis, Jr.
Iven J. Maddox
Earl P. McBride
William L. McNamara
Arthur W. Melton
Byron O. Moore
William B. Moye, Jr.
"R" "F" Musgrave
Charles LaR. Noblit
Richard C. Perfetti
Alfred A. Peterson
Joseph H. Pettigrew
David "A" Phoenix
Carroll R. Price
Joseph R. Priestley
Lawrence F. Ribble
Alan H. Rice
Daniel W. Roderick
Silvano F. Sandoval
Gilbert E. Schmidt
Thomas D. Shearer
Robert L. Shuey
George W. Tracy III
Luther C. Tucker
Charles Walker
William P. Welborn
Gustav R. Weston
James E. Whitaker
Charles E. White
Ronel J. D. Williams

The following-named to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jack M. Cornelius
Jimmie S. Delleney
John C. Klaren
Richard N. Knop
Luther W. Peek
Howard "T" Ross, Jr.
Bill M. Velotas
Walter L. Williams
Paul Wohl
Robert H. Young

The following-named women to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marjorie N. Clarke
Joan G. Mackie

Albert D. Nelson, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Doyle R. Ballard
Forest C. Beaty, Jr.
Roy L. Belli
Charles H. Black
William E. Block
Edward R. Brog
Judson C. Bump
William G. Carson, Jr.
Robert P. Charles
James G. Collier
Goodwin Cooke
George J. Coughlin
Talmage R. Cowan
Claude M. Daniels
John P. Delaney
Chester P. Dereng
William C. Dobson
Joseph G. Doser
Edward R. Duda
John A. Durham
James R. Eddy
George M. Edmondson, Jr.
Raymond W. Edwards
John J. Flynn
Karl J. Fontenot, Jr.
John A. Forderhase
Edward P. Freeman
Gordon W. Hardy
Charles F. Harris
Robert A. Hodgins
Richard H. Holt
John E. Hutton, Jr.
Clayton Joyce
Billy J. Keller
Bobby T. Ladd
Lester D. Lane, Jr.
Richard H. Lang
Rodney H. Ledet
Emanuel J. Macchia
Paul M. MacDonald
Jack A. Manhke
Joseph R. Marosek
Arthur H. Miller
Clarence B. Miller, Jr.
James F. Milligan
Michael P. Murray, Jr.
John D. Muzdakis
Joseph G. O'Brien
John T. O'Connell
Robert G. Prebihalo
Richard M. Raia
Edwin J. Richardson, Jr.
Joseph W. Rodgers, Jr.
John F. Rubia
John Q. Ryan
Donald A. Schaefer
Donald F. Selby
Joe W. Shirley
Robert T. Simpson
Thomas H. Simpson
Bobby N. Smith
Theodore O. Snyder
Stanley L. Stanford
John R. Stanley
Alexander W. Stevens
Daniel C. Stewart
William K. Stuckey
Donald T. Tafjen
Hinton L. Tayloe
Robert B. Treat, Jr.
William J. Wagespack III
Donald Wojcik

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James Moriarty, Jr.
Arthur B. Thompson, Jr.

John W. P. Robertson to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 347, 79th Congress, as amended (34 U. S. C. 15).