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

As a day of tribulation Thou hast called us to dedicate our little lives to vast and vital causes.

In Thy providence it is ours to act part in momentous days when it can be solemnly said:

"Once to every man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood,
For the good or evil side."

We thank Thee that in such a day America is privileged to pledge her utmost that government by and for the people shall not be replaced by the shackles of tyrants, who disdain human dignity and whose ruling passion is to seize the reins of power for their own evil designs.

We humbly pray for the assurance that we are on Thy side. To this end keep our motives clean, our appraisals just, our conscience unbetrayed, as together, with fixed purpose of heart and in Thy might unafraid, we march to dignity and whose ruling passion is to seize the reins of power for their own evil designs.

We humbly pray for the assurance that we are on Thy side. To this end keep our motives clean, our appraisals just, our conscience unbetrayed, as together, with fixed purpose of heart and in Thy might unafraid, we march to dignity and whose ruling passion is to seize the reins of power for their own evil designs.

To the Senate:

Harris, ·

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories in that area, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) favoring temporary permission for parking on square 722 of the Capitol Grounds.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1955, Mr. George, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, and the protocol thereto signed at Manila on September 9, 1954 (Ex. K, 84th Cong., 2nd sess.), reported it favorably on January 25, 1955, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 1) thereon.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate entertain a convention on Great Lakes fisheries, signed at Washington on September 10, 1954.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention on Great Lakes fisheries between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington on September 10, 1954.

Upon submission of the present convention to the Senate, I desire to withdraw from the consideration of the Senate the Great Lakes Fisheries Convention signed at Washington on April 2, 1946 and submitted to the Senate on April 22, 1946 (Senate Executive C, 79th Cong., 3d sess.). I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention signed on September 10, 1954.

Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The White House.


(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries, signed at Washington September 10, 1954.)
Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5221 OF REvised Statutes Relating To VOLuntary Liquidation Of National Banks

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 1955, together with a supplement thereto (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER PRODUCING FACILITIES

A letter from the Chairman, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting pursuant to law, Report No. 8, prepared by the Federal Facilities Corporation, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, and maintenance of the Government-owned rubber producing facilities during the 5-month period for fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, pursuant to law, the third report on the extent and disposition of United States contributions to international organizations, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDING SECTION 1 OF ACT OF MARCH 12, 1914

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of act of March 12, 1914 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LEARNING OF RESTRICTED INDIAN LANDS REQUIREMENT OF 1945

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN GAMBLING INFORMATION IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities or on facilities of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REGISTRATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS TRAINED IN ESPIONAGE, COUNTERESPIONAGE, OR SUBVERSION SERVICE OR TACTICS OF A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RATES OF BASIC SALARIES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF FOREIGN SERVICE

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to readjust postal rates; establish a commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REALJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES AND ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON POSTAL RATES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to readjust postal rates; establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation increasing the personal income tax exemption limits.

"Whereas it is estimated that approximately 80 percent of Rhode Island's industrial workers are engaged in either directly producing goods for the consumer market, or producing materials or parts for consumer goods; and

"Whereas Rhode Island's goods are sold in a national market, and therefore the prosperity of Rhode Island business and industry and high levels of earnings and employment depend on a sustained and rising level of consumer purchasing power throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas extensive unemployment has resulted from the fact that the Nation's productive capacity exceeds present levels of consumption and

"Whereas it is essential to a more prosperous Rhode Island and a more prosperous Nation, that our national purchasing power be increased; and

"Whereas such an increase in purchasing power would be most effective and beneficial to the State, the same being spent at the highest proportion of their income: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the personal income-tax exemptions; and be it further

"Resolved, That attention of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States is respectfully called to these facts and that each is requested by this body to use all efforts in this behalf; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution by registered mail to both branches of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Relative to memorializing the President and Congress to have the Mammoth Pass Road in San Bernardino County, constructed as a national defense highway.

"Whereas the National Government is maintaining a naval ammunition depot at Hawthorne, Nev., for national defense; and

"Whereas the National Government has assisted in the construction of a national highway from the Mexican border to the coast, known as United States Highway No. 395; and

"Whereas the United States Highway No. 395 connects with various other highways leading to other coasts of the Nation; and

"Whereas the central portions of California, namely San Joaquin and Santa Clara Valleys, are without direct defense highways for a great portion of each year because of snow on the high Sierra Mountains; and

"Whereas, the Mammoth Pass, which is within a few miles of United States Highway No. 395, is much lower and in more open country than the other passes and is not closed with snow during the months of the winter months as the other passes; and

"Whereas a portion of said proposed highway has been constructed by the Forestry Department, building from both sides of the mountain range, leaving a distance of approximately 20 miles to connect the United States Highway No. 395 and State Highway Route 123; and

"Whereas the construction of a highway over the said Mammoth Pass which could be kept open during the winter months by the use of modern machinery would be an important link in coast defense, inasmuch as the proposed highway would connect the naval ammunition dump at Hawthorne, Nev., to San Joaquin Valley and coast points with great advantage to our defense; and

"Whereas the proposed highway would connect with United States Highway No. 99 from which several State highways lead across the Coast Range to the Santa Clara Valley on the west side of the said range, and connect with United States Highways Nos. 101 and 466; and

"Whereas the construction of the proposed highway would not only be of importance from the standpoint of national defense, but would be of inestimable advantage from an economic standpoint, in that it would

"(a) Afford an opportunity for the development of a virgin territory with extensive commercial value and an additional 2 billion board feet of potential pulp timber and

"(b) Attract a large amount of tourist traffic to view the priceless heritage of forests, mountains, game animals, birds and other natural beauty of the region which would be open to tourist and other travel; and

"(c) Provide a loop trip for those persons traveling from Southern California to the Owens Valley by the eastern route; and

"Resolved, That the National Government is respectfully called to these facts and that each is requested by this body to use all efforts in this behalf; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution by registered mail to both branches of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of California in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

By the Honorable Frank C. O'Bannon:

"Respectfully submitted, etc.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MARCH 26, 1955"
By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) : Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services;

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to make a suitable memorial to construct said highway as soon as possible; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor and to the Governor of any of the several States by the President of the United States or by the governor of any of the several States to certain aliens convicted of certain crimes to prevent deportation; and

"Whereas in many deserving cases undue hardship results by reason of the limitations placed upon the power of the governor provided for under this law; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Governor and Executive Council be thereby urged by the President of the United States to amend the provisions of the said Immigration and Nationality Act, commonly called the McCarran-Walter Act, and identified as Public Law 414, 83d Congress, 2d session, chapter 477 (8 U. S. C. sec. 1101 et seg.)

"Whereas this law provides only for the granting of a full and unconditional pardon by the President of the United States or by the governor of any of the several States to prevent deportation of an alien; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the Governor of each of the United States, to the Governor pertaining to the provisions placed upon the power of the Governor of any of the several States to prevent deportation of an alien; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation, Hon. Ezra T. Benson, United States Secretary of Agriculture and Hon. George M. Humphrey, United States Secretary of Treasury.

"O. E. BAHA,
"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate."

By Mr. ELLENDER : A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 4

"Whereas the Charolais cattle smuggled into Louisiana originated from an area in Mexico which foot and mouth disease has been prevalent and in which all livestock were exposed to and vaccinated against the disease; and

"Whereas the presence of these smuggled cattle in our State constitutes a threat to the livestock industry of the State and Nation, in that exposed vaccinated animals are considered potential carriers of foot-and-mouth disease for unknown periods of time; and

"Whereas the individuals involved in this case were refused permission for the legal entry of these cattle into the United States on two occasions because of the disease threat but chose to smuggle the cattle into this country, thus jeopardizing the entire livestock industry for their own personal gain; and

"Whereas the effectiveness of our livestock disease control laws in Louisiana will seriously curtail the movement of our livestock through normal marketing channels as 16 States, in order to protect their own livestock industries, have threatened to embargo all cloven-footed animals originating from or passing through Louisiana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representa­ tives, State of Louisiana, That the United States Secretary of Treasury Department be requested to refuse all further requests for delays in the removal of these animals; and be it further

"Resolved, That all the smuggled Charo­ lais cattle and their offspring be returned to Mexico immediately; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

"C. A. ATKINS,
"Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

A true and correct copy, January 20, 1955.

"W. CLEG COLE,
"Clerk, House of Representatives."
RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE ADMINISTRATORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Commissioner Melvin Larson, of the Wisconsin State Motor Vehicle Department, an important resolution which had been adopted by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators at a conference which they held on Los Angeles, Calif., on November 19, 1954.

The resolution raises the very important issue of a proposed special low postage rate for the mailing of motor vehicle license plates and certificates of title.

The resolution points out that there is at present a very unfortunate disuniformity in postage charges.

I present this important resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

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

Resolution 2

Whereas since the beginning of the practice of registering motor vehicles the United States post office has been confronted with the important task of distributing license plates and certificates of title issued by the several States; and

Whereas the postage for such distribution has been paid by the States; and

Whereas motor vehicle registration has grown to such an extent in recent years that the volume of license plates and certificates of title now imposes a tremendous financial burden on the States; and

Whereas all costs of administering motor vehicle registration and laws are steadily increasing; and

Whereas it is impossible to pass these increases on to the motoring public; and

Whereas 51 jurisdictions out of 65 States, Provinces, Territories, and districts have now adopted a standard-size license plate measuring 6 by 18 inches, and it is believed that all other jurisdictions which have not yet adopted such standard-size plate will do so in the near future; and

Whereas certain inequities now exist in the postal rates charged for sending license plates and certificates of title through the mail, an example of which is shown by the fact that in some States the postage on 1 license plate to a point within the first, second, or third zone is 8 cents, while the rate for 2 such plates is 20 cents; and

Whereas Congress has been long urged to promptly pass a bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Act which in a city of New York employ approximately 60,000 workers. Our Board of Trade has recently adopted a resolution requesting that Congress support Governor Harriman's proposal to extend the existing exemptions to labor performing such work in the City of New York. Time is of the essence because we are losing ground steadily.

MINIMUM HOURLY WAGE—TELEGRAM

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Friday, January 21, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, the junior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. CHASE, the senior Senator from Michigan, Mr. McNAMARA, the junior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. NELLY, and the junior Senator from Rhode Island, I introduced the bill (S. 662) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes. There has been a good deal of interest in this from groups and individuals in my State and elsewhere for such legislation.

It is certainly not news when groups and individuals representing labor give their strong support to legislation increasing the minimum wage and extending coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. However, when an organization representing business goes all out for such legislation, I believe that my colleagues in the Senate and other Americans throughout the country should take notice. Such support for the bill has come from the Greater Clothing Contractors Association, Inc. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed the telegram which was sent to me on January 21 from Mr. Greiff.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.: The Greater Clothing Contractors Association, Inc., of 100 Fifth Avenue, New York City, is a trade organization representing over 200 contracting shops in the men's clothing industry which in a city of New York employ approximately 60,000 workers. Our Board of Trade has recently adopted a resolution requesting that Congress support Governor Harriman's proposal to extend the existing exemptions to labor performing such work in the City of New York. Time is of the essence because we are losing ground steadily.

RUDOLPH GREIFF, General Manager, the Greater Clothing Contractors Association, Inc.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly:

S. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution authorizing the President to request the Secretary of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related territories adjacent to that area; without amendment (Rept. No. 13).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 589. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1903, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; with amendments (Rept. No. 15).

GREATER LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear today from Col. P. H. Phillips, Deputy Chief, Corps of Engineers, here in Washington, that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors had approved the regional report on deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels.

This marks an important step forward toward the completion of this great project which will cost around $110 million, but which will repay itself manyfold to our Nation.

The channels are the subject of (S. 171) a bill to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, which I introduced earlier this session.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Rivers and Harbors Board release recommending the deepening of the channels be printed at this point in the body of the Congressional Record and be thereafter appropriately referred.

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

RIVERS AND HARBOR BOARD RECOMMENDS DEEPENING OF GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

JANUARY 21, 1955. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at its meeting on January 20 held in Washington, D. C., concurred in the recommendation of the district engineer, United States engineer office, for the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels.

The Board's recommended plan of improvement provides for deepening and further improving the channels in St. Marys River, the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and Detroit River generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer. The Board also recommended that the district engineer's plan be revised to include 1 foot of depth, in addition to that shown in the plan, in South Canal, upper St. Marys River. The recommended improvements would provide not less than a 27-foot depth throughout the connecting channel of 96 percent of the navigation season, applicable to St. Lawrence Seaway traffic. The recommended increased depths are based on the requirements of internal Great Lakes traffic but are designed as being fully comparable to depths planned for the St. Lawrence Seaway. The Board estimated the additional cost of these improvements at $110,377,000.

The Board's recommendation also provided that a cutoff channel be constructed in Canada at Southeast Bend, St. Clair River, generally in accordance with the alternative plan of the district engineer for that section in lieu of further improvement along the existing alignment. If prior to initiation of construction in this reach accomplishment of that cutoff channel is not deemed feasible at an estimated additional cost to the United States of $5,491,000.

The Board's recommendation is being processed for submission to the Chief of Engineers. The proposed report of the Chief of Engineers thereon will be furnished to the Governors of the involved States and to interested Federal agencies for their views and comments. These comments will accompany the complete report to Congress with the Board's recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

After the report has been transmitted to Congress further action toward construction of any part or the entire improvement therein will depend upon the authorization of those projects by Congress and the subsequent appropriation of the necessary funds for the work proposed.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

By Mr. HUMPHREY [for Mr. MCCLELLAN], from the Committee on Government Operations, a resolution (S. Res. 40), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment.

S. Res. 40. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so as to effectuate such reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1957; without amendment (Rept. No. 1174).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 13. Resolution to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce (Rept. No. 19); and

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the employment of an additional clerical assistant by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTINUANCE OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare under Senate Resolution 235, 84th Congress, to the extent of $500,000, is hereby extended through March 31, 1956.

S. Res. 15. Resolution to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce (Rept. No. 19); and

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the employment of an additional clerical assistant by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], from the Committee on Government Operations, I report an original resolution to provide funds for the investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, and ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 41. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration, by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning January 1, 1955, and ending on January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR THE SERVICE OF EVAN D. BOWRING—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 47), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Zelma Shepard, widow of M. H. Shepard, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HILDA MILLER COON

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 47), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Hilda Miller Coon, widow of Jesse D. Coon, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN PERIOD OF EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR EVA BOWRING—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to pay compensation for a certain period to employees of former Senator Eva Bowring, and I submit a report (No. 18) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 48) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Eva Bowring, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 7, 1954, salary for services in her office for the period November 8, 1954, through December 4, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 7, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 7, 1954.

MARY ELIZABETH ELLIS

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 45), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Elizabeth Ellis, widow of Joseph C. Ellis, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 12 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, paid as a death benefit, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ZELMA SHEPARD

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 46), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Zelma Shepard, widow of M. H. Shepard, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 2 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXTENSION OF TIMES FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to extend the times by which the Committee on the Judiciary may conduct studies and investigations, and I submit a report (No. 17) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.
The resolution (S. Res. 49) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the times in which the Committee on the Judiciary may expend funds under authority of Senate Resolution 172, agreed to January 27, 1954; Senate Resolution 181, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 187, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 188, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 190, agreed to January 27, 1954; and Senate Resolution 227, agreed to April 26, 1954, are hereby extended through February 28, 1955.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR UPTON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 50), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Robert W. Upton, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 7, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period November 8, 1954, through December 7, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 7, 1954.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR BROWN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 51), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Ernest S. Brown, who were carried on the Senate payroll on December 1, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period December 2, 1954, through December 31, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of December 1, 1954.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR BURKE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 52), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Thomas A. Burke, who were carried on the Senate payroll on December 2, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period December 3, 1954, through January 1, 1955, or for so much of that time through January 1, 1955, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of December 2, 1954.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR CRIPPA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 53), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Edward D. Crippa, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 26, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period November 29, 1954, through December 28, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 28, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 26, 1954.

COMPENSATION FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD TO EMPLOYEES OF FORMER SENATOR LENNON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 54), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the administrative and clerical assistants appointed by former Senator Alton Lennon, who were carried on the Senate payroll on November 26, 1954, salary for services in his office for the period November 29, 1954, through December 28, 1954, or for so much of that time through December 28, 1954, as they were not otherwise gainfully employed, at their respective rates of salary as of November 26, 1954.

INTERIM REPORT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER (S. REPT. NO. 14)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit an interim report by the Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter. This report contains recommendations for 1 more year so that it may make final recommendations helpful to the President in formulating the position of the United States Government in the event a United Nations Charter Review Conference is held next year. By the terms of the resolution, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Goree, will serve as chairman of the subcommittee.

I should like to express my appreciation to the Honorable Guy Gillette, who conceived the study originally and who served with me during the 83d Congress. I also wish to thank other members of the subcommittee who helped carry on this work, namely, Senators Ferguson, Knowland, Cooper, Holland, Sparkman, and Mansfield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Mr. Browne, W. M., Mayor, Jr., and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Philip Alexander Ray, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce; and

Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner; and

John, Robert O'Conner, Charles B. Williams, and sundry other persons for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. DANIELS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner; and

Ben H. Gull, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 701. A bill to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted by the city of Charleston, S. C., to the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 702. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GORZOK:

S. 704. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indians and Indian communities in the southern part of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 705. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 706. A bill for the relief of Dr. James Zolotas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 707. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indians and Indian communities in the southern part of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 708. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GORZOK:

S. 709. A bill for the relief of Margarete Lewis; and

S. 710. A bill for the relief of Chrisito Paul Zolotas to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By MR. DRIKSEN:

S. 711. A bill for the relief of Dr. James C. B. Levy, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 712. A bill to authorize the release of the personnel files of Federal officers and employees to congressional committees at the request of such officers and employees; and
S. 710. A bill to establish a postal rate-making procedure in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 711. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents with the Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 712. A bill to amend section 7 (h) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to toy Hagopian; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. DORGAS):

S. 713. A bill for the relief of Romana Michellina Sereni;

S. 714. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Ferrara; and

S. 715. A bill for the relief of Toy Lin Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDY:

S. 716. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Fort Randall Dam project, of mineral, oil, or gas interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDY (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 717. A bill to provide for the return to the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years the age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 718. A bill to provide a return to the former owners of certain Pakistani aliens; and

S. 719. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Stafford Ordnance Corp., a corporation, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 719. A bill to authorize certain improvements in the Upper Weber Dam project, in Utah, for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 720. A bill to establish the Interstate Commerce Commission in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 721. A bill to establish a Commission on Mental Health, and to provide for a study of the problems of mental illness and for the development of a national mental-health program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. NEELLY:

S. 722. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

for the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. HENNING):

S. 723. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEHR (for himself and Mr. MUNROE, Mr. SCHOFFEL, and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 725. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEHR (for himself, Mr. MUNROE, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. FULSBRIGHT):

S. 726. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 727. A bill to provide public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 728. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the anti-trust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 731. A bill to provide for the control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 732. A bill to establish a corporation, by granting a right of action to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. MUNROE, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. FULSBRIGHT):

S. 733. A bill to provide for the control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONEY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. FULSBRIGHT:

S. 734. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Fort Randall Dam project, of mineral, oil, or gas interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 734. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and members of his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 735. A bill to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. NEELLY):

S. 736. A bill to provide a transcontinental superhighway with alternate sections; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 737. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Wallace, in Wallace County, Kansas, as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. NEELLY):

S. 738. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (40 Stat. 396), as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMATHERS (by request):

S. 739. A bill for the relief of Avak Hagopian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 740. A bill to extend for an additional 5 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 741. A bill to amend section XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, in order to repeal the provi­ sion that provided for federal assistance under such title; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 742 (request). A bill to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 743. A bill to authorize biennial inspections of the United States Merchant Marine Art, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, in order to repeal the provision that provided for federal assistance under such title; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 744. A bill to authorize the expansion of post-office facilities at Williston, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNROE:

S. 745. A bill to encourage durum wheat production through nonrecourse production loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 746. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Fort Randall Dam project, of mineral, oil, or gas interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 747. A bill to enable the States to provide for the increased financial needs of persons receiving assistance under the public assistance plans established pursuant to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 748. A bill to prohibit the United States from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 749. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 750. A bill to require the registration of persons or groups who have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage tactics and techniques of a foreign political party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 751. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. SCHOFFEL):

S. 752. A bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, relating to market losses of the Mercantile Bank of Haverford, in order to provide for assistance to the Mercantile Bank of Haverford; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 753. A bill for the relief of George Rolland Lavole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 754. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Laverne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. GLEASON, Mr. McLENNAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCOLLER, Mr. FULLER, Mr. EVIN, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MIKULIS): S. J. Res. 29, Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualification of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Holland when he introduced the above Joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEPAUVER (for himself, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DURKSEN, Mr. EVIN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. HILL):

S. J. Res. 30, Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. WILEY, Mr. DURKSEN, Mr. KEPAUVER, Mr. MCCOLLER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. IVES, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. GORE):

S. J. Res. 31, Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Daniel when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

IMPROVEMENT OF WEBER BASIN, UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING 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. 722) to authorize certain improvement of the Weber Basin, Utah, for flood control, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

Even though the State of Utah faces a perpetual water shortage—in common with the rest of the country—we also face the unpredictable threats of floods.

The Corps of Engineers has approved a field report which recommends certain channel improvements on the Weber River between Morgan, Utah, and the mouth of the Ogden River. The corps characterizes these improvements as "essential parts of the flood control program of the basin." The bill which I am introducing today would embody the corps' plan and would provide estimated federal taxes of $226,000 for reduction in flood damages and $16,000 for higher land use, a total benefit of $242,000.

Such a bill is necessary to help prevent the annual loss to my State of hundreds of thousands of dollars caused by a result of periodic floods. Ten such floods between 1890 and 1952 have ravaged this area, destroying homes, industrial buildings, transcontinental highways, railroad yards, schools and many acres of valuable farm land. Paradoxically, some residents have thirsted for water within just a few short months thereafter. Similar floods will rear up to the same threats, even if the presid- ent, unless we can authorize and build such economical improvements as are embodied in this bill.

The estimated cost to the Federal Government for construction of these improvements will be $470,000, with another $100,000 of non-Federal funds. Annual charges will be $42,000 and the benefit-cost ratio of 1.46, such investment by the Federal Government is more than warranted.

The River Basin Project of the Weber River has been developed by the Corps of Engineers in collaboration with the Bureau of Reclamation and with local cooperation, and I hope that the Congress will see fit to approve those phases of it as embodied in this legislation.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO CIVIL LIABILITY OF COMMON CARRIERS AND FREIGHT FORWARDERS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of the law, and in order to provide for the recovery of such damages under provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The purpose of this bill is to write into part II of the Interstate Commerce Act a similar provision to that now contained in section 8 of part I and section 308 of part III.

These sections of law were enacted for the purpose of protecting persons who suffer damages resulting from violations of the law under parts I and III. Other past few years shipper have been seriously injured as a result of violations of part II of the act; therefore, it appears desirable to write language into part II in order to provide civil liability for violations.

It seems eminently fair that the shipping public should be permitted to recover damages sustained as a result of violations of the law, and that they are entitled to the establishment of an orderly system whereby recovery of such damages can be made under provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. This bill has been designed to accomplish that objective.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 723) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMISSION ON MENTAL HEALTH

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to augment and accelerate our present efforts to solve the difficult, nationwide problems which have long persisted, and which continue to confront us, in our efforts to bring about a more universal understanding of the nature of mental illness and greater improvement in our methods of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement of the bill, which will consume approximately 5 minutes and that the text of this bill (S. 724) immediately follow my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. So the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

The bill (S. 724) to establish a commission on mental health, and to provide for a study of the problems of mental illness and for the development of a national mental health program, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. PURTELL. First, Mr. President, I am convinced that this Nation must step up its efforts to deal more effectively with the general problem of mental illness. From time immemorial the populations of the world have experienced problems of mental disorder and mental despair, which, widely attended by ignorance of the nature of mental diseases, have accompanied the incidence of mental illness. Yet we have made progress, so that today we are in a position of many of the basic aspects of the problem, which, if more widely and properly applied, would help to reduce the number of patients presently in mental hospitals and to prevent the admission of countless others.

To the extent that we can reduce the population in mental hospitals but do not do so, for lack of adequate programs or for other reasons, we are merely continuing to incur the cost of this nation's health care, as well as failing to conserve our human resources. It is a fact, Mr. President, that 98 percent of all our mental patients are in State, county, city, or Federal tax-support hospitals. We are spending over $1 billion a year in public funds alone on costs incident to mental illness. It is also a fact that more than 700,000 veterans, or 54 percent of all hospital patients of all kinds, on any given day, are in mental hospitals. I also invite attention to the fact that 38 percent of the 5 million men rejected before induction into the Armed Forces during World War II were rejected for neuropsychiatric disorders of one kind or another.

There is no doubt about the need for action, Mr. President. As a result of my experience as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, during the 83d Congress, I have reached the conclusion that the problems incident to improving our attack on mental illness, through improved care, treatment, rehabilitation, and preventive measures rank among the most serious problems with which we are confronted in any
consideration for improving the Nation's health.

Accordingly, it is most gratifying that in his budget message last week President Eisenhower specifically singled out the field of mental health and made positive recommendations that the President recommended a budget increase of approximately $44 million for various mental health purposes.

The bill I have introduced would provide for the establishment of a Presidential Commission, made up of experts, to make a thorough inquiry into the whole question, and to develop and recommend to the President and Congress a comprehensive, long-range program of action for dealing with the problem. Such a program, Mr. President, is not to be envisaged as a Federal program, but as a national program, which would enable us to achieve progress through the joint efforts of all levels of government and of the numerous nongovernment organizations which are now working in this field. The step that is needed is for the establishment of a Presidential Commission, and to set goals, so that the combined efforts of all agencies may be brought together with common purpose and focused on common goals.

Further, I wish to compliment the Chairman and to the President and Congress a comprehensive, long-range program of action for dealing with the problem long enough to bring about a lasting improvement in existing circumstances. Accordingly, it is proposed that this Presidential Commission continue in existence after completion of its inquiries in order to follow up, for a reasonable period of time, its review of progress toward solution of the problems of mental illness and to assist and cooperate with all agencies in the public through educational programs in mental hygiene. I believe this sort of approach is absolutely necessary if we are going to do anything to step up our efforts in mental health.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record. There being no objection, the bill (S. 724) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON MENTAL HEALTH, AND TO PROVIDE FOR A STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF MENTAL ILLNESS AND FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "President's Commission on Mental Health," to be composed of a chairman and seven other members appointed by the President. Members of the Commission shall be entitled to participate in the fields of mental health, and of representative organizations of the Council of State Governments. Such members shall be appointed for fixed periods, with a vacancy to occur prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, six at the end of the first year, six at the end of the second year, and six at the end of the third year, after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 6. (a) The Commission shall be authorized and directed to conduct a thorough inquiry into the problem of mental illness, including the status, progress, and problems incident to (1) the provision of hospital and related facilities necessary to the furnishing of care and treatment for the mentally ill, (2) the availability of institutions and facilities for the improvement and treatment both in and outside mental hospitals, (3) the availability and training of personnel necessary to the provision of mental hygiene, and (4) the development of research into the causes, treatment, and prevention of mental illness.

(b) The Commission is further authorized and directed to develop and recommend a comprehensive national mental health program, including long-range plans for coping with both existing and anticipated problems incident to mental illness, as well as recommendations for financing the costs of such a program and the proper role of the local, State, and Federal Governments, together with the necessary public and facilities in such a national program.

(c) The Commission shall transmit a report of its findings pursuant to subsection (a), together with its recommendations under subsection (b), to the President and the Congress not later than thirty months following the enactment of this Act. In addition to such report and recommendations, the Commission may transmit to the Commission such interim reports as it deems appropriate.

Section 3. Upon completion of its inquiry and transmittal of its report, in accordance with section 2, it shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct a continuing review and evaluation of the status, progress, and problems incident to the provision of care and treatment for the mentally ill, and to report annually to the President and the Congress the results of its review and evaluation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable, and from the sums made available therefor for any fiscal year, the expenses of the Commission, including travel and necessary expenses, shall be payable out of the sums appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act.

Section 4. (a) In connection with its inquiry under the provisions of section 2 (b) the Commission is authorized to sit and act at such times and in such places: to hold such public hearings; and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable.

(b) All executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government are authorized to cooperate with the Commission in its work and to furnish the Commission with such assistance and facilities as it deems necessary to enable it to carry out its functions and duties.

(c) To enable the Commission to carry out its functions and duties, it is authorized to appropriate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the sum of $1,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the sum of $1,500,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as Congress may determine to be necessary for the purposes of this Act.

The Commission is also authorized to accept (1) grants; (2) the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel (and to pay reasonable remuneration therefor); (3) equipment; and (4) facilities, donated for purposes of the Commission, and to use the same in accordance with such purposes.

Section 5. The Commission shall cease to exist ten years after the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will my colleague from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I am very happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to compliment the Senator upon his splendid address, and upon the bill which he has introduced dealing with this very important subject.

For a number of years I have been director of the Connecticut Society for Mental Health, and I am aware of the very serious problem which confronts us, a problem which exists throughout the United States.

I am very happy that my distinguished colleague has studied this situation so closely, and has introduced this legislation which I think will go a considerable distance toward solving this very serious national problem. I heartily compliment the Senator.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank my distinguished colleague.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF JUDGES OF MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS AND MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, be printed in the Record, as follows:

The bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. NEELY by request, was received, read twice by its
title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill was presented by Mr. Neely and is as follows:

BAR ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Hon. THOMAS N. KEFAUVER, Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, United States Senate.

Sir: The Bar Association of the District of Columbia requests your assistance in the consideration to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to accompany S. 462.

S. 462 is proposed legislation for national Federal judicial salaries, among other things, and is being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. It is predicated on the Segal Commission report. That report too recognizes that the problem is one that is growing in size and seriousness. The most recent figures indicate that in the last ten years the number of individuals in trouble with the police rose by a quarter of a million, from one million to one and one-quarter million. That fact in itself is an indication of the growth of the problem. It is the feeling of the members of the bar association that the same reasons advanced by the Segal Commission report apply equally to the District of Columbia. The municipal court of appeals, and the municipal court should be maintained in the same ratio that has been established by those concerned, and that the salaries are fully organized. The purpose of the proposed legislation, which is transmitted with this letter, is to preserve the system of the District of Columbia.

We of the bar association feel that the historical differential between the salaries of the judges of the United States district court of appeals, the United States circuit court of appeals, and the municipal court of appeals, and the municipal court should be maintained in the same ratio that has been established by those concerned, and that the salaries are fully organized. The purpose of the proposed legislation, which is transmitted with this letter, is to preserve the system of the District of Columbia.

CHARLES B. MURPHY
President.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN THE CONTROL OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Langer], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and myself, I introduce for appropriate consideration a bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with State efforts to control juvenile delinquency.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a brief explanatory statement and an analysis of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 728) to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the control of juvenile delinquency, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

On behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I am introducing a bill to provide for a broad and comprehensive federal program to strengthen and improve the nation's juvenile delinquency program. The purpose which we are proposing is designed to assist States and localities to strengthen and extend their own programs, to provide for the prevention and correction of the problems which are created, and to provide treatment and rehabilitation for those children and youth who have already been damaged in the process of delinquency. As members of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, we have, during the past year and a half, heard the testimony of countless witnesses from coast to coast and have heard hundreds of different recommendations as to what can and should be done to fight juvenile delinquency. Out of all this testimony, certain facts are abundantly clear. It is clear that the problem is one that is growing in size and seriousness. The most recent figures indicate that in the last ten years the number of individuals in trouble with the police rose by a quarter of a million, from one million to one and one-quarter million. That figure in itself is an indication of the growth of the problem. It is the feeling of the members of the bar association that the same reasons advanced by the Segal Commission report apply equally to the District of Columbia. The municipal court of appeals, and the municipal court should be maintained in the same ratio that has been established by those concerned, and that the salaries are fully organized. The purpose of the proposed legislation, which is transmitted with this letter, is to preserve the system of the District of Columbia.

We of the bar association feel that the historical differential between the salaries of the judges of the United States district court of appeals, the United States circuit court of appeals, and the municipal court should be maintained in the same ratio that has been established by those concerned, and that the salaries are fully organized. The purpose of the proposed legislation, which is transmitted with this letter, is to preserve the system of the District of Columbia.

We of the bar association feel that the historical differential between the salaries of the judges of the United States district court of appeals, the United States circuit court of appeals, and the municipal court should be maintained in the same ratio that has been established by those concerned, and that the salaries are fully organized. The purpose of the proposed legislation, which is transmitted with this letter, is to preserve the system of the District of Columbia.

CHARLES B. MURPHY
President.

The bill is designed to meet the problems on all levels of government. It establishes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an office for children and youth which will encompass the present Children's Bureau and provides for an added title of the title of the United States Youth Office. This greatly strengthens the program of the Federal Government in providing leadership and establishment of programs for combating juvenile delinquency.

An advisory council on juvenile delinquency to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is also established with membership from leading organizations dealing with the problems of delinquency in such fields as education, social work, psychiatry, and police.

There are two provisions incorporated within the scope of this bill providing grants. One is to aid State governments in developing programs to combat delinquency and cooperate with these governments, but it does not underwrite even a portion of the present State and local programs. The other is the "seed money" or "risk capital" program, and is intended to permit the testing and development of new techniques for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. It is intended to provide "seed money" or "risk capital" and, if successful, to duplicate the program in the State. This program, too, is limited to 7 years.

This title provides—for a period of 7 years—for grants to States to assist them in achieving coordination of the many services involved in the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. It is intended to plan such programs consideration is given to the viewpoints of the national agencies in the field of juvenile delinquency, and to establish a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency, and in the advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This title provides—for a period of 7 years—for grants to States to assist them in achieving coordination of the many services involved in the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. It is intended to plan such programs consideration is given to the viewpoints of the national agencies in the field of juvenile delinquency, and to establish a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency, and in the advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This title provides—for a period of 7 years—for grants to States to assist them in achieving coordination of the many services involved in the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. It is intended to plan such programs consideration is given to the viewpoints of the national agencies in the field of juvenile delinquency, and to establish a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency, and in the advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This title provides—for a period of 7 years—for grants to States to assist them in achieving coordination of the many services involved in the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. It is intended to plan such programs consideration is given to the viewpoints of the national agencies in the field of juvenile delinquency, and to establish a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency, and in the advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This title provides—for a period of 7 years—for grants to States to assist them in achieving coordination of the many services involved in the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. It is intended to plan such programs consideration is given to the viewpoints of the national agencies in the field of juvenile delinquency, and to establish a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency, and in the advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Title V This title provides—for a period of 7 years—for grants to States to assist them in achieving coordination of the many services involved in the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. It is intended to plan such programs consideration is given to the viewpoints of the national agencies in the field of juvenile delinquency, and to establish a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency, and in the advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
State expenditures under title III, except for the first thirty thousand spent in the first 2 years.

RECOVERY OF DAMAGES UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the Attorney General recommending enactment of the proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 733) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the anti-trust laws, was introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
The Vice President,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department of Justice recommends amendment of the Clayton Act so as to grant to the United States a right of action to recover actual damages for violations of the antitrust laws. As previously indicated by this Department, its recommendation into effect is enclosed for your consideration and appropriate action.

Section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U. S. C. 15) provides that any person injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws may sue therefor in the United States district courts and if he prevails shall recover an amount equal to three times the damages which were actually sustained by him.

In the case of United States v. Cooper Corp. (313 U. S. 600 (1941)), the United States Supreme Court held that the United States is not a person within the meaning of the statute or within the meaning of section 4 of the Clayton Act, which also authorizes treble-damage recovery for antitrust violations. The legislation here recommended would grant the United States the right to recover actual damages sustained by it as a result of violations of the antitrust laws.

The United States is the largest single purchaser of goods in this country and may suffer substantial losses from antitrust violations. As shown in the Cooper case, the Government sustained extensive damages as the result of certain bids submitted on material contracts. For example, for a year ending March 31, 1947, 18 companies submitted identical bids on 82 different sizes of tires and tubes. This identical bidding was repeated for the next year but with substantially higher prices than for the preceding period. When bids were submitted for the third period, the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, upon the advice of the Attorney General, rejected them and invited new bids. The new bids were the same as those rejected. In the circumstances the Treasury Department negotiated a contract with another supplier for its full requirements.

In its next invitation to submit bids the Government required the bidders to warrant that the prices bid were not the result of an agreement among them. Lower bids were solicited. A comparison of these bids with the earlier bids showed that the United States had been injured to the extent of $15,180. Equally damaging was the fact that the offending companies were stealing contracts from the United States by submitting identical bids on 82 different sizes of tires and tubes.

A draft of a bill designed to carry this recommendation into effect is enclosed for your consideration. The proposed legislation would make it necessary for Congress to authorize recovery by the Government of treble damages for violations of the antitrust laws. The legislation here recommended does not provide for recovery of damages for violations of the antitrust laws.

The legislation here recommended, which is not necessary for Congress to authorize recovery by the Government of treble damages for violations of the antitrust laws, does not need a provision for the recovery of treble damages to stimulate its law-enforcement activities. Nevertheless, the taxpayers would seem to be entitled to recovery of actual losses sustained by the Government as the result of antitrust violations.

Amendments to the Clayton Act (15 U. S. C. 15) are as follows:

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the taxpayers would seem to be entitled to a brief statement, the letter presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

The President-elect of the United States.

Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President."

Title 18, United States Code, section 871 makes it a Federal crime willfully and knowingly to make any threat to take the life of or to inflict bodily harm on the President-elect or the Vice President.

The proposed legislation would amend title 18, United States Code, section 871 to threats against the President, threats made against the President-elect and the Vice President of the United States.

The United States Secret Service, Treasury Department, is charged with the protection of the President-elect and Vice President, as well as the protection of the President, and has had extensive experience of the Secret Service that the present law has been a great aid in the investigation of threats against the President-elect and the Vice President. Any prompt Federal action would be taken in the matter regardless of the manner in which the threats are communicated. The past experience of the Secret Service that threats against Presidents-elect and Vice Presidents have been no less numerous than those directed against our Presidents, there have been a sufficient number of cases involving threats against Presidents-elect and Vice Presidents to warrant the proposed amendment of title 18, United States Code, section 871. Accordingly, the Treasury Department recommends the enactment of the proposed legislation.

A comparative type showing changes which the proposed legislation would make in existing law is enclosed for convenient reference. The proposed legislation was submitted by the Department to the Senate in the first session of the 83d Congress and is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President: I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for an additional 5 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement, prepared by me, explaining why I think the provisions of this pending bill matter at this time be printed in the Record.

The ACTING 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. 740) to extend for an additional 5 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, introduced by Mr. Johnston of South Carolina, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. Johnston of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

While I am well aware of the fact that the provisions of existing law for GI loans and loans with veterans may buy homes do not expire until July 15, 1957, and
for the Korean veterans at a subsequent date, I am also mindful of the fact that many veterans, like to have available for themselves the beneficial provisions of these laws have not been able thus far to do so. A good number of the war heroes have been and remain confined in our hospitals in process of becoming rehabilitated. Many have been completely disinterested in such matters as we have talked about. Some are compelled to study on a part-time basis. There are others who for economic reasons are just now finding themselves in a position to assume the responsibility of purchasing it adequately is a problem faced by many of our veterans. To accommodate this practical situation is the primary purpose of the proposed legislation.

The separate dates provided for in the extension of the several acts have for their purpose uniformity of time limitations for the benefits, as originally provided. Many of the veterans of the Korean war are still in school and will not graduate until several years from now, hence the extension of time for them and for others situated in similar circumstances is necessary if we are to meet these problems and have available a time in which it is the will of Congress that these problems, varied and complex as they are, are being faced with the best of intentions, are being confronted with the best of intentions, with the best of intentions, with the best of intentions.

PROVISION FOR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN WAR RISK, MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to provide war risk and certain marine and liability insurance for the protection of passengers and cargoes when endangered by war conditions or threat of war.

The present law—Public Law 763, 81st Congress—expires on September 7, 1955. In view of the fact that the present conditions will end not so forth, and that war conditions this legislation should be kept on the statute books so that if conditions require it, the Government will be prepared to issue war-risk insurance when commercial marine insurance companies cannot or will not do so.

I may say, Mr. President, that I was the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee which held hearings on the Commerce Appropriation Bill at the 81st Congress. When I reported that legislation to the floor it contained no expiration date. However, the minority calendar committee objected to such provision and in accordance with their amendment was added placing a limit of 5 years on the Secretary’s authority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 741) to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, in order to repeal the provision which would terminate authority to provide insurance under such title, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REGISTRATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO HAVE RECEIVED INSTRUCTION OR ASSIGNMENT IN ESPIONAGE, COUNTERESPIONAGE OR SABOTAGE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, relating to the registration of certain persons. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me on this subject, together with a letter from the Attorney General of the United States, be printed in the Record.

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

The bill, introduced by Mr. Wiley, requires the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction in espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or a foreign political party, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Wiley, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. Wiley is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am introducing today a bill recommended by the Department of Justice to amend and revise certain sections of the Internal Security Act of 1950. These sections, although conceived with the best of intentions, are not, however, working out as originally planned.

The sections pertain to the registration of persons who have knowledge of or who have received instruction in espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or a foreign political party.

The purpose of this new bill, like the purpose of the present sections in the Internal Security Act, is sound and fundamentally necessary.

The only question before us in the modus vivendi, as we have conceived it, is how to attain a worthy purpose, which by our experience is not being attained, imbedded under the present overall internal security statute and its foreign registration component.

I believe, and Attorney General Brownell and his associates believe that we can achieve our goal by setting up a separate and distinct registration statute which will require registration of espionage-trained individuals, whether they have knowledge or not, of a foreign principal or relationship as a foreign principal.

I want to point out that on a great many previous occasions I have commented on the Senate floor regarding the danger of Communist espionage in our country.

In the case of a single foreign Intelligence agent—like a Richard Sorge, or a single treacherous American like the great espionage agent, Michael Vodopyan—such ‘skilled’ at the Lenin Institute and other Red schools of subversion—can do incalculable damage. The Soviets could put together an agency able to steal valuable secrets from American research labs and that there is no stigma attached to registration. The tenor and import of the bill is that it is an attempt to place within the definition of “agent of a foreign principal” persons who have received training in espionage in foreign espionage or sabotage systems.

For these reasons, it is recommended that the Foreign Agents Registration Act be
amended by deleting from it any reference to the President's having received a request for a draft in foreign espionage or sabotage systems and to substitute therefor a separate and distinct registration statute which would require the registration of such persons irrespective of any technical agency status or relationship.

The attachment for your consideration a draft of a measure which would effectuate this recommendation. It will be observed that provision is made for the exemption of certain categories of persons from its registration requirements. These exemptions have been concurred in by the Departments of Justice and State.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.,
Attorney General

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE NATIONAL TRADE POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], I introduce for appropriate reference this bill to provide assistance to those individuals, companies, and communities suffering serious injury or threatened with serious injury as a result of increased imports resulting from the national trade policy. This bill is identical to one which the Senator from Massachusetts, who is absent from the Senate because of illness, introduced in the closing weeks of the 83d Congress—S. 3650, Representatives HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, Harold DONOHUE, of Massachusetts, and others have introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives in the 84th Congress.

Since the first introduction of this bill in June of last year, administration spokesmen have indicated agreement with the basic thesis of the Junior Senator from Massachusetts that consideration must be given to the significant readjustment problems certain to follow from the adoption of any national trade policy. For instance, the President has announced a decrease in tariffs and a corresponding increase in imports directly competitive with the products of so many of our industries.

This idea has recently been expressed publicly by Mr. Clarence B. Randall, the Chairman of the President's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, and by Samuel W. Anderson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, in a recent speech before the National Foreign Trade Convention. Mr. Anderson discussed the need for assisting American industry to readjust to an economy weakened by tariff decisions taken by our Government in the national interest and stated:

"In my judgment, this idea has had its origin in the fact that the American public is not willing to accept the hypothesis that a Federal Government would be incapable of administering such an assistance program exclusively on the grounds of helping those unable to help themselves to readjust their affairs because of tariff action in the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks certain excerpts from the statement the Junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], which appears in the Congressional Record of June 29, 1953, under the title, and referred to the Committee on Finance. The excerpts and analysis presented by Mr. Humphrey are as follows:

The difficulties caused by increased competition from imported products which face many businessmen, workers, and communities, are a matter of serious concern to the various State of Massachusetts, present an increasingly serious problem which must be met by the United States. In Massachusetts, as any tariff, existing or prospective, is a direct result of national policy promulgated by the executive branch under authority delegated by Congress, it is only fitting that those individuals, companies, and communities who suffer serious financial loss or other injury in consequence, be assisted by the Government in their own efforts to meet those problems.

The "peril point" provisions in our tariff law, aimed at affording protection to domestic industries from foreign competition which is ruinous in nature, are not to be increased under "escape clause" proceeding, even when an industry proves to the satisfaction of the Tariff Commission that imports have caused or threatened to cause serious injury, and the Commission has recommended to the President that the tariff be increased to prevent serious injury, the President is free to reject the Tariff Commission's recommendation (although he must provide Congress with an explanation of his action).

Under the "peril point" provision, the Commission, upon receipt from the President of a list of industries of the United States, which are being considered for possible tariff modifications, specifies for each such product the "peril point" at which, in the Commission's opinion, excessive imports would cause or threaten to cause serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or competitively similar articles. But this again is merely a recommendation to the President, who is at liberty to reject the recommendation (again with an explanation of his reasons for doing so), and to negotiate a tariff lower than the "peril point" or any modifications specified by the Commission. Thus, in both instances a finding of serious injury can be ignored.

Since the "escape clause" principle was first incorporated in the Tariff Act of 1940, it has become painfully clear that the proof of injury or threat of injury does not insure protection. Thus, whereas 48 applications for relief under the escape clause provision upon which action has been completed to date, only 3 have been successful in traveling the tortuous route to relief: the fur-felt hat industry, the hatters fur industry, and the dried-flg industry. In the other 46 applications, 33 were rejected by the Tariff Commission, 5 were rejected by the President and 2 have been postponed by the President pending further study. Thus, although the congressional intent that domestic industries adversely affected by foreign competition from imports is written in crystal-clear language, no real relief has been forthcoming. Moreover, these discouraging results have not been limited to industries which are legitimately in need of relief from imports, that those companies which can benefit through consuming, expensive procedures of the Tariff Commission to have their cases fairly adjusted, only to find that they are entitled to relief under the criteria established, in the final instance such relief must be denied.

I am not suggesting that the President is guided by improper motives in rejecting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, to the extent that relief is granted to suffering industries in the form of tariff adjustments. Nor do I suggest that the decision is an easy one for the President. Indeed, it is extremely difficult to reconcile the conflicting national interest, which the President rightfully believes demands a high degree of international trade, with the legitimate needs of the domestic industries to be protected from imports which can be manufactured in foreign countries—with lower living standards and labor costs—at substantially lower prices than in this country.

But it is our hope in presenting this bill to the Senate to make the decision an alternative to callous disregard of economic hardship, an alternative whereby the President, with all the tools at his command, programs, and resources of the Federal Government to provide special assistance to localities, industries, workers, and communities in making those economic adjustments necessary by the President's decision. Where now the President can either accept or reject the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, this bill would authorize the President to invoke the provisions of the bill in the cases decided by the President to follow the peril point or (b) refuse tariff modifications recommended as a result of an escape-clause proceeding. Let me make it perfectly clear that it is not our intention that this bill is to be a substitute for the present escape-clause or peril-point provisions.

Mr. President, with the legitimate need for assistance to our domestic industries being sufficiently recognized, the President will continue to use his authority under the escape clause, as the national interest permits, to make "such modifications in such imports, duties, duties in such circumstances, or in such quotas, or make such other modifications as are found and reported by the Commission necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the national interest, or to a particular industry. But the President cannot use this as a substitute for following the peril-point provisions. We have reserved those cases where he would normally decide to follow them. The Trade Adjustment Act recommended by this bill would merely provide the President with an alternative in the event he determines, for reasons of overriding national interest, not to follow the recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Upon the President's invocation of the provisions of the act those individuals, companies, and labor who are shown to themselves to be eligible for benefits under the act could apply to a new Trade Adjustment Commission to determine the eligibility of applicants for relief under the act. The Board would issue certificates of eligibility entitling the holders to the assistance features of the act.

Very generally speaking, the following provisions of assistance are contained in the bill. Pursuant to the President's authority: (a) for those industries which might be the result of the failure of the President to adhere to the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, the following forms of assistance would be available: (1) temporary unemployment compensation benefits in addition to those already available under existing unemployment compensation laws; (2) a lower
social-security retirement age, if he is of advanced age and unable to find further employment, and the training would be made available through established governmental agencies; and, (4) in certain cases, financial assistance in his efforts to relocate to a labor area if no job opportunity exists where appropriate employment is available.

For a company adversely affected, (1) technical assistance in retraining and adjustment would be made available through governmental agencies; (2) rapid amortization benefits would be made available to qualified firms engaged in modernization and diversification; (3) loans otherwise not commercially available would be made by the State loan and investment companies; and, (4) further aid in retraining, diversification, and technological assistance in retraining workers, diversification of production, and conversion to other lines.''

In order that the Members of the Congress might better understand the purposes and provisions of this bill, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted into the Record at this point in my remarks a brief section-by-section analysis which I have prepared.

**SUMMARY OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACT of 1955**

Section 1 authorizes the act to be cited as "The Trade Adjustment Act of 1955."

Section 2 recognizes the necessity for an international trade program, designed to aid in the problems of international trade, and the provision of technical information, advice, and consultation to those parties engaged in the domestic industry. The Board is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary. The Secretary is also authorized, under certain circumstances, to assist in the transportation of an unemployed individual and his dependents, or to provide such additional training facilities as may be necessary.
This proposed amendment would abolish the electoral college and provide for the election of each State in the exact ratio with the popular vote. This would mean that every person’s vote would be counted as it was in the past. It is the nearest possible approach to electing a President by direct popular vote of the people and at the same time retaining and preserving the present proportional strength of each State in the election of a President.

This joint resolution is worded exactly the same as the so-called Gossett-Lodge joint resolution, which was passed by the Senate February 1, 1856, by a vote of 84 to 27—Conservative Republicans voting 96, part 1, page 1278. We have chosen this same language because it has been studied thoroughly and approved by the Judiciary Committees of both the House and Senate in previous sessions of Congress. Briefly, the proposed amendment would accomplish the following:

First. Abolish the fictitious electoral college.

Second. Abolish the office of presidential electors.

Third. Provide for direct voting for President and Vice President.

Fourth. Sectionalism will be largely abated.

Fifth. Provide that the winning candidate must receive at least 40 percent of the electoral vote, in falling which the Congress would select the President from the other highest numbers of electoral votes. This was the so-called Lucas amendment adopted in the Senate in 1950 in order to prevent splinter parties.

Mr. President, in due time it is my intention to speak at length concerning the evils of the present electoral college system and the benefits to be obtained from its replacement by the direct popular vote. For the present, I will simply summarize a few of the benefits, as follows:

First. We will cleanse our Constitution of an archaic provision which has failed to obey the demand for more than a century.

Second. We will have democratic elections, with every person’s vote counting for the candidate for whom it is cast.

Third. There will be less opportunity for fraud and pressure-group action.

Fourth. Sectionalism will be largely abated. A vote in every State will be just as important and count just as much as a vote in any other State. Their votes for a candidate for President are not counted in the electoral vote unless their candidate receives a majority of the popular vote in their State.

This is the tragic state of present-day politics which the amendment to abolish the electoral college and replace it with direct popular vote would make. It is my hope that during this year, with the approach of another presidential election, a serious effort will be made on both sides of the Country to submit the proposed reform to the States for their approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUMARK) in the chair. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution abolishing the electoral college and providing for popular vote elections was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. Daniel (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.
The Acting President pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them to Senate Joint Resolution 28, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MOSSE, and Mr. MOORE submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them to Senate Joint Resolution 28, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MOSSE submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them to Senate Joint Resolution 28, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them to Senate Joint Resolution 28, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

House Joint Resolution Placed on Calendar

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159), authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories of that area, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

Addresses, Editorials, Articles, etc., Printed in the Record

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

By Mr. KILGORE:

Statement prepared by Senator HANNINGS conveying President Eisenhower's message requesting a congressional resolution on the defense of Formosa and adjacent areas.

Notice of Further Hearing on S. 462 and S. 540, Relating to Increases in Salary of Judges and J udges of the United States Courts, and Members of Congress

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a special Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on yesterday, January 25, 1955, held hearings on S. 462 and S. 540, relating to judicial and congressional salary increases. Numerous witnesses, including Mr. M. C. Maybank, Attorney General of the United States, were heard. In order that any other persons or organizations interested in this matter may be given an opportunity to testify or present a statement, the subcommittee is again meeting in open session on Friday, January 28, 1955, at 10 a.m., in room 424, Senate Office Building. I herewith present for insertion in the Record a notice of the continuation of these hearings on Friday next.

There being no objection, the notice was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On Friday, January 28, 1955, at 10 a.m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, there will be held further hearings on S. 462, entitled "A bill to increase the salaries of judges and judges of United States courts, Members of Congress, and for other purposes," and S. 540, entitled "A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States district courts," to which Members of Congress shall receive salary comparable to that of judges of the United States district courts. This is a continuation of the hearings commenced on Tuesday, January 25, 1955. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], chairman; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Kilegore]; the Senator from Texas [Mr. Daniel]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. Watkins]; and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Wadsworth].

Notice of Hearings on Nomination of Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General of the United States

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], I wish to announce that the Committee on Government Operations will hold public hearings on the nomination of Joseph Campbell, to be Comptroller General of the United States, on February 2, at 10 o'clock a.m.

Eulogies of Senators Who Died During the 83d Congress

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record the eulogy which I have prepared on the life and public service of four Senators who died during the 83d Congress.

There being no objection, the eulogies were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eulogy of Senator Hugh Butler

Mr. President, one of the Senators who welcomed me to Congress in 1946 was a man whom I had come to know and admire as the Republican national committeeman from Nebraska, our departed colleague, Senator Hugh Butler. My first joint project with Senator Butler was to provide active support to a bill that I had introduced to increase the salaries of Judges which I have prepared on the life and public service of four Senators who died during the 83d Congress.

Mr. President, the past 2 years have been filled with many tragic moments for us Members of Congress as we received notice after notice of the passing of stalwart members of the legislative Houses. Each of these men who died in the legislative service of his country was immediately missed by his colleagues in the Senate, and I am gratified to recall that our relations here in the Senate were always pleasant, even though the political aisle had technically separated us.

My last joint project with Senator Hunt was to provide active support to a bill that he had introduced to provide protection to the coal industry. Because of his wide background in public affairs, he had a rich source of experience to draw upon, and he could always be counted on to be well prepared in support of measures concerning the developing of the Mountain West.

The passing is deeply regretted by his many friends in the Senate, and his death is a heavy loss to the State of Wyoming.

Eulogy of Senator Lester Callaway Hunt

Mr. President, Senator Hunt had the distinction of being one of the few dentists ever elected to serve in the United States Senate. From the practice of dentistry in his hometown of Lander, Wyo., he first responded to a deep-seated urge for public service by filling many elective and being elected to the Wyoming House of Representatives in 1932. From that time to his death he dedicated his profession and was active in public affairs in the State of Wyoming and in the United States Senate, to which he was elected in 1940. In 1942, he was elected to the Senate, and I am gratified to recall that our relations here in the Senate were always pleasant, even though the political aisle had technically separated us.

Our respective States have a common and similar economic problems. I had the pleasure of working with Senator Hunt on many problems of mutual interest. It was almost a duty for me to act with the competence and sincere devotion to duty displayed by Senator Hunt on those occasions, and I am glad to be on record as saying that our relations here in the Senate were always pleasant, even though the political aisle had technically separated us.

My last joint project with Senator Hunt was to provide active support to a bill that he had introduced to provide protection to the coal industry. Because of his wide background in public affairs, he had a rich source of experience to draw upon, and he could always be counted on to be well prepared in support of measures concerning the developing of the Mountain West.

The passing is deeply regretted by his many friends in the Senate, and his death is a heavy loss to the State of Wyoming.

Eulogy of Senator Burnet Rhett Maybank

Mr. President, the past 2 years have been filled with many tragic moments for us Members of Congress as we received notice after notice of the passing of stalwart members of the legislative Houses. Each of these men who died in the legislative service of his country was immediately missed by his colleagues in the Senate, and I am gratified to recall that our relations here in the Senate were always pleasant, even though the political aisle had technically separated us.

Those present at the hearing conducted in the caucus room on September 1, 1954, will remember the deep thrust that the room with the announcement of Senator Maybank's death. As we stood in silence, and the deep sorrow that we shared as the room for the annunciation, I could not help reflecting how only days before we had exchanged friendly greetings, and that is something that the members of the Senate and the corridors of the Senate Office Building

Mr. President, the past 2 years have been filled with many tragic moments for us Members of Congress as we received notice after notice of the passing of stalwart members of the legislative Houses. Each of these men who died in the legislative service of his country was immediately missed by his colleagues in the Senate, and I am gratified to recall that our relations here in the Senate were always pleasant, even though the political aisle had technically separated us.

Our respective States have a common and similar economic problems. I had the pleasure of working with Senator Hunt on many problems of mutual interest. It was almost a duty for me to act with the competence and sincere devotion to duty displayed by Senator Hunt on those occasions, and I am glad to be on record as saying that our relations here in the Senate were always pleasant, even though the political aisle had technically separated us.

Mr. President, the past 2 years have been filled with many tragic moments for us Members of Congress as we received notice after notice of the passing of stalwart members of the legislative Houses. Each of these men who died in the legislative service of his country was immediately missed by his colleagues in the Senate, and I am gratified to recall that our relations here in the Senate were always pleasant, even though the political aisle had technically separated us.

Those present at the hearing conducted in the caucus room on September 1, 1954, will remember the deep thrust that the room with the announcement of Senator Maybank's death. As we stood in silence, and the deep sorrow that we shared as the room for the annunciation, I could not help reflecting how only days before we had exchanged friendly greetings, and that is something that the members of the Senate and the corridors of the Senate Office Building
to inject a note of subtle humor when the occasion needed some relief, and to be serenely serious when the occasion demanded a steadfast adherence to fact and principle.

Mr. Watkins. Mr. President, with respect to escape-clause legislation, I should like to point out that the United States has invoked this clause on 4 occasions out of 55 requests for such action, since the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951 became effective, whereas four occasions were with respect to:


But our ability to use such provisions and parts, third investigation, 1954.

That certainly is not a very impressive list. The use of the escape clause by the United States, it is evident, has not made tariff rates unstable and subject to our capricious and arbitrary change, as Mr. Lippmann indicates is generally the case when escape-clause provisions are included in trade agreements and treaties.

Exhibit I

TOPIC AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)

ECONOMIC DISARMAMENT

Reading the President's message on foreign economic policy, one is left with a general impression that American tariff rates are too high and that we are losing trade largely by our excessive rates. Any country is authority to lower them a little bit by reciprocal agreements arrived at by international negotiations. Whether this puts the real problem in its proper focus, perhaps we can reach a clearer definition of that problem.

The central theme of their remarks, I believe, is authority to lower rates because they involve, in effect, defense and stability in tariff schedules. The President referred to this point in his message.

One of the central themes of their remarks is that trade has to be, reciprocal and no more. I believe that in this we have an argument in favor of a device known as "the escape clause." According to the President, the escape clause is the means by which the President may be able to avoid the consequences of a new tariff law.

Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations with respect to the President's message on foreign economic policy. As the term suggests, it is a message to Congress regarding foreign economic policy, but it also addresses a domestic audience. It is clear that the President wants to set an agenda for the Congress and the country on foreign economic policy.

The President's message on foreign economic policy is an important one. It is a policy that embodies the attributes of predictability, continuity, and stability in tariff schedules. The environment in which trade can flourish, investment can realize its potential, and general world economic progress can continue, is one which is stable enough to ensure that economic decisions can be made with a reasonable chance for success. Importers and exporters build markets on the basis of stability in tariffs, quotas, and other barriers.

This message is important because it recognizes that foreign economic policy is not just an international issue; it is also a domestic one. The President's message suggests that there is a need for legislation that will protect domestic industries such as wool, fuels, and agriculture. The President asks Congress to consider a "miniaturized" version of the "escape clause" provision in the Trade Act of 1954.

The President's message also recognizes that there is a need for legislation that will protect domestic industries such as wool, fuels, and agriculture. The President asks Congress to consider a "miniaturized" version of the "escape clause" provision in the Trade Act of 1954.
in America. The notion that the American market can be flooded with foreign goods all coming one way cannot be true. For what on earth would the foreigner want to do with the dollars he earns? What good would he get with the currency? What is the use of economic warfare and the beginning of economic disarmament? The tariff rates do not need to be fixed by reciprocitement in the field of credit, nor do they need to be fixed by reciprocal bargaining power lies elsewhere. It lies in the field of what we might call the ending of the great city of Los Angeles. The problem is not a local problem, nor, indeed, an American problem. The problem of considerable moment. I commend the article to the reading of my brethren in the medical profession. The problem of air pollution is not a local problem, nor, indeed, an American problem. The problem of considerable moment. I commend the article to the reading of my brethren in the medical profession.

SMOG CAN KILL. DOCTORS SAY (By Magner White)

Smog can cause death. For the first time, the Los Angeles County Medical Association, through its 38-man council, was officially on record yesterday in favor of a proposal to limit air pollution to a level which will not cause death.

The council adopted nine motions, of which this was the first, all bearing on smog, as recommended by its smog committee, headed by Dr. Francis M. Pottinger, Jr., of Monrovia, the official bulletin disclosed.

The viewpoint that air pollution can cause death, the smog committee reported yesterday, "is based on medical literature on air pollution, including reports on the 1944 death of Mr. Long and the 1939 Long Beach deaths, and other air pollution disasters in which people died."

REAL QUESTION

The real question is, "Have such deaths occurred in Los Angeles? We have no positive proof, but the question has been brought up several times by physicians."

Dr. John Barrows, former president of our association, was the first to sign a death certificate listing smog as a contributing factor in a death. "Doctors in the city, and others have done this in the last 2 years."

Dr. Pottinger said it is yet unsettled how much smog and what in smog, could kill a human being.

A meeting of all sections of the medical association with his committee has been set for next Monday night to develop an opinion survey on this. Dr. Pottinger said. Results of this survey will be published officially later in the association's monthly bulletin.

NINE POINTS

The request for this meeting was 1 of the 9 polonies I have selected for a list of resolutions establishing the association's views on smog which was adopted by the council. Others are:

1. That air pollution is a continuing dynamic problem in the Los Angeles area.

2. That biological (effects on living things) as well as chemical (density and duration of smog) indices "must be determined for the safety of human beings."

3. That substantial changes in the air pollution standards of the state be approved and begun by the board of supervisors.

4. That the smog committee feels that present chemical standards (based mostly on ability of workers in certain industries to withstand effects of gases) "do not alone safeguard the health of the public."

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SHIPPING, SHIPBUILDING, AND SHIP-REPAIR INDUSTRIES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the interest of conserving time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a statement I have prepared, regarding the need for continued and vigorous attention to the problems of our shipping, shipbuilding, and ship-repair industries. In making this request, I especially emphasize to my colleagues the concern I feel in respect to the funds which are recovered by the Government from the profits of subsidized shipping lines.

The statement being without objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

During the 1954 session of the Congress, a great beginning was made toward solution of some of the many problems that plague American shipping and its sister industry, shipbuilding and ship repairing. But there is a misunderstanding on this point, I believe the achievements advanced in this respect were important. They will solve a growing problem which threatens the health of the nation. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner of Friday, January 21. In the article the Medical Society of Los Angeles points out that air pollution can kill. I commend the article to the reading of this body. For the first time, the Los Angeles County Medical Association, through its 38-man council, was officially on record yesterday in favor of a proposal to limit air pollution to a level which will not cause death. The viewpoint that air pollution can cause death, the smog committee reported yesterday, "is based on medical literature on air pollution, including reports on the 1944 death of Mr. Long and the 1939 Long Beach deaths, and other air pollution disasters in which people died."

The real question is, "Have such deaths occurred in Los Angeles? We have no positive proof, but the question has been brought up several times by physicians."

Dr. John Barrows, former president of our association, was the first to sign a death certificate listing smog as a contributing factor in a death. "Doctors in the city, and others have done this in the last 2 years."

Dr. Pottinger said it is yet unsettled how much smog and what in smog, could kill a human being.

A meeting of all sections of the medical association with his committee has been set for next Monday night to develop an opinion survey on this. Dr. Pottinger said. Results of this survey will be published officially later in the association's monthly bulletin.

NINE POINTS

The request for this meeting was 1 of the 9 polonies I have selected for a list of resolutions establishing the association's views on smog which was adopted by the council.

Others are:

1. That air pollution is a continuing dynamic problem in the Los Angeles area.

2. That biological (effects on living things) as well as chemical (density and duration of smog) indices "must be determined for the safety of human beings."

3. That substantial changes in the air pollution standards of the state be approved and begun by the board of supervisors.

4. That the smog committee feels that present chemical standards (based mostly on ability of workers in certain industries to withstand effects of gases) "do not alone safeguard the health of the public."
our national security. However, I repeat, and I hold emphasis strongly, that what has been done is only a beginning.

The 1954 enactments in the maritime field must not be allowed to go unmentioned. I should like to point out that there is a sound, long-range program for rehabilitilitating and maintaining the American Merchant Marine on the statute books, under the terms of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Unless this is done, we shall have accomplished only a transitory and fleeting result.

A recent issue of Nation's Business pictures in realistic fashion the current shipbuilding and repair activities for the merchant fleet which are essential to the security of the future, in an article captioned "Needed: 60 Ships a Year." As a direct result of the ship construction and emergency ship repair authorizations and appropriations passed in the final days of the 84th Congress, the horizon is somewhat brighter today than when this article was written. However, I believe it would be most appropriate to excerpt some of the factual statements and conclusions of this illuminating article for the reason that they are just as pertinent now as when written. For instance, the author lays down this premise as a salient fact:

"America's shippers and operators are worried about the future of the Nation's trade and security as the cost of shipping has added greatly to that amount. Our import-export trade was averaging about 1 million person in 1953; today it is 11,813,000. The net result, I believe it can safely be stated, is that other United States-flag vessels do not serve the route adequately; that their sailings will be scheduled. Furthermore, it must be remembered that in the past 20 years, the merchant fleet increased by only about the Fifth Fleet and the Seventh Fleet at the same time, many millions of dollars were tossed overboard and lost.

"The 1954 enactments in the maritime field must not be allowed to go unmentioned. We cannot afford to stabilize our merchant fleet. If a line's profits during the contract period exceed 10 percent of the capital necessarily employed in the business, 50 percent of the excess amount is withheld by the Government until the recapture has equaled the entire amount of the subsidy paid. This is the greatest obstacle American shipping has to surmount in its efforts to win support in the Congress and throughout the country.

"To those unfamiliar with the provisions of our basic shipping legislation, maritime subsidies have always represented, I daresay, so much money paid out the Government in ship construction and operating differential subsidies, and the portion of such funds recovered from the carriers.

"To begin with, American shipping is as much a part of the defense structure of the country as are the fighting ships of the Navy. They are the vessels that, in the event of war, will be responsible for the carrying out of the services of the Navy, the warplanes that operate from bases all over the world, and the land forces, the millions of fighting men, stationed in far-away bases, who must be kept supplied with food, armaments, medical requirements, and a thousand-and-one other products. Without the services of the thousands of trained officers and men of the merchant marine, this vast military establishment would be absolutely incapable of functioning, it would bog down quickly and completely.

"The Nation is spending billions and billions of dollars to develop and maintain a military establishment capable of carrying on war anywhere throughout the world. Isn't it reasonable that we should spend something on personnel as well? The American Merchant Marine is too great a drain upon Government subsidy funds have been and are being made, made, and the American merchant marine is too great a drain upon Government.

"Some even go so far as to argue that this Nation's shipping is too small to meet the growing demands which demand the services of the thousands of trained officers and men of the merchant marine, this vast military establishment would be absolutely incapable of functioning, it would bog down quickly and completely.

"The Nation is spending billions and billions of dollars to develop and maintain a military establishment capable of carrying on war anywhere throughout the world. Isn't it reasonable that we should spend something on personnel as well? The American Merchant Marine is too great a drain upon Government subsidy funds have been and are being made, made, and the American merchant marine is too great a drain upon Government.

"Some even go so far as to argue that this Nation's shipping is too small to meet the growing demands which demand the services of the thousands of trained officers and men of the merchant marine, this vast military establishment would be absolutely incapable of functioning, it would bog down quickly and completely.

"The Nation is spending billions and billions of dollars to develop and maintain a military establishment capable of carrying on war anywhere throughout the world. Isn't it reasonable that we should spend something on personnel as well? The American Merchant Marine is too great a drain upon Government subsidy funds have been and are being made, made, and the American merchant marine is too great a drain upon Government.

"Some even go so far as to argue that this Nation's shipping is too small to meet the growing demands which demand the services of the thousands of trained officers and men of the merchant marine, this vast military establishment would be absolutely incapable of functioning, it would bog down quickly and completely.

"The Nation is spending billions and billions of dollars to develop and maintain a military establishment capable of carrying on war anywhere throughout the world. Isn't it reasonable that we should spend something on personnel as well? The American Merchant Marine is too great a drain upon Government subsidy funds have been and are being made, made, and the American merchant marine is too great a drain upon Government.

"Some even go so far as to argue that this Nation's shipping is too small to meet the growing demands which demand the services of the thousands of trained officers and men of the merchant marine, this vast military establishment would be absolutely incapable of functioning, it would bog down quickly and completely.

"The Nation is spending billions and billions of dollars to develop and maintain a military establishment capable of carrying on war anywhere throughout the world. Isn't it reasonable that we should spend something on personnel as well? The American Merchant Marine is too great a drain upon Government subsidy funds have been and are being made, made, and the American merchant marine is too great a drain upon Government.

"Some even go so far as to argue that this Nation's shipping is too small to meet the growing demands which demand the services of the thousands of trained officers and men of the merchant marine, this vast military establishment would be absolutely incapable of functioning, it would bog down quickly and completely.
merchant marine actually has been, if not self-supporting, at least so nearly so as to require only a negligible Government aid in the final analysis.

One of the larger subsidised shipping lines recently presented a study of its experience with Government subsidies. It is the first such statement that has come to my attention, and I am not able to therefore, whether the experience of this particular line is typical of the entire industry, or is due to the fact that it has the good old adage that "the proof of the pudding is in the eating." I think the study deserves the serious consideration of Senators and citi-

Here a word of praise might well be said for those former Members of the Congress who, for example, Mr. Nimitz, who furnished the material for this report. They were extremely farsighted when they carefully designed the recapture provision of that act. It is a most unique provision. By virtue of it the Federal Gov-

mer, reserves the right, under specified conditions, to recapture the amount of the operating subsidy paid during the effective recapture accounting period. In effect, the recapture provision requires the Mandatory subsidized operator to pay the payment of subsidy accruals to the extent necessarily employed in the operation. The performance, under this section, of at least this one major subsidized operator would seem to prove a point, and, to my mind, is worthy of special comment. The company in question is the owner and operator of one of the larger fleets of freight vessels under the American flag.

First subsidy contract was executed in 1917, when it was granted in excess of the Ma-

years, 1943 to 1946 inclusive) through 1953, it performed 2,069 round voyages with pri-

vately owned and operated vessels and under trade routes declared by the Maritime Board to be essential.

As agreed upon in its contract, the company accrued operating-differential subsidy in the amount of $40,800,000. Its profit for this operation permitted the Government to re-

capture a total of $38,000,000. Thus, actual payments to the company by the Government in the form of operating subsidy were $16,000,000.

During this same period from 1937 through 1953, this company paid $18,800,000 in Fed-

eral income taxes, paid $16,200,000 in State in-

come taxes, and paid to the Government, in the form of charter hire, some $31 million above and be-

yond the amount of subsidies received by it.

It is freely admitted that the steamship business is cyclical, and that the subsidised lines, in order to remain in business, do not exist without full payment of subsidy under the parity principle. During the good years, however, the Government shares proportionately in the profits as and when they accrue—a fact which I fear is all too little understood by the people at large.

It does seem to me that the results noted, covering the entire shipping subsidy period, do not make the matter any less challenging as applied to participation by Government in the operation of this one ship-ownership company.

SUPPORT FOR PROPOSAL FOR AN-

NUAL ADDRESS TO CONGRESS BY THE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in support of section 4, which I submitted on January 21, 1955, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two interesting articles which appeared recently in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:


Why Not a State of the Union Address? (By Miriam Ottenberg)

The parade of foreign dignitaries who have addressed Congress over the years is being cited by some of the legislators who want to hear foreign dignitaries.

The argument of these legislators: Congress listens to the aspirations and problems of other countries. Shouldn't it give equal attention to the problems of the chief of one of the three branches of its own Government—particularly when these problems affect all of us?

Since the days of Lafayette, scores of for-

eign emissaries have addressed one or both Houses of Congress. Shouldn't we now have a sprinkling of American generals and a few cabinet officers.

In one 4-month period in 1917, 9 dif-

ferent representatives of foreign countries addressed 1 or both Houses of Congress.

Between January and July of 1954, Con-

gress assembled in joint meeting four times to hear foreign dignitaries.

Debates in Congress, a flowery predecess-

or of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, shows the American Republic to the nation and to the world the American Republic.

And in 1953, the Joint Session of Congress on December 10, 1924. The volume notes that the Speaker addressed the House 2 days later. Shouldn't we give "the tone in which; energy of character and sens-

bility of feeling were most interestingly blended." A half century later, a Chief Justice did address a joint session—by default. On December 18, 1954, His Majesty David Kalaha-

i, King of the Hawaiian Islands, appeared before a joint session but the first reigning monarch of a Japanese war mission and by the head of the Government of the interest of prompt and efficient justice.

As a matter of fact, it is entirely proper and fit-

ting that the Chief Justice make a statement to the Congress once a year, reviewing the accomplish-

ments of the judiciary and on its needs.

Certainly, the Chief Justice is the head of the judicial system and I do not see who could not be interested in the progress of the courts.

"I feel that the Congress and the people would support the reasonable needs of the judiciary and on the performance of its needs. Certainly, the Chief Justice is the head of the judicial system and I do not see who could not be interested in the progress of the courts.

The judicial department of our Government should have a spokesman, just as the executive branch has a spokesman and the legislative branch has a spokesman.

In my observations as president of the American Bar Association and as a long-time member of the bar, the judges get together at meetings and make recommendations, but they really have no spokesman. No public attention is given to their needs.

The judicial department of our Government should have a spokesman, just as the executive branch has a spokesman and the legislative branch has a spokesman.

How will the proposal for an annual address to Congress be received by the people? Will the people possibly think there is a great lack of information concerning the needs of the judicial community?

It is entirely proper and fitting that the Chief Justice make a statement to the Congress once a year, reviewing the accomplish-

ments of the judiciary and on its needs. Certainly, the Chief Justice is the head of the judicial system and I do not see who could not be interested in the progress of the courts.

I think there is a great lack of information concerning the needs of the judiciary.

The case loads are far beyond the capacity of the courts in many areas. The facts properly brought to the attention of the Congress
and the public would result in help for the judicial system.

"There is another reason for the Chief Justice to address the Congress. In this world of increasing freedom and responsibility, the successful function of the judicial system stands out as one of the most important functions of government. It is a system that provides justice for all, and it is a system that is built on a foundation of integrity and honor. The principles that govern the judicial system are the same principles that govern our society at large. They are the principles of fairness, equality, and respect for the individual. We need to ensure that the judicial system is protected and that it is able to function properly."

SAFEGUARD OF LIBERTY

"I don’t think anyone can argue people as a whole understand the safeguards and guarantees we receive through our independent judiciary system. The system works, it’s effective, and it’s entitled. Under the Communist regime, contracts are not sacred. Our independent judiciary system is one of the greatest safeguards of liberty not only for us but for other free nations.

"Long delays in the disposition of cases will affect the standing integrity of the judicial system and hence tend to weaken it. We should do all we can to assure that justice will be prompt as well as efficient."

AIR CARGO LOGISTICS AND THE FAIRCHILD FLYING BOXCAR

Mr. BUTLER, Mr. President, the Fairchild is a truly an aviation workhorse, one of the special products developed by Maryland hands. Located at Hagerstown, Md., the Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp. has for a generation been engaged in building troop and cargo transports. More than 1,200 of these planes have been produced since VE-day in 1945.

Recently the flying boxcar was made the subject of an extended and scheduled air cargo service operated by the United States Air Force in Europe, under the command of Lt. Gen. William T. Tunner. The development of a regular airlift through careful planning has been receiving increasing attention, and has been the means of providing an astounding increase in combat effectiveness for military planes and crews stationed in various areas of the world. By efficiently utilizing pilots and crews in their required routine training, freight transportation between military bases on a scheduled basis has been achieved with a saving of additional cost to the Government.

Mr. President, in December 1954 there appeared in the Perus, a monthly publication of the Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., an article on the subject of the importance of air cargo logistics, the excellence of which prompts me to ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record. The article being objected to, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CRACKING THE ACPB BARRIER

In an operation lacking the high drama of jet air combat, the 770th Troop Carrier Wing of the Air Force at Rhein-Main has been building up the airlift strength on the continent. The Ramstein Complex (Pegasus, November 1955) had been built up to six airlifters by the establishment of a new unit. The Air Logistics Service at Ramstein is responsible for the maintenance and supply of its USAFP units, and that of the MIDAP command, the 322d Air Division. A few C-47’s borrowed and begged from administrative units were being flown on scattered emergency missions. By 1955, the remaining 16 percent consists of fillers items put aboard to utilize the capacity of the flying boxcars and, at the same time, save this additional cost of ground transport of the items.

About the only way in which an estimate of what this means can be given, without at the same time giving away order of battle details to our enemies or the maintenance and supply of his USAFP units, and that of the MIDAP command, the 322d Air Division. A few C-47’s borrowed and begged from administrative units were being flown on scattered emergency missions. By 1955, the remaining 16 percent consists of filler items put aboard to utilize the capacity of the flying boxcars and, at the same time, save this additional cost of ground transport of the items.
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carrying out of the American mission on the continent. USAFE represents a $312,000 investment on the part of the United States in aircraft, equipment, and supplies, and provides facilities which serve to cut down the time it takes to move military personnel with an annual payroll of $325,000,000.

It is spending more than $200 million a year in constant operation. Of this, $58 to $60 million is spent on real estate facilities. It maintains 58 cars covering more than 256,000 miles a week on trunk and feeder routes, operating 58 airplanes daily, 5 days a week.

The feeder runs are those among the base complexes in southern Germany and northern Europe, between the key depots at the Continent. It represents a $312,000 investment on the part of the United States in aircraft, equipment, and supplies, and provides facilities which serve to cut down the time it takes to move military personnel with an annual payroll of $325,000,000.

When it is considered that an estimated 800,000 tons of cargo has been flown through Air Force supply in the European theater, it is obvious that elements other than combat cargo figures and extent the combat posture in a situation in which victory or defeat could be decided in a matter of hours.

The reduction in supply time is not solely a matter of air delivery. It involves innovations in procedures, in paperwork, packaging, and distribution.

For example, requisitions today are prepared at the base on a basis of priority lists, and then processed through the various distribution areas and turned into airplane loads, and hand delivered to the crew of the AL5 airplane going through, and delivered at the depot directly to the voucher section bypassing the Adjutant General step for processing. At the depot a further analysis is given the requisitions, and, even though the item may be ordered as routine, it will be air-shipped if it comes in the high-cost category. This necessarily an item on which the cost of, in say France, is high, but rather one in which a number of elements enter: expense of packaging, expense of removing it from the high-cost category, expense of exposure to damage and loss, expenses of ground transportation, etc.

There is a basic difference between the two major sources of supply, namely, the C-119's which are at home and those which are at overseas bases.

The goods brought from the Continent to the United States or to other parts of Europe are considered by supply officers to be at the depot directly to the voucher section, and then turned into the airplane loads.

The feeder run is a normal military operation, and has been in operation for many years. It is the system whereby the 58 cars are used to move personnel, supplies, and equipment from one point to another.
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There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:


Hon. Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: This is a formal request to urge that you include funds for the Talent irrigation project in the budget of the Bureau of Reclamation for the coming fiscal year.

In my opinion, the minimum which should be recommended is $350,000 for restoring the canal systems of the Medford and Rogue River irrigation projects. I also believe that at least $2,500,000 should be recommended for the start of construction on the Talent project. It is imperative, I think, that the Talent irrigation and power project constitutes such use of our resources.

Because the total cost of the project is $22 million, it is obvious that even a recommendation for the funding of the coming fiscal year will still leave a considerable amount of time before the project can be completed.

I hope that you and your associates in the administration can see fit to recommend in the budget the funds necessary to get the Talent project well started.

With good wishes, I am, Respectfully yours,

Richard L. Neuberger, United States Senator.

Mr. Neuberger. During the 1954 campaign my wife, who campaigned vigorously throughout the State, and I warned the people of southern Oregon that the administration might drop all real interest in the Talent project, after having used it as a campaign come-on. We pointed out that without construction funds was like a man telling his girl friend to go down to Tiffany's jewelry store to buy the best necklace in the house, but never opening his checkbook to pay the bill.

My opponent told the people of southern Oregon that it was merely run of the mill work from here on, so far as the Talent project was concerned. The Governor of Oregon said at a big political rally:

'"I know that you people will prove to Congress and the President that the Talent project was well considered and a worthwhile project, not only for Jackson County but for the State of Oregon and being good for Oregon, is good for the United States.

The Governor spoke as if the Talent project already were completed; but the cold hard fact is that, in the 1954 budget, does not provide one penny to finance concrete, excavation, girders, generators or ground clearing on the Talent Project.

For political purposes the people of Jackson County were sold a mirage.

I should like to say here and now, for the senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. Morse), that we will make every effort to try to redeem the broken promises which the administration made to the people of southern Oregon last year.

The budget should contain $2,500,000 for the start of engineering and construction on the physical engineering works themselves. The whole project will cost approximately $23 million so even this is only a modest beginning.

The Bureau of Reclamation plans for the Rogue River Basin call for development of storage facilities to irrigate 17,890 acres of land in Bear Creek Valley, and the consequent development of a kilowatt hydroelectric plant. The Talent division includes 9,250 irrigable acres in the Talent irrigation district which require supplemental water, and also 8,640 irrigable acres.

The area critically needs a reliable and permanent supply of water, which can come only with adequate storage. The Talent project will provide this storage.

Oregon is one of the 2 or 3 fastest growing States in the Nation. It needs sound and steady development of its natural resources. Its people should not be subjected to the kind of political manipulation of authorizations of projects, which then are cavalierly abandoned, once the campaign at the polls is over. Either a project is sound and meritorious, or it is to be sold with bands and fanfare and political speeches, if there is no genuine intention to provide the funds with which the authorization can be turned into steel and concrete and other good works benefiting the community.

Mr. President, I ask that you have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a dispatch by Mr. A. Robert Smith in the Medford Daily Mail Tribune of January 9, 1955, describing the elimination of the Talent project from the budget; a story in the same paper of January 17, 1955, detailing my letter to Secretary McKay requesting funds for the Talent project; and a report by the Commissioner of Reclamation, dated March 17, 1954, setting forth some of the details of the Talent project in Jackson County, Oregon.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TALENT PROJECT OUT OF FEDERAL BUDGET; CORRESPONDENCE RESULTS SAID REASON FOR REMOVAL.

(By A. Robert Smith)

Washington.--The Eisenhower administration has passed over Oregon in preparing the new Federal budget in the field of new reclamation projects for 1955, while approving new starts on added irrigation acreage in neighboring Washington, Idaho, and California.

Oregon was left out because of the outcome of the recent election, in which the voters of the State refused to return Republican Senator Guy Cordon and thereby gave Democratic control of the Senate, according to a highly placed administration official.

The Oregon project which the Bureau of Reclamation and Oregon Members of Congress have been seeking to get started in 1955 is the Talent division of the Rogue River project, a $20,500,000 irrigation proposal in the Medford authorized by Congress last summer.

REPORTED TURNED DOWN

But reportedly the project was turned down by the budget Bureau, which has the last word on projects of the President's annual budget requests—that is, which projects go in and which get chopped. Official word on the matter will not be out until President Eisenhower sends his detailed budget message to Congress January 17.

Only three new reclamation projects are reportedly contained in the new budget. They are Santa Maria, near Santa Barbara, Calif.; Michaud Flats near American Falls Dam on the Snake River, near Idaho; and Michaud Flats near Chief Joseph Dam on the Columbia River, Wash.

The administration official said Senator Cordon had tried before leaving office this past week to get the Budget Bureau to loosen funds for the Rogue River project.

"But he could not succeed," the official said.

"But the boys in the Bureau feel, 'Why should they help Cordon? He was defeated.' And that's all they need to cut a project out of the budget.'"

Reminded that Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay is still in office and favors the project, the official declared: "But the Budget Bureau has seen the Oregon election returns, and they know McKay came out on the short end."

In short, it was pointed out the few projects gaining approval were doled out to States that stood by GOP candidates. The California project, a $10,000,000 flood control and recreation project near Lake Kaweah, a Republican reelected in November; the Idaho project is a favorite of Senator Henry Heidbrink, a non-GOP Republican in 1954; and the Washington project goes to Representative Walt Horan, Republican, and Senator Warren G. Magnuson, a Democrat who will be the top man from the Northwest on the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee in this Congress.

ELLSWORTH BUDGET APPROVAL

Representative Ellsworth B. Latham, a Republican of Oregon, said he vigorously argued for Rogue River project funds but had no word on whether they had been approved or disapproved.

From Democratic circles, it became clear that Senator Wayne Morse and Senator Richard L. Neuberger will try to add funds to the budget during its review by Congress, and that the slighted Oregon project would be on the cutback list. The long-haul strategy of Democrats so long as they control Congress and the GOP controls the executive departments, it is expected, will be something like this:

Although Eisenhower does not ask Congress for funds to start many new projects, the Democrats will use the administration's failure to add funds for such resource development. They will initially appropriate the minimum amount of money needed in the budget, then at the end of the fiscal year—when Congress is in recess— they will add funds for such resource development projects which would be calculated to force the administration to request additional funds to complete the projects without politically risky and uneconomic interpollations.

Neuberger Calls on McKay to Add Funds for Talent Project

Oregon Senator Richard Neuberger has called on Interior Secretary Douglas McKay to include at least $2,500,000, authorized by the Bureau of Reclamation to be used for the Talent irrigation project.

CASH REHABILITATION

In a letter which was printed in the Mail Tribune, Neuberger stated: "In my opinion the maximum which should be recommended is $850,000 for restoring the canal systems of the Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation Districts. I also believe that at least $2,500,000 should be recommended for the start of construction on the physical engineering works themselves..."
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migrated into our States between 1940 and 1950, one can earn a living at pro-
ductive work only if we use our resources
wisely and well. I feel certain that the
Talbot Committee's work constitutes such use of our resources."

TOTAL COST $22 MILLION

"Because the total cost of the project is
$22 million, it is obvious that even a recom-
mended report for construction of this project
ating fiscal-year budget will still leave a con-
siderable amount of time before the project
can finally be completed."

"I hope that you and your associates in
the administration can see fit to recommend in
the budget the funds necessary to get the
Talent project well started."

PROPOSED REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF
RECLAMATION

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 17, 1954.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Sirs: This is my proposed report on the
Talent division, Rogue River Basin project,
Oregon. It is based on and includes the ac-
companying report of the regional director,
Boise, Idaho.

The Talent division is located in Jackson
County of southwestern Oregon. Portland
Lake, on Bear Creek, a tributary to the
Rogue River, in the general vicinity of the
city of Ashland and the towns of Talent
and Roseburg. The principal purpose of the
development is primarily for irrigation but also pro-
duces hydroelectric power, flood control, and
incidental fish and wildlife, and recreation
benefits.

There is substantial need in the project
area for supplemental water for irrigation
purposes and for the development of new
irrigated lands from the water supply that
the proposed development would make avail-
able. A substantial percentage of the popu-
lation of small farms does not have off-farm
income and is important in the economy.
A full water supply would furnish additional
income to farmers on the small tracts and
would provide for optimum use of the avail-
able water resource which, as a result of popu-
lation increase, is important to the econ-
omy of the region.

Lands developed along Bear Creek for agri-
cultural uses have many additional com-
mercial, and residential purposes are subject to flooding al-
most every winter. The flood damage would be
reduced by the proposed project of enlarging the existing Emigrant Reservoir as part of the proposed plan. The construction of the project would be at the ratio of 1.3 to 1.

The plan provides for an adequate water supply for 17,890 acres of irrigable land on which 9,250 to 48,000-acre feet capacity, as would the length and capacity of the existing major canals and laterals. Hyatt Prairie Reservoir would be utilized at its present size. Mayor recommendation of Howard Prairie Dam and Reservoir, 60,500-acre feet capacity, a system of collection canals for conveying water from the Little Butte Creek watershed into Howard Prairie Reservoir, and the Howard Prairie Diversion would be in the course of developments such as convey diversion the reservoir water and other flows of Beaver and Jenny Creeks, of the upper Klam-

area would be increased in size from

Water supplies would be augmented to the same extent as if the
Division plan is primarily an extension to the works of the Talent irrigation district, Eastern Oregon. The project would be used to as great an extent as possible and enlarged as required. The Reclamation Service would be increased in size from 6,000 to

The estimated cost of the development based on January 1953 prices is $19,894,000. Annual operations and replacement costs would amount to $150,500, of which $85,900 is allocated to irrigation and $64,600 allocated to the flood control.

The allocation of the $19,894,000 to irriga-
tion, power and flood control are respectively $12,971,000, $6,286,000, and $637,000. The latter amount is nonreimbursable in accordance with law. It is estimated that the amount allocated to power including interest during construction, would be repaid from net power revenues in 49 years with interest at 3 1/2 percent. For the water users to pay out the irrigation cost would be increased in size from

The Regional Director, therefore, in the ab-
sence of commitment by local interests for
reimbursement costs of development and in ac-
cordance with Bureau of the Budget Circular 47 must recommend the plan developed in accordance with the recommendations of the regional director. However, it is believed that this construction of the facilities necessary to provide access, sanitation, and safety for immediate public use and for protection of the area should be undertaken as part of

The plan will require transbasin
diversion of water to be successful. Studies
indicate that the required supply is avail-
able and there is no apparent conflict with
existing rights. The State Engineer of Oregon has expressed his approval of the pro-
posal to go ahead with this project.

There is the possibility of the State Engineer of Oregon and the Federal
authorities coming to an agreement over the wildlife resources of
Oregon, in accordance with provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 887), to the State of Oregon for the views and recommendations of the
department for the proposed development. However, over the wildlife resources of that State, in accordance with provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 887), and the other interested Federal agencies for their

Respectfully,

W. A. DECHERSIEH,
Commissioner.

Attached and adopted: April 1, 1954.

S. 414, would require the Army engi-
neers to determine possible means of
preventing damage to property and loss of
human lives by hurricane winds and tides.

The distinguished senior Senator from
Rhode Island (Mr. GAXZER) and his dis-
tinguished colleague from New Mexico (Mr.
CHAVES) to schedule hearings at the
earliest practicable time, and with all other Senators interested in constructive action toward meeting this problem.

It is my hope that these bills will be
scheduled for hearings before the Approp-
riate Committee on Public Works. I have
requested the chairman, the distin-
guished senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. CHAVES) to schedule hearings at the
earliest practicable time, and with all other Senators interested in constructive action toward meeting this problem.

Mr. President, many difficult problems
have been created by the increasing fre-
quency and severity of hurricane dam-
ages, which is one of the most difficult
problems and with all other Senators interested in constructive action toward
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avenues of proper assistance to the States, communities, and people who have borne the brunt of these disasters. I ask unanimous consent that an exchange of correspondence between the Governor of Connecticut, Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, and myself on this matter be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT;
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hon. Prescott Bush,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I know that you are vitally interested in the problems of shorefront protection and beach erosion as it affects the State of Connecticut. The serious effects of tidal floods and beach erosion will take the cooperation of the Federal Government, the State, the towns, and the individual property owners.

I have received a letter from Governor Roberts of Rhode Island in which he states that the Rhode Island delegation intends to ask for a study by the Army engineers concerning the tidal waters of Narragansett Bay and waters along the southern shores of New England. Furthermore, Governor Ribicoff has asked congressional representatives from the three southern New England States to meet for discussion of an act the Rhode Island delegation is introducing in Congress.

In reading the proposed Rhode Island act, it would appear to me that it might be preferable to take a broader scope of the subject to cover beach erosion and shorefront protection in general as well as problems of damages due to hurricanes.

I have written Governor Ribicoff that I am sure that the Connecticut delegation would be pleased to cooperate with other congressional representatives from adjoining States in joint action for the mutual benefit of southern New England.

It is my intention, at some future date, to call a conference to which I will invite our United States Senators, the Congressmen whose districts adjoin the Connecticut shoreline, and local officials. Before setting such date, I will clear with you to find a day mutually convenient.

In presenting this suggestion, I would be pleased to receive them.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

Abraham Ribicoff,
Governor of Connecticut.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
January 22, 1955.
Hon. Abraham Ribicoff,
Governor of Connecticut,
State Capitol, Hartford, Conn.

Dear Governor:

Thank you for your letter of January 10. I am delighted that we share interest in the problems of shorefront protection and beach erosion vitally affecting Connecticut. In an effort to contribute toward the solution of the problems, I introduced in the Senate on January 14 a bill to authorize a survey of the New England, New York, and New Jersey coasts and tidal areas for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of life due to hurricanes and tides. A copy is enclosed.

The bill was drafted after consultation with the Chief of Army Engineers and with experts who have been concerned with the very serious problems of beach erosion and shore protection in general as well as those arising from the impact of floods. I had not been aware, at the time the bill was introduced, that Senator Gazez was working on a similar bill, in which Senator Pastore joined as a sponsor, was introduced on January 18. I agree that the Rhode Island bill appears to be too limited in scope and its author has been restricted in the proposed survey to southern New England it narrows the support we might expect from other States and points east.

As you know, bills of this nature are referred to the Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member. I am writing this to request that hearings be held at the earliest practicable date. When hearings are scheduled, I think it advantageous if you, as Governor of our State, could appear in person or by representative to join me in presenting Connecticut's views.

In the meantime, a conference of Connecticut Members of Congress with shoreline and local officials, such as you suggest, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, and I am confident that by working together we will be able to make progress toward its solution.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Prescott Bush,
United States Senator.

Mr. PURTELL subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in today's session my colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Busb] introduced correspondence between him and the Governor of Connecticut concerning the problems which affect the navigation of the Connecticut River as it flows along the southern shores of New England; furthermore, that Senator Gazez will invite congressional representatives from the three southern New England States to meet for discussion of an act the Rhode Island delegation is introducing in Congress.

In reading the proposed Rhode Island act, it would appear to me that it might be preferable to widen the scope of the survey to cover beach erosion and shorefront protection in general as well as those problems of damage due to hurricanes.

I have written Governor Ribicoff in Hartford, Conn., informing you of my intention to introduce a bill providing for a study to be made relative to preventive measures guarding against hurricane damage along the New England, New York, and New Jersey coasts. Before setting such date, I will clear with you to find a day mutually convenient.

In presenting this suggestion, I would be pleased to receive them.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

Abraham Ribicoff,
Governor of Connecticut.

JANUARY 24, 1955.

Hon. Abraham Ribicoff,
Governor, State of Connecticut,
Executive Chambers,
Hartford, Conn.

Dear Abe: Thank you for your letter of January 19, with respect to the communication which you received from Governor Roberts of Rhode Island, informing you of the study which the Rhode Island delegation is asking the Government to undertake, concerning the problems affecting the navigable waters of Narragansett Bay and waters along the southern shores of New England. This general area is one which has given me some concern for quite a period, and early last fall I first took up the matter with the office of the Governor and had directed, in a letter of introduction in the Congress a bill which would, "authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, to conduct a detailed study of the coastal areas of the New England States and of New York State for the purpose of developing the capability of protective works in such areas against hurricanes and other heavy storms."

However, I found that Senator Bush had likewise proposed a bill which would serve the same general purposes and, inasmuch as

he is a Member of the Senate Public Works Committee, in which committee any request having to deal with public works would be referred, I deferred to him. A copy of his proposal is known that you are vitally interested in the problems of shorefront protection and beach erosion as it affects the State of Connecticut. The serious effects of tidal floods and beach erosion will take the cooperation of the Federal Government, the State, the towns, and the individual property owners.

I have received a letter from Governor Roberts, of Rhode Island, who informs me that the Rhode Island delegation intends to ask for a study by the Army engineers concerning the problems which affect the navigation of the Connecticut River as it flows along the southern shores of New England; furthermore, that Senator Gazez will invite congressional representatives from the three southern New England States to meet for discussion of an act the Rhode Island delegation is introducing in Congress.

In reading the proposed Rhode Island act, it would appear to me that it might be preferable to widen the scope of the survey to cover beach erosion and shorefront protection in general as well as those problems of damage due to hurricanes.

I have written Governor Ribicoff in Hartford, Conn., informing you of my intention to introduce a bill providing for a study to be made relative to preventive measures guarding against hurricane damage along the New England, New York, and New Jersey coasts. Before setting such date, I will clear with you to find a day mutually convenient.

In presenting this suggestion, I would be pleased to receive them.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

Abe, Governor.

RELIef OF TAKASHI SUGIURA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced Senate bill 328, for the relief of Takashi Sugiu, a picture courier in the Smithsonian Institution.

I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Gleek] be permitted to be a cosponsor of the bill.

The Acting Presidend pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the text of a letter written by the Director of the Smithsonian Institution to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], together with an attached memorandum. By unanimous consent, the letter and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

FREER GALLERY OF ART.


Hon. Theodore F. GREEN, United States Senate, Atchison, Kansas.

My dear Senator Green: You no doubt recall meeting our Japanese picture mounter, Mr. Takashi Sugura. Senator SALTONSTALL has introduced a bill in the Senate for the relief of our man's wife and children. The number of the bill is S. 228, and the enclosed paper will explain the situation. I do hope that you will find it possible to support this bill, which is very important to us.

Sincerely yours,

A. G. WENLEY, Director.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED CONCERNING JAPANESE PICTURE MOUNTER, FREER GALLERY OF ART.

Early in 1953 we brought to this country on a first priority immigration visa Mr. Takashi Sugura, of Tokyo, Japan, to work as a picture mounter in the Freer Gallery of Art. Our understanding with him was that, if both parties liked the arrangement we would bring over his wife and family; but at the end of the year we find that, although he petitioned for the admission of Mrs. Sugura and her three children, Motoko, Atsushi, and Kumi, and they were placed on the waiting list on October 15, 1953, they are on the No. 3 priority list and there is no hope of getting them over here in the near future in that classification.

This matter is extremely urgent to us because, should we lose Mr. Sugura, it would be almost impossible to get someone to take his place here. We could get no technician like him in this country, and it is difficult even to get one that is really good. We therefore asked Mr. Fouche of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to draw up a bill for the admission of Mr. Chi Sugura, Motoko Sugura, Atsushi Sugura, and Kumi Sugura. This has been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives as S. 228 and H. R. 6622 on January 5 of this year. These bills were introduced by Senator SALTONSTALL and Representative CANNON, respectively, and are identical. These two bills are worded as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Chi Sugura and her three children, Motoko Sugura, Atsushi Sugura, and Kumi Sugura, shall be deemed eligible for the issuance of immigration visas pursuant to section 203 (a) (1) (B) of that act not to exceed two hundred visas for each fiscal year for the period of one year and nine months since he has been in this country, and as yet we have been unable to fulfill the agreement that we made in writing to Mr. Sugura, since his family has placed a physical and financial burden on Mr. Sugura, for not only has he been separated from his wife and children but he has supported two households. He has recently expressed his determination to return to Japan in the hope of being able to reunite him with his family in the United States.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BAN THE POLL TAX

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the last three Congresses a group of southern Senators, of which I have the privilege to be one, has introduced in each Congress a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the effect of which would be to ban the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in elections in which a President, a Vice President, Members of the United States Senate, or Members of the House of Representatives are being elected.

This has been an extremely serious matter to the Japanese picture mounter, Mr. Sugura, and it is evident that the time has arrived for us to introduce with the assistance of my colleagues a similar amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment should be constitutional, to eliminate any poll tax or any other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"Sec. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable organizations.

"Sec. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to state to the Senator from Florida that I am pleased by his introduction of the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to provide for a constitutional amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred. Without objection the text of the joint resolution will be printed in the Record at this point.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 29) to provide for a constitutional amendment to the Constitution of the United States, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND for himself and other Senators, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Senate Journal as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which amendment shall be deemed part of the Constitution as from the date of its ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by any State by reason of the failure of any person to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"Sec. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

"Sec. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to state to the Senator from Florida that I am pleased by his introduction of the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

The time has arrived for us to take some action that will be meaningful and effective. I wish the Senator from Florida to know that, because we always try to treat each other with a sense of integrity and fair play. Therefore, I believe it will be the duty of those of us who believe that the poll-tax requirement should be eliminated to support an effort to bring about a vote through a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. By way of response I should like to say that many of us disagree entirely with his belief that it would be efficacious or constitutional to bring about the desired result by a Federal statute. I think such an approach would lead only to a snarl in the floor
of the Senate, which would get us nowhere at all.

The senior Senator from Minnesota and other Senators will consider seriously supporting our proposal for a constitutional amendment. The senior Senator from Florida and many other Senators believe that the poll tax is a bad tax. For example, on the floor today several Senators who in their own States, either as members of their legislatures or as Governors—and some of them in both capacities—have time to have accomplished that result.

We believe that with the limitations that are proposed in the joint resolution, the constitutional amendment could be submitted quickly to the States and that probably it could be adopted even more quickly than any other amendment has been heretofore adopted.

I have been indicated to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary that we would be perfectly willing to have a 2-year limitation or any other reasonable limitation placed upon the measure, because we are confident that the measure could be adopted by most of the several States, if they are given an opportunity to act on it.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to express the hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will proceed along the lines of the request of the Senator from Florida, and hold hearings on the joint resolution. I should like to say further that, while one always has his own personal convictions as to the best manner in which to approach a very difficult problem, which in this case relates to the election laws of the various States and that we believe is the most important thing is to get something done.

I believe the Senator from Florida will find that the junior Senator from Minnesota, instead of trying to be an obstinate, will try to be a supporter of prompt and effective consideration of the joint resolution. At the same time, with all the vigor I have and with the powers of persuasion I have, I shall try to gain majority support for a legislative proposal.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, if I am permitted to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has expired. The Senate is still operating under the 2-minute order.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed additional time so that I may yield for a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and an Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is undoubtedly aware of the fact that in 1926 I had advocated that the best way in which to handle the poll-tax situation was by a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall that with pleasure.

Mr. KILGORE. The effect of a constitutional amendment would be much more far-reaching than would the effect of a bill. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has introduced his joint resolution, and it is my hope that we will get efficacious action on the matter in committee, so that it may be reported soon and be promptly adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very much encouraged by the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia.

APPOINTMENT OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR TO THE RANK OF GENERAL OF THE ARMIES

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on January 21, 1955 (S. Res. 26) was introduced on the floor of the Senate. This resolution authorizes the appointment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the rank of General of the Armies of the United States, and represents a step to which this distinguished American, I should like to speak on behalf of this resolution. Gen. Douglas MacArthur has marched through history with the alert, giant, man who knows where he is going. This colorful son of a colorful father was born 75 years ago today on an Army post in Arkansas. He was born into the Army. He gave it his life.

The early record of Douglas MacArthur promised the great future he later achieved. He graduated from West Point as the No. 1 man in his class. He achieved the incredible record of 98.14 percent in all his studies. It was not a surprise that he was selected as the man most likely to succeed.

His record in the Rainbow Division of World War I was a brilliant success combined with astute military judgment. When he was appointed Chief of Staff of the United States Army by President Hoover he was only 50 years old. He was the youngest man ever to hold that high position.

The highlight of his career came in the Second World War. Few of us will forget his brilliant and inspired defense of the Philippines. The news was tragically bad from all fronts. The Dutch East Indies and Singapore fell like dominoes before the rush of the Japanese. But General MacArthur conducted a defense of the Philippines that was brilliant and valuable. The Japanese planning for the conquest of the Philippines was thrown completely off schedule.

The free world is grateful to Gen. MacArthur for his excellence and the Japanese Generalissimo is no longer the most dangerous enemy. The Japanese have been crushed by small forces and by meager resources, he held on to give us the precious time we needed so vitally. Even in adversity this was one of his finest hours.

When victory finally came it was due in small part to the magnificent leadership of Douglas MacArthur. But he was not yet free of responsibility. After our splendid success, the Japanese reconquest, MacArthur again assumed the role of military leader with the invasion of South Korea. Again his devoted service led us successfully through a trying time. The brilliancy of the master craftsman appeared with the attack on Inchon. The Nation had again called on Douglas MacArthur. To raise this rank to General of the Armies would truly be a fitting tribute to a truly great man.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Iowa on his remarks concerning that great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and to join with the Senator in the sentiments which he has expressed upon the occasion of the 75th birthday of that very distinguished citizen of our country.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Iowa in paying tribute and in saying "Happy birthday" to this great professional military tactician who is today celebrating his 75th birthday anniversary in the city of Los Angeles, Calif. The Senate that last week I introduced a joint resolution which was cosponsored by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANTIEL], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTYN], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and other Senators, which would accord to General MacArthur the distinguished honor of being General of the Armies of the United States. I should like to invite all my colleagues to join in the sponsorship of that resolution.

It has been impossible to call this matter to the attention of the Committee on Armed Services because that committee has been holding hearings on Formosa problems.

I should like to give way to any other Senator who favors the resolution, and who, because of their superior knowledge of the great work of General MacArthur, might desire to be the author of the resolution which I have heretofore introduced. So again I say to General MacArthur, on behalf of the people of this Nation—"Happy birthday," and many, many more of them. I thank the Senators for their interest in the matter.

PROTECTION OF THE SECURITY OF FORMOSA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, which held a joint meeting, I report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 28, authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States to protect the security of Formosa, and for other purposes. I request unanimous consent to file the joint report of the two committees to which this resolution sometime during today.
Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I in- quire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations if it is the purpose, to his knowledge, to bring up this matter for consideration immediately, or if the Senate will have a few days in which to study the joint resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. It is not my purpose to move the immediate consideration of the joint resolution, but I expect to move tomorrow morning to proceed with its discussion.

Mr. THING. Are we to understand that debate on the measure in the Sen- ate is to be undertaken without Senators having had more than simply tomorrow morning in which to study the report of the committee?

Mr. GEORGE. The report of the committee will be filed sometime during this afternoon—as early as possible, I may say to the Senator—and I hope that the Senators will be ready to proceed with the consideration of the joint resolution tomorrow.

Mr. LONG. Has the distinguished Senator from Georgia discussed in the Senate how much time Senators will have in which to study the report of the committee before the Senate takes up the matter?

Mr. GEORGE. I cannot say. I shall move the consideration of the joint reso- lution tomorrow, immediately upon the convening of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem- pore, Mr. LONG, Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that I have been advised that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has discussed in the Senate how much time Senators will have in which to study the report of the committee before the Senate takes up the matter?

Mr. GEORGE. I cannot say. I shall move the consideration of the joint reso- lution tomorrow, immediately upon the convening of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to confirm what the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has said with reference to the plans for tomorrow. It is my intention to move that at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until 1 o'clock tomorrow morning. Therefore, I shall make the announcement that the joint resolution will not be called up until after the Senate has reconvened, following the joint meeting with the House.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to Senate Joint Reso- lution 28 and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement which I have caused to be prepared relating to the fight against what is known as the Chi- cago water steel, and also a letter from the municipal port director of the city of Milwaukee.

There being no objection, the state- ment and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record.

We must continue to fight against the Chicago water steel.

For many years it has been my privilege to battle against what is generally known as the Chicago water steel. It is the result of efforts by the Chicago Sanitary District to sabotage a United States Supreme Court decision limiting the second diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Sanitary Canal.

Many years it has been my privilege to battle against what is generally known as the Chicago water steel. It is the result of efforts by the Chicago Sanitary District to sabotage a United States Supreme Court decision limiting the second diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Sanitary Canal.

The water diversion controversy arose from the Chicago water steel. For many years it has been my privilege to battle against what is generally known as the Chicago water steel. It is the result of efforts by the Chicago Sanitary District to sabotage a United States Supreme Court decision limiting the second diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Sanitary Canal.
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The water diversion controversy arose from the Chicago water steel. For many years it has been my privilege to battle against what is generally known as the Chicago water steel. It is the result of efforts by the Chicago Sanitary District to sabotage a United States Supreme Court decision limiting the second diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Sanitary Canal.

The water diversion controversy arose from the Chicago water steel. For many years it has been my privilege to battle against what is generally known as the Chicago water steel. It is the result of efforts by the Chicago Sanitary District to sabotage a United States Supreme Court decision limiting the second diversion of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Sanitary Canal.
Having been frustrated before the War Production Board, the United States Public Health Service, and the general community of lakeographers, Chicago then attempted to secure an Executive order from the late President Roosevelt forbidding water diversion.

A barrage of protest came from the Great Lakes region as a result of which the President was made aware of the significant position Lake Michigan occupies in the lives of all who live in the Great Lakes basin.

Chicago thereafter petitioned the Supreme Court to reopen the case on the grounds that Chicago’s water supply and public health would be irreparably injured if the Supreme Court did not make its decision immediately.

A majority of the judges supported Chicago’s application, and the Supreme Court decided in favor of Chicago.

A variety of reasons have been advanced by the State of Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District to support their position. These reasons are the real motives for the increased diversion of lake water are navigation, public health, recreation, community use, agriculture, and in some cases, water supply.

The increased diversion of lake water is desired because of the increased availability of this water to be derived from the development of hydroelectric power at Lockport, Ill., where the sanitary district maintains an electric power plant and to decrease the operating expenses of the sanitary district, which becomes possible if untreated or partially treated sewage can be diluted with additional lake water. In the report of Special Master Lemann to the United States Supreme Court in March 1941, it was pointed out that the additional electricity which could be developed by a diversion of 10,000 c. f. s. is worth $1,500 a day to the sanitary district, or $550,000 a year.

The sanitary district has thoroughly confused the entire issue by repeated shifts of position and numerous phony claims. Among the many reasons given by Illinois and Chicago for diverting lake water are agriculture, recreation, pollution, farming, and to support the Chicago Water Plant. All of the above has been thoroughly disproved.

Only two conclusions can be drawn—either the securing of increased diversion has proven our obsession with increased water consumption and the fixed political objective in the Chicago area, or the sanitary district with the political power at Lockport to increase the funds available to it from sale of power.

The Great Lakes Harbors Association, the port cities of the Great Lakes, the Lake Carriers’ Association, and the governments of the States bordering the Great Lakes have been united in opposition to the diversion of lake water into the Chicago area.

The Canadian Government has repeatedly protested through diplomatic channels and has finally established an international basin for the benefit of a single community.

For the past 40 years the Milwaukee city government has been a powerful force for the protection of the community and regional interests in this matter. Milwaukee should not be considered in this situation because statements emanating from Chicago, which have little or no basis in fact. The allegation that Milwaukee is taking water at the Chicago locks and that Milwaukee is utterly ridiculous. While the writer is no author in this subject, it is my understanding that it would be physically and financially impossible to build sewage facilities of a capacity adequate to treat sudden deluges of stocks water when potential rains fall. Under these circumstances, there is inevitably some mixing of storm and sanitary water in the sewerage works, and the necessity of our treatment plant. However, it is not reasonable to expect that the city would be physically and against hasty enactment of legislation such as H. R. 3300 which slipped through the Senate in the confusion of the closing hours.

Respectfully,

H. C. Brockel
Municipal Port Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nye) in the chair. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF WHEAT MARKET-ING QUOTA PROVISIONS

Mr. LONG obtained the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LONG. I shall yield to the distinguished acting majority leader, with the reservation that I do not lose my right to the floor, and by that I mean that if the measure the Senator intends to take up should result in relatively lengthy debate, I shall insist on my right to proceed in the regular order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the following sentences to the bill:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall increase the farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1955 crop of wheat, for commercial food products during 1 or more of the 10 years 1946 through 1956. Provided that the increase in the wheat acreage allotment, as determined by this subsection, shall be in addition to the national, State, and county wheat acreage allotments, and the acreage of class II durum wheat thereon shall not be considered in establishing the wheat acreage allotments."

The amendments were agreed to.
The bill would permit a small increase in the production of durum wheat for a 1-year period. Durum wheat is used in making macaroni and spaghetti. Because of a severe new type of rust that has declined from an average of about 35 million bushels to about 6,600,000 bushels this year, additional acreage is badly needed. The bill is approved by the Department of Agriculture, farm organizations, the Grange, the macaroni industry, the milling industry, and by the committee.

The normal requirement for domestic use, exports, and carryover is about 35 million bushels per year.

These three successive crop failures have endangered the entire durum wheat industry both on the production and milling sides.

The proposal would result in a slight increase in the acreage allotted for durum wheat, which will induce farmers to seed increased acreages of durum wheat.

In 1953 and 1954, the crop of durum wheat was only 5.5 million bushels, as compared with an average of about 35 million bushels.

The proposal is designed to provide for the increase of rust-resistant durum varieties, to stabilize the production of durum, and to protect the farmers from the dangers of rust damage from stem rust "race 15b." In 1952 the production of durum wheat totaled 22 million bushels, which was only 60 percent of the usual crop.

The normal requirement for domestic use, exports, and carryover is about 35 million bushels per year.

In 1952 more than 10,000,000 bushels, and in the 1953-54 crop, 5,500,000 bushels were produced. In 1955, 3,500,000 bushels, and in the 1956 crop, 2,500,000 bushels will be produced.

In 1953 and 1954, the crop of durum wheat was only 5.5 million bushels, as compared with an average of about 35 million bushels.

The proposal is designed to provide for the increase of rust-resistant durum varieties, to stabilize the production of durum, and to protect the farmers from the dangers of rust damage.

The proposal would result in a slight increase in the acreage allotted for durum wheat, which will induce farmers to seed increased acreages of durum wheat.

The proposal is designed to provide for the increase of rust-resistant durum varieties, to stabilize the production of durum, and to protect the farmers from the dangers of rust damage.
Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YOUNG. One year.

Mr. DANIEL. The bill does not propose to restrict the planting of that crop in any other area, and will have no effect whatever except for a period of 1 year. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I have re­ceived inquiries concerning the bill, and certain objections were raised, which I think the Senator from North Dakota has met by the elimination of certain language from his bill.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to add that the bill would permit the production of durum wheat on undiverted acres in any county in the United States which had a previous history of raising durum wheat. If the county had produced any durum wheat in the past 10 years, the farmers in that area would be permitted to produce additional durum wheat.

Mr. DANIEL. For 1 year?

Mr. YOUNG. For 1 year.

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

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SE­CURITY OF FORMOSA.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have been seriously worried about the request for the passage by Congress of a joint resolution authorizing the President to conduct military operations for the defense of Formosa, the Pescadores, and other islands along the China coast. Let me say that as one Member of this body I very much appreciate the fact that the President has undertaken to request of the Congress our advice and consent to any military operations that might well lead to world war III. It is an extremely grave decision that Congress is called upon to make. Its gravity should not be und­errated, nor should it be arrived at without thoughtful consideration.

Yesterday the House voted 409 to 3 in favor of the resolution, only 1 day after its introduction, without having the

benefit of a single day's hearings. The argument that prevailed on the floor of the House was that we should back the President. I do not agree that that is the basis upon which we should decide this issue. It seems to me that it is our duty to give the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff every possible assistance in the formulation and development of the problems involved in the commitment which we are asked to make.

It is well that the entire public of the United States should go into this matter with their eyes open. Up to this point, as a former member of the Committee on Armed Services, and as one who served on that committee when President Truman first came into office to defend the strait between Formosa and the mainland, I have never interpreted that obligation as extending to the small islands within easy artillery range of the Chinese mainland held by the Communists.

I would not attempt to compare my judgment with that of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Nevertheless, as a veteran of three amphibious landings, I have some practical understand­ing of the difficulties of an amphibious landing. I say to my colleagues that there is all the difference in the world between committing our fleet to the defense of a strait more than 75 miles wide, defending islands more than 50 miles beyond the horizon, so far as the Commonwealth are concerned, and defending islands a mere stone's throw from the Chinese mainland. To me it is incon­ceivable that it would be at all difficult for the greatest naval power on the earth to defend a strait attempted by a force, totally lacking in modern seapower, against a well-armed island manned by 500,000 troops. Yet, I can envision eventualities that could lead to an amphibious landing if the President were to take full advantage of the invitation in the resolution as presently worded.

If I understand the situation correctly, it is the feeling of the responsible military authorities of this country that our forces should undertake to attack the Chinese mainland prior to the time that our opponent could launch any amphibious invasion and the concentration of Communist Chinese troops at any point along more than 200 miles of shore­land could serve as justification for heavy bombardment of Red Chinese ports. This is far more than our Na­tional has thus far committed itself to do.

When President Truman committed this Nation to resist aggression, it re­sulted in severe criticism, as the hard­ships of the Chinese Communists course became apparent.

We owe it to the people of the United States to explore fully and to understand fully the extent of the commitments we are asked to make and the possibilities to prevent they may lead.

If this resolution is to be regarded as a decision to ask for a showdown with the Communists, it should face it as such. We should real­ize that to become involved in a war with Russia under such circumstances would mean that the many allies, num­bering many millions in population, committed to our side in the event of Communist aggression, would have no obligation to come to our aid. It would be strictly the type of go-it-alone policy that has previously been advocated by some of our military commanders in the Pacific.

It would be with the utmost regret that I should feel forced to vote against the resolution requested by the President. Nevertheless, I believe in my con­science that I owe it to those whom I have the honor in part to represent to vote on my own convictions in this matter after learning the facts, rather than to approve without study the judgment of the President or Admiral Radford.

I am extremely concerned about that fact that we have not made available to the American people all the facts and considerations that have been developed in hearings on this joint resolution. Mr. President, at this point let me say it is my understanding that we shall have no printed hearings on this matter which will be available to the body for consideration. If keeping the public somewhat in the dark is necessary to prevent our enemies from knowing our intentions, then at least Senators and Representatives shall have before themselves the facts and of our intentions prior to the vote. It is for that reason that I wish to request that we not be in such a wild rush to pass the joint resolution before all Members have had the opportunity to apprise themselves fully as to the effect of their vote.

This joint resolution need not be rushed through today or tomorrow. As we have seen in the past, we have the capabilities of defeating any enemy Communist effort to capture Formosa and the Pescadores. The entire world knows of our intention to do so.

Having seen our great fleet in action, I have not the slightest doubt that it could prevent any major organized landing on Formosa. It could do this without bombing China, prior to the de­finitization of such a landing, if there is the slightest determination or will to fight on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek's troops on Formosa, and I am confident that such a determination exists.

Yet if we pass the joint resolution in its present form, it would be urged by the friends of Chiang Kai-shek that it would be appeasement for our President to permit the Chinese Communists to capture any one of many islands held by the Chinese Nationalists along the China coast. For myself, I fully believe that Chiang Kai-shek and his friends have no intention whatever of allowing the United States fully involved in all-out war with Red China, even if this should mean war with Russia.

Once Congress has given this matter the green light, it would be difficult for the President to resist the urgent to ex­tend our protection even closer to the
Chinese mainland; in holding tiny islan-
deis of no value to the de-
fense of our essential interests. Every
person who urged that we should hold
back would be accused of being an ap-
peaser. When troops are concentrated
opposite the mainland of China, along the
coast, the hue and cry would be raised
across the land that our forces should
bombard the mainland of China.

I do not regard it as a bad thing that
we have many able fighting men who be-
lieve that war with the Communist
powers is inevitable. After all, a good
fighter will never be fully prepared un-
less he believes he is going to fight.
However, we should be careful that
those of us trusted with the policy deci-
dions do not permit our judgment to be
colored too much by those forceful men
of action who become impatient with those
who attempt to make their action
unnecessary.

It is also fair that we give the Ameri-
can people an opportunity to be heard
in the making of this decision. So far,
therefore, I feel that it is desirable.
Although I am not one to decide my
vote in such a matter by popular senti-
ment, I believe it only fair to our peo-
ple that the question of carrying warfare
to the China mainland and the possibil-
ity of Chinese counteraction, together
with the steps that might be expected
from China's powerful ally, Russia, in
support of the Chinese Communists,
should be made clear. Thus far, the
American people have not been informed
of the implications of this joint resolu-
tion. They do not realize that our com-
mittments are being extended far beyond
anything any of us have realized prior
to this time.

Let us be true to our responsibilities
by so carefully studying this joint reso-
lution that we give the President our best
advice. Let us arrive at a joint resolu-
tion which we can support with the
assurance that it offers the best possibil-
ity for world peace.

IN OPPOSITION TO PREVENTIVE WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the
course of my life I have delivered many
speeches; but I have never delivered a
more difficult one, or one which carries
a greater obligation and responsibility
to my conscience and to what I consider
to be my patriotic duty, than the speech
I am about to make on the floor of the
United States Senate.

During the course of this speech I
shall not yield, Mr. President, because I
wish to have appear in the Record a state-
ment of continuity, setting forth the
reasons for the vote I cast this morn-
ing in the joint meeting of the Commit-
tee on Foreign Relations and the Com-
mittee on Armed Services in opposition
to the resolution authorizing the Presi-
dent in emergency to exercise extraordi-
nary powers in the Pacific.

Up to this minute I have refused to
give to any member of the press any
statement of the reasons, because I
think I owe it to my constituents and to
my country to set them forth in the first
instance on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, as a Senator, there is
no question in my mind as to the proba-
ble consequences, insofar as I am con-
cerned, of the course of action I am fol-
lowing in this issue. However, I may say
that I have committed political suicide many
places, and perhaps I may do so again
and make no great difference, even though
it may be the final act of its kind in my
case. But I have always meant it, Mr.
President, when I have said I would
never hesitate to sacrifice myself politi-
cally for any principle which I believed
to be one of right. I shall always try
to keep faith with the dictates of my
conscience, and, in my judgment, the im-
plcations of this issue, called for the
vote against the resolution in its present
form which I cast this morning in the
joint meeting of the two committees,
and for the reasons I am about to enun-
ciate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the
Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will not
yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the
Senator from Oregon yield for a unan-
nimous-consent motion?

Mr. MORSE. I pause, Mr. President—
in order to protect my rights to the
floor—to inquire whether the Senator
from Louisiana wishes me to yield, in
order to permit him to submit some-
things and make himself heard with the
Senator from Oregon or the subject
matter of the speech I am about to make,
but has something to do with the busi-
ness of the Senate, over and above this
matter, and can be printed in the Rec-
ord following my remarks.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should
like to suggest the absence of a quorum,
if the Senator from Oregon will yield
for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not
think there is any doubt about the fact
that the purpose and subject of this
speech was known throughout the
Senate. Furthermore, I am not speak-
ing to the Senate alone; I am speak-
ing to the American people, on an
issue which I believe to be of as vital
importance to their security as any is-
 sue which has come before the Congress
since the outbreak of the Korean war.

President Has Emergency Defense Power

Mr. President, I desire to have it dis-
tinctly understood that it is my judg-
ment that the national constitutional
law of the President of the United States,
and Commander in Chief, has the emergency
power at any time to proceed to take
such steps as may be necessary for de-
fensive action in his wise dis-
cretion in order to protect the se-
curity of the United States. From the
standpoint of authorizing the President
to exercise that power, the joint resolu-
tion pending before the Senate is abso-
lutely unnecessary.

I can understand why a President of
the United States, for psychological rea-
sions and in view of the present world
situation—and I think that is one of the
reasons—why he feels it necessary to have
the President's message, it becomes very
clear that that was one of the motiva-
tions of the message—might wish to take
up the matter and give the Senate in ad-
vance of any exercise of discretion on
his part. I wish the President had not
done so, Mr. President, not because I
have any hesitation in meeting the issues
anyway, but because I think the Member of the Senate, in my judgment, the
responsibility of carrying out an in-
dependent senatorial duty in regard to
the proposals, and the implications of
those proposals, found both in the mes-
sage and in the joint resolution. That
makes it necessary, in my judgment, for
a full discussion and for the maximum
discussion possible of the serious de-
cline inherent in the resolution consonant
with the obligations of each Member of the
Senate to keep secret certain high mill-
dreds of decisions that were discussed in
the executive joint meetings of the com-
mittes.

Security Makes Debate Difficult, But Public
Must Have Facts

That is very difficult to do, Mr. Presi-
dent, because the Senator from Oregon
are to receive the information they are
entitled to receive on this issue, it be-
comes necessary, in my judgment, to
discuss some of the implications and
possible outcomes to the people of the
United States, inherent in the resolution
pending before the Senate, and the
Joint resolution. Such a course of debate is
even though some of the information
might be considered by some to be of
some value to potential enemies. I don't
think anything will be said in this de-
bate that will disclose any information
that will be helpful to our enemies.
However, Mr. President, such a risk must
be considered in the light of the pos-
sition of our system of political freedom if
the Congress is to fulfill its responsibilities
to the people of this Nation.

So as we proceed in this debate, it
seems to me that we shall walk a pretty
tight wire as between our obligations to
the Commander in Chief on the one
hand and our obligations to a free citi-
senry on the other. But the President
raised the issue, and I did not. When
the President raised the issue and placed
upon me as a Senator the responsi-
bility to fulfill what I consider to be my sol-
edications to the people of my State, I
came duty bound to discuss the
implications of this issue as I
honestly believe them to be. Let me make
it very clear, however, at the outset of
this debate, that I do not have the
intention of disclosing on the floor of
the Senate any information which could
possibly be used against the best
interests of my Nation.

In decades gone by in the history of
the United States Senate, other men
have stood in a position somewhat simi-
lar to mine at this moment. Other men
stood on the floor of the Senate when
great issues of war and peace were
involved, and have not represented
a majority point of view in the Senate.
It is rather paradoxical for me to find myself in a somewhat similar position today because in most of the past I have had the opportunity to have a majority of the Senate paralyze him, but accurately—"If those steel furnaces go cold, we shall pay for it in the loss of life of American boys in uniform."

I said in substance, "If that fact holds up, if he has the power and the situation is such that there will be a loss, by reason of those furnaces going cold, of ammunition needed by our military forces, then the President of the United States has the power under the facts of the situation to seize those furnaces going cold, to operate them under the flag, and to provide what the facts demand has been taken from behind his desk, so that there may be continuity of production in the interest of the successful prosecution of the Korean war."

That is why I said on the floor of the Senate—and I paraphrase my speech—that I did not think any of us would live long enough to see the United States Supreme Court deny that power to the President. It was wrong on a finding of fact so far as the Supreme Court was concerned, because the Supreme Court disagreed with a finding of fact which I made as a Senator. For that reason, I should render in regard to the seizure of the steel plants.

It will be recalled that, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows, the moment the Supreme Court decision was handed down, I walked onto the floor of the Senate and said in effect, "The Court has spoken. Its decision is law, and we must proceed now to see to it that the rights of management are protected in accordance with the Court's findings of fact and law."

PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY POWER SUBJECT TO CONGRESSIONAL CHECK

The Record will also show that when I supported the Korean seizure, I pointed out that, although a President has the right to act as President Truman did in the premises, the Congress has the duty to pass judgment upon the action. If it modifies or repudiates the President's course of action. If I say nothing else in this speech on the question of constitutional power—and although this is an abstract point, and I recognize that it may be considered by many as an academic and professorial—I desire to make plain that the constitutional principle I am talking about now is of vital importance in connection with the course of action we may follow with respect to the resolution dealing with the Formosan area.

Therefore, I wish to stress the point that under its constitutional checking power the Congress has jurisdiction and authority to modify a course of action followed by a President in the exercise of his emergency powers. I emphasize that, Mr. President, because I am sure President Eisenhower and many citizens seem to think that when the Commander in Chief exercises an emergency power the Congress has no authority to act. To the contrary, Mr. President, under our system of checks and balances the Executive power is subject to a legislative check; and if a President of the United States, for example, should order his troops somewhere in the world where the Congress thought troops should not be sent, the Congress would have the right to pass a resolution checking the President's action. I deny that premise. When we are called upon to deal with such an issue as that which now confronts us, the Congress has the duty of taking affirmative protective action if it believes the President of the United States is exceeding his emergency power, or if the facts in a particular situation do not authorize a claim of his inherent constitutional powers as Commander in Chief.

Therefore, Mr. President, on the very day the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows the Korean seizure was pronounced legal by the Supreme Court in the steel seizure case, I introduced in the Senate a bill proposing to regularize the seizure, making perfectly clear the limitations of such seizure, and protecting the constitutional interest. I thought that the argument could not be supported that the seizure would override the rights of management. The Record shows that I said I thought there were really three types of strikes involved in the steel case. I said one strike was the threatened strike of the workers. Then there was the threat to them without the employers which amounted to a strike on the part of management. Lastly there was the strike by the Congress of the United States in not going forward with its contemplated action upon the President of the United States in the exercise of his powers as Commander in Chief. I argued that Congress had a clear duty to pass some legislation, the strike which exists.

I have given that little review of my position on the question of emergency power of a President because my position has ever been consistent with respect to it, and it is consistent today.

In my judgment, the President of the United States has the authority to carry out the defensive purposes of the resolution which has been submitted to Congress. I think it is a significant and historic message which the President of the United States has sent to Congress in support of the resolution and of the exercise of his war-making powers.

I shall always support the President of my country when he exercises those powers in his capacity as Commander in Chief, unless a clear showing can be made that the President is following a course of action contrary to the security and welfare of the Nation, in which event a restrictive check should be put upon him by Congress. I do not expect, Mr. President, that any such situation will ever develop under Dwight Eisenhower.

Knowing full well that misunderstandings may arise concerning the President's action, and that in some quarters, the deliberate misrepresentation of my position will be made of my position on this...
issue, let me make the Record perfectly clear by saying, although I oppose the President of the United States on a great many domestic issues, I have gone down the line with Dwight Eisenhower on all the major issues of foreign policy which have come before the Senate, and I intend to continue to do so. I reserve the right to disagree with the President on matters which fall clearly within the field of my legislative responsibility. I doubt if President Eisenhower in the future, any more than in the past, will propose legislation which would call for a challenge to his constitutional powers. I shall disagree undoubtedly on some details and support from time to time some amendments to his legislative proposals in the field of foreign policy but I do doubt if we will ever be so far apart that I cannot support his main objectives in foreign policy legislation.

RESOLUTION IN PRESENT FORM A BLANK CHECK

However, Mr. President, what confronts us now is not legislation. This is a proposal that, in advance, we give a blank check of approval to the President of the United States to do any and all the things that he may judge fit. This is done under all the implications of the resolution: We are being asked in effect to underwrite by our approval not only the acts of the President but the means of the resolution to be found between the lines, which are not written physically into the resolution. Those meanings must be read into the resolution, I believe, by any of our colleagues Dulles and Admiral Radford and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In my judgment, that is not appropriate under our system of checks and balances. The Executive has the duty of carrying out executive functions. The Congress is required to exercise its constitutional checks upon the decisions and actions of the President of the United States.

I wish to say, Mr. President—and the arguments I have heard in support of the resolution make this clear, that I am in my judgment—that one of the effects of this resolution will be to seal the lips of the elected representatives of the American people with respect to the course of action the President may take under the resolution.

If the President were to follow a course of action which Congress might think was not in the best interest of the Nation, we would hear it said to us: "You voted for the resolution to give to the President the authority and the sanction to carry out that course of action; did you not? Why are you now criticizing him?"

The fact is, what the President is asking for is a predated authorization of anything he may do under the resolution. I have shared to a great extent in the merit in what one distinguished Member of the Senate said to some of us when we discussed the subject: "It may be a predated authorization of war. It might very well be that.

One of the reasons for my voting in committee against reporting the resolution favorably—and there are many other reasons in my mind—under our constitutional processes, the resolution should never have been introduced in the first instance. The President should have proceeded to exercise his constitutional powers and have sought Congress for a predated authorization for any particular course of action. In my judgment the Members of Congress will be put in a rather difficult position if, subsequently they find themselves not in support of a particular course of action the President may be following.

THE NEED FOR NATIONAL UNITY AND THE NEED TO STOP OCTOBER 26

In these early remarks I wish to make it very clear that no Member of the Senate is more appreciative than I am of the fact that in this hour we need the maximum amount of unity and support of the President of the United States and of the Government of the United States. For me, possessing, as I do, the conviction that we should have the maximum of unity in this hour, Mr. President, it is not pleasant, I think, not easy to stand on the floor of the Senate and set forth objections to a resolution, when I know very well that the very objections themselves are being put forward, not by me, but by the words of the resolution, but all the Members of Congress will see that there is a responsibility. I doubt if President Eisenhower, who does not think that what it proposes is a proposal that, in advance, we give a clear public duty to do so, then become a clear public duty to do so, for the Members of Congress will see that there is a responsibility.

WILL SUPPORT FINAL ACTION OF CONGRESS

But—and mark this—when the Senate acts, whatever its action may be, there is not a Member of the Senate who will stand behind the action more firmly than will the Senator from Oregon. That has always been my position. When the court speaks—and this is the court of last resort in the Senate, it then becomes the duty of each Member of the Senate who does not think that what it proposes is the best interest of the United States to make clear the reasons for his objections.

The executive is not under our constitutional processes, the President. It might have been a blank check of approval to the Congress, which is the court of last resort. If the Congress were to hold sessions and never go to war, until war is made upon us.

Senators may differ with my conclusions, but my conviction is mine, Mr. President, and no one can take it from me. My conscience is mine, and no one can take it from me. My conscience and my convictions shunt in my ears a warning that in the course of action proposed now by the United States, for the first time in all its history, is moving itself into such a position that the judgment of millions of people will be that we are, at least so far as the resolution in its present form is concerned, going so far as to threaten an act of aggression before an act of war has been committed upon us.

I happen to believe it is important—Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Low in the chair). The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I happen to believe, Mr. President, that in this hour of crisis we have a duty to the men and women and girls 50 years from today or 100 years
or 200 years from today, because in future international councils of the world governed by law, we do in making a record on this issue. We shall weaken our position, Mr. President, one of the strongest positions we have had over decades in the field of foreign relations. It is contended we must run the historic principle that we are a nation of peace, and that the proof of it is found in our actions. The proof of it is that there cannot be pointed out in our history an act of war on the part of the United States prior to an act of war being committed against us.

I know one of the arguments or rationalizations being used by some in justifying following the course of action to which this resolution may lead is that we have to run the calculated risks of war.

THE CALCULATED RISKS OF PEACE

In answer to that, Mr. President, I plead with my Government and with my people also to show a sufficient determination to run the calculated risks of peace. The calculated risks of peace, applied to this form of faciliation, in my opinion, mean that we must face the calculated risk of the Red Chinese massing forces in China, without striking them unless they actually commit an act of war.

I am greatly disturbed about the extent to which in so many quarters in America, it has become accepted that legal principles of international law no longer are important. The argument is by way of rationalization, I respectfully submit; it is an appeal to fear and not to reason. We cannot stop and pay respect to the principles of international law, goes the argument, because the issue now is an issue of survival. Therefore, it is contended we must run the calculated risks of war, and we must make it very clear to the Communist segment of the world that we will use mass air power and troop power on the mainland of China, or naval power in the harbors of China, we are giving them notice by this joint resolution, I say, we are engaging in the exercise of a value judgment by someone to determine whether we should not strike first.

RESOLUTION IN PRESENT FORM CONTAINS THREAT OF PREVENTIVE MILITARY ACTION

In my opinion, Mr. President, the threat of such an aggressive course of action does violence to the long history of America's international record of non-aggression and peace. Even the threat is bad enough. But another reason I am against the resolution is that the judgment, the odds will be against peace if the resolution should be passed in its present form. I do not say that the joint resolution will make war a certainty, but I say that the passage of the joint resolution will step up considerably the possibilities and probabilities of war on the mainland of China.

PROPOSAL IRRERECONCILABLE WITH CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

Here, again, we deal with a matter of conscience, which a Senator is entitled to have the record show when it is such a driving force as it is to me in the contemplation of my conscience. I cannot reconcile with my religious priniciples what I consider to be some issues and questions of morality involved in this proposal. I cannot reconcile them with what I think is the Christian motivating force behind the whole history of American foreign policy, because that policy, in my judgment, can best be defined or described by three words: Promotion of peace. That has been the moral principle of American foreign policy, and I cannot reconcile this joint resolution with that principle. Therefore, I know that this resolution greatly endangers the prospect of peace and steps up the probabilities of a new war.

What if I see it that way? My duty is to fight as hard as I can in this debate for the protection of the blood of millions of my fellow citizens, because I am certain that if we get into a war on the mainland of China, it will cost us vast reservoirs of American blood, to the number, not of thousands, but of several million Americans.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have listened to the arguments, I have listened, to the arguments about what will happen to us if an enemy should start dropping atomic bombs upon us, thereby involving the danger of the annihilation of man. I know of that danger. It is a very real danger. Does that danger justify what I consider to be a repudiation of the historic policy of our country, not to commit an act of war unless war shall have been committed upon us?

I say it is a matter of conscience. I like to think that the words "In God we trust" constitute more than a motto. I like to think that those who express a spiritual way of life for the American people. As I listen to some of the arguments made by the preventive-war group in America, I come to the conclusion that no longer do they fully appreciate the meaning of that motto. Is it something simply to pass lightly between our lips? Do we mean it, Mr. President, as I am, as we have to run the calculated risks of war.

I am not in the slightest moved by all the scarecrow and fear arguments relating to this joint resolution. I am coming to considering the question whether we shall keep faith with or shall now repudiate a great international policy principle of our Nation from its beginning, namely, that we are a nation of peace, and that we do not make war upon others until war has been made upon us. I have greater faith in a living God than to accept the argument that the threat of war justifies our committing an act of war out of fear that we may be attacked. I cannot reconcile such an act with God's law.

It seems to me that great spiritual truths are at stake. Not only in the lives not only by individuals, but also by a group of individuals who have formed themselves into a political society called a nation. How frequently do we hear it said on the platforms of America, in the discussions of the people of America, from the pulpits of America, and from the offices of the politicians of America that God is on our side? Do we mean it? If we mean it, Mr. President, then here is one Christian whose Christian convictions compel him to say on the floor of the Senate today that we think it is immoral to propose that we tell any nation, no matter how much we may fear it and despise it, that "We threaten you with aggression if you follow your course of action." I think it is immoral. I say it cannot be reconciled with Christian principles. I say it cannot be reconciled with Christian principles.

Other men as Christian as I am, as spiritually devoted to the right as I want to be and try to be, hold a view on this question directly opposite of mine; and I respect their sincerity, patriotism, and integrity. What I am confessing now on the floor of the Senate is my earnest feeling in regard to this matter because I happen to believe that it is of such serious import to the future of my country that I must say whatever I think needs to be said by way of warning the American people as a whole and all of the world, that war is being marked out for them by implication and by the express provisions of the resolution as well.

I have discussed a hypothetical situation in terms of spiritual and moral generalizations. I now wish to discuss the problem from the standpoint of the question of sovereignty in the field of international law.

THE PROBLEM OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

I say most respectfully that one who listens to the debates in Congress and by some persons might think that all we had to do was to take an eraser and erase and wipe from international law codes that have existed during the history of mankind the doctrine of national sovereignty. That doctrine cannot be erased. It is indelibly written in the chronicles of history for all time. While a nation can violate it, the doctrine cannot be erased.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the joint resolution in its present form is that it will lead to the violation of the sacred doctrine of sovereignty, if civil law can be considered sacred, if man-made law can be considered sacred. I know one should not entertain feelings of hate, and yet we are human. I hate communism. I despise the Communists. Yet I know that even if one entertains against Communist nations and communism the feelings of hatred that the Senator from Oregon holds, and yet talks about the sovereign rights of a Communist nation, I know what that person feels himself in for. But I take the abuse and misunderstanding of my position if it comes, because I am not talking about these nations as nations except in respect to the law and the documents of the law. I am saying that even dictatorships have rights of sovereignty, Fascist dictatorships, Communist dictatorships, Socialist dictatorships—yes, dictatorships of any hue—have rights of sovereignty, as do our races.

As I cross-examined the Secretary of State in executive session, and as I cross-examined the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the doctrine
Our sovereignty—and I speak respectfully—I came to the conclusion that they were willing to put the doctrine of sovereignty in refrigeration for the time being, and proceed with a foreign policy course of action as though the doctrine were nonexistent. But the doctrine does exist. The germinal rights, which I referred a few moments ago, are going to be judged, 50 or 100 or 200 years from now, by the people of other nations of the world, on the issue whether or not we were willing to respect the sovereign rights of another nation, violated those sovereign rights, or threatened to violate them, under the implications and meaning of the resolution.

Let us consider of the meaning of sovereignty. On the map in the back of the Chamber is shown the mainland of China. Does anyone wish to deny that it has sovereign rights? Does the fact that we know it is to be a mortal enemy of ours and that we know the Communist segment of the world, if it ever felt strong enough to annihilate us, would endeavor to destroy the sovereignty of the Communist nation or the Government which controls the mainland of China? Of course not.

If I happen to believe, as a sovereign nation, I trust others in the Senate pray with the frequency that I pray for the fulfillment of the hope, that the day will soon come when great international problems, such as the one now before the Senate as a nation of the United States, will be settled in international judicial tribunals, where the rules of reason will prevail, rather than by military force and atomic weapons threatening the destruction of men and the destruction of civilization.

The time when reason and justice will prevail in international disputes may be far in the future, but when the day comes when I shall cease to be a Member of the Senate of the United States, I shall be very proud to think that my greatest contribution may be judged, if I shall have made any contribution, whereby my country and the world will be settled in international judicial tribunals, where the rules of reason will prevail, rather than by military force and atomic weapons threatening the destruction of men and the destruction of civilization.

We are not marching toward a goal of international justice, in which a dispute such as the one now before the Senate will be determined by rules of conduct and justice, based on the experience, and the merits of the respective positions of the parties in issue, by threatening to ignore the rights of sovereignty, even of a dictatorship nation.

Therefore, Mr. President, when I am discussing my fear as to the possibilities of the joint resolution, I am raising my voice today on the floor of the Senate in the interest of what I believe to be the security of millions of American boys who will be called into the service of this country. Should a conflict come it will go on long after the bombing is over. We then would be confronted with the job of occupying the vast land mass of China, which no nation to date has ever subdued, and which we would have to defend in the event of some trigger-happy military advisers of our own Nation believe even we could conquer. Years of guerrilla warfare, threatening the lives of our own occupation of China. It is a great mistake to take the risk of a war that would necessarily send foot soldiers to China.

Mr. President, another word on the question of sovereignty. I would like to discuss the dangers of the kind of a full-scale war the possibility of which I believe this resolution increases.

GOING IT ALONE

We have no reason to believe that Red China will act alone; we have no reason to believe that Red Russia will pay no heed or will give no consideration to her treaty commitments to Red China. We certainly have the right to believe that Red Russia, like Red China, would like to see us go into a war we could not stand alone, or comparatively alone, in a contest with Red China. No one can give a guarantee, as of this hour—and I do not think it will be possible to give guarantees for the future, if ever—that we will not stand alone if we become involved, as the result of the threat of aggression which is implied in the joint resolution, in a war on the mainland of China.

RESOLUTION SHOULD BE LIMITED TO FORMOSA AND THE PESCADORES

I believe it is fairly well recognized in our country that the people and many of the leaders of countries who are our allies are very much divided on the military course of action which should be followed in Asia by the United States and our allies. I think there is general recognition that we have the right and, as I happen to believe, the duty of protecting America's vital interests in the Pacific, by seeing to it that the Pescadores and Formosa are protected. I want it clearly understood that I shall vote for an amendment to the joint resolution, which has become known as the Humphrey amendment, the legal implications of which I shall discuss on a different day, because I call for a detailed discussion of means of perfecting the joint resolution. I shall vote, as I did in committee this morning, for such an amendment because it draws the line of demarcation which I believe should be drawn in the Straits of Formosa, and serves clear notice, not only on the Communist segment of the world, but also on our allies, that we have no defense policy in Asia except the resolution to protect the Pescadores and Formosa.

I have supported the proposition that is what we should do. I have supported it from the very beginning of the Pescadores issue, up to the time of voting, Mr. President, I have taken the position, and I repeat it today, that the responsibility of protecting Formosa should be placed under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. I completely support the President as to the United Nations reference in both his message and, I happen to believe, the Humphrey amendment as a part of the joint resolution itself, namely, that the United Nations should be encouraged by
us to take early action over the issue of jurisdictional control of this very hot island of Formosa.

Why do I take that position, Mr. President? I take it because I think we have rights—they are not permanent rights, but I think they are rights which would be recognized as sovereign rights of law—to exercise jurisdiction by way of protecting Formosa and the Pescadores from becoming a threat to the peace in the Pacific. Our rights grew out of World War II, the Japanese treaty.

UNITED STATES RESPONSIBILITY AND RIGHTS CONCERNING FORMOSA

Further, I take that position because of this history, which I briefly state: For a long, long time, of course, Formosa was recognized as a territory of China. In 1941, the Cairo agreement in 1943, and the Potsdam declaration of 1945, we entered into agreements with the United Nations that as we had a right to exercise jurisdiction over the Aleutians, we would not be in the Pacific. We would not be in the Pacific. We would not be in the Pacific.

Why do I take that position? To me, it is a very clear position. When we considered the question of exercising some protective jurisdiction over Formosa, we should not do so, and the sooner the better.

RESOLUTION SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED TO EMPHASIZE U. N. ROLE

There can be no denying the fact that the loss of Formosa at the present time to the Red Chinese would lead to the preservation of peace in the Pacific. I believe we ought to urge, in stronger language, and more specific language than is contained either in the message or the resolution, that the United Nations take early jurisdiction over Formosa, as I have suggested in the past, and suggest again today. I call it a trusteeship. I care not what it is called. It is the United Nations which is interested—a jurisdiction which will be placed on the United Nations, to which we are a party, the responsibility for maintaining peace in that area of the Pacific so far as Formosa is concerned.

STATUS OF OTHER ISLANDS DIFFERENT FROM STATUS OF FORMOSA

But let us take the other islands—Tachen, Matsu and Quemoy. For decades they have always been within the sovereignty jurisdiction of China. They are not to be considered as a part of that disagreement. They are recognized as Chinese territory. It so happens that as the Nationalist Chinese forces retreated from the mainland of China they occupied those islands. It makes no difference whether they are occupied by National Chinese or Red Chinese, so far as their sovereignty line is concerned. Now they are involved in a civil war, which is the next major point I wish to stress in this argument.

Under the doctrine of sovereignty those islands are clearly Chinese territory. They have never been under our control. We have never exercised any jurisdiction over them. They were not involved in the Cairo agreement in the respect to the point I am now discussing. They are unquestionably Chinese territory even though they are now the subject of a civil war.

I cannot see any other conclusion than that if the conflict involved in the islands, we knowingly and intentionally and willfully, as a nation, involve ourselves in a Chinese civil war. That will be the propaganda of the Communists all over China.

CONGRESS MUST CONSIDER ASIAN OPINION

That causes me to say at this point that we must pay some attention to what the millions of people in other parts of Asia think about these matters of sovereignty and the involvement of western power in Chinese civil wars, or the civil wars of any Asiatic people. I am fearful of some of the consequences of this resolution because, as we look at the map and recognize the sovereignty rights of these islands, I do not see how we can escape the fact that they are the subjects of a civil war. Certainly Quemoy, the Matsus, and the Tachens, which have figured so prominently in the discussions, both in public and in our committee, are involved in red Chinese victories. If we try to maintain Nationalist Chinese forces on those islands with American support, we are involving this nation in a civil war of China.

The question may be asked: "But why does not that argument apply to Formosa?"

It does not apply to Formosa for the reason that Formosa was occupied by Japan during a period of war, because it became involved as one of the settlement problems of World War II itself. Furthermore, we took jurisdiction over Formosa, as one of the victorious powers, and it is the sovereign right of the United Nations to exercise jurisdiction by way of protecting Formosa and the Pescadores from becoming a threat to the peace in the Pacific.

Our right in Formosa are not rights of fee simple, I may say, but rights of protection, which we as a nation have in maintaining peace in the Pacific. They grow out of World War II. Their treaty did not become a threat to the vital interests of the United States. Why do I take that position, Mr. President?

That leads me to make a few comments on one of those participants. I make these comments on the Nationalist Chinese participant by saying, first, that no matter what I may think the shortcomings of the Nationalist regime may be, the Chinese Nationalists are so strong in their program that they are not the red Chinese and their program that I am not at all hesitant about our protecting the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa and on the Pescadores. I am not hesitant about it, because that area was involved in the Cairo agreement. It was involved in the settlement following the war, and we still have responsibility in connection.
with that settlement. Of course, we have the clear responsibility of maintaining peace and protecting our vital interests in that area. Therefore I support the defense of Formosa.

NATIONALIST CHINA COULD LEAD UNITED STATES INTO WAR ON CHINESE MAINLAND

One of my fears is that if we shall adopt the language of the resolution, including what it covers and what it implies, we shall place the American people and the interests of the American people in the Pacific in the hands of the Nationalist Chinese. In that, if they followed a course of action on the coastal island areas that would require additional military support which would result in war, we would be in it with the Nationalist Chinese.

Of course, we must speak in terms of possibilities and hypotheses in dealing with the question of Formosa. Therefore, let us assume that the Nationalist Chinese in the Tachen or in the Matsu or in the Quemoy area should follow a course of action that would require major military operations, and that we would support them—and I believe that under the resolution we would be expected to support them, do we not thereby run the risk of a military conclusion? I also wonder whether this war would be on the mainland of China? I think we would. Suppose the Nationalist Chinese so maneuvered in their military operations in the coastal island areas that it would look as much as though we were being attacked by the Red Chinese. In that event we would be drawn into a war on the mainland of China by the Nationalist Chinese.

As I said, Mr. President, many people do not entertain that fear. I do. I am very much afraid of the consequences of giving the Nationalist Chinese any support in connection with their military operations on the coastal islands. I am very much afraid that it would be very easy for the Nationalist Chinese, under the operations that would ensue from implementing the resolution, to cut off the chain of communication from the Tachen or in the Matsu or in the Quemoy area which would have the effect of dragging us into a war with Red China.

I have an additional fear. I believe that exactly what the Nationalist Chinese would like to have us do. I happen to share the point of view, which has been expressed by other Senators also, that the Nationalist Chinese believe their only hope of survival in the long run is to get the United States involved in an all-out war on the mainland of China, which would result, they hope, in the final subjugation of the Communist regime and in the restoration of the Nationalist Chinese on the mainland of China.

I do not believe I can say more than that. I do not feel I can say more on the floor of the Senate by way of documenting that fear without violating what I believe to be security matters.

However, I make the assertion about my fears of the Nationalist Chinese because it explains one of the reasons for my vote this morning against the resolution. I shall not be a party to a resolution which, in my judgment, places what I believe to be an awful power, or the opportunity to exercise an awful power, of the Nationalist Chinese, with the danger of involving the people of my country in a third world war. I do not believe there is any necessity for running that risk in order to protect Formosa.

The argument is made, of course, that we cannot draw a line in the Straits of Formosa, because if we draw a line, we could not. They do say that we will not defend the Tachen, the Matsus, and Quemoy. However, I say if we do not draw a line, there is a very great danger that we will not only defend the Tachen but we will have to hold the mainland of China. I shall not vote to sacrifice the life of a single American boy on Quemoy or on the Matsus or on the Tachen in the defense of a particular island of China, even though it be, as the Nationalist Chinese are.

Can we defend Formosa without threatening to bomb any concentration of military force on the mainland of China? I believe that is what the Nationalist Chinese are asking us to do. If we threaten and carry out the threat that we will commit an act of war upon a sovereign nation before that sovereign nation commits an act of war upon us, I should certainly hate to think we could not. I hope I am within the proprieties when I say I have not heard any high American official, civil or military, say we would not. They say that we run a greater risk, militarily speaking, if we follow that course of action. There is, of course, a greater risk if we wait for the enemy to get its forces concentrated on Formosa and then try to drive them back. I do not share the point of view that the Nationalist Chinese believe their only hope is to drive us off the mainland of China even though in that sense they would have achieved victory.

THE RESOLUTION IN ITS PRESENT FORM THREATENS PREVENTIVE WAR

On the last point, Mr. President—and I speak respectfully when I make this argument—I think the implication of the joint resolution is that we are going to strike on the mainland of China. When those in charge of our military operations have reached the conclusion that the enemy is about to attack us. This amounts, in fact, to authorizing by the resolution in its present form, I think we had better hold firm to our historic policy of peace which I have outlined.

I am more confident in the military than to think they cannot hold Formosa; that the Philippines, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and economic and military forces upon which the peace of the Pacific depends. It would create a breach in the island chain of the western Pacific that constitutes for the United States and other free nations, the geographical backbone of their security. If in that case a breach would interrupt North-South communications between other important elements of our defense barrier, and damage the economic life of countries friendly to us.

There are some who dispute the military value of Formosa, but I recognize that it has great military value. It has great military value, as I said earlier in this speech, in protecting our defense lines in the eastern Pacific, in the island chain to Australia and New Zealand. But I do not share the point of view, and I am satisfied that many military officials do not share it, that if we lose Formosa, our defense lines would be lost; lost Formosa; that we would be driven back to the California shore if we lost Formosa; that the Philippines, Japan, Okinawa, Australia, and New Zealand would fall. I do not think there is any basis for such military conclusion. It would be much more difficult to defend our vital interests in the Pacific if we lost Formosa. Any war would be much more costly in precious lives and material, if we lost Formosa. But I do not believe that the calculated risk of losing Formosa justifies the United States at this time in violating our historic policy of avoiding the commission of an act of war. I have more confidence in the military than to think they cannot hold Formosa. I wish to reemphasize that no one in the hearings—and I think I am free to say this much—testified that we could not hold Formosa even if we did not strike first on the mainland of China in case we thought the situation was such that there was a real danger that a strike was about to be made against us.
Events, of course, helped Radford. Evacuation of all the offshore islands was a possible alternative, but Chiang Kai-shek bitterly resisted this idea. The alternative prospects were the risk of a bloody war to the Communists, while the Seventh Fleet stood idly by, seemed more and more likely to be realized.

At the same time, it became more and more obvious that these islands, virtually within spitting distance of the mainland, could not possibly, in any event, be defended, and supply lines on the mainland were attacked.

Both the President and Dulles undoubtedly hoped to have the issue decided by intervention if necessary might bring "stability" to the area, in the form of a deal with the Communists. The President had agreed in the straits of Formosa between two Chinas. In fact, the Presidential decision was presented to the British on this defense.

Now both the Communists and Chiang have furiously rejected any "two-China" resolutions, that would require a major amphibious operation. Simultaneously, the fear that the Chinese Communists, far from being deterred, would accept the American challenge, and invade Quemoy, was growing.

Moreover, although the basic decision to attack the mainland if necessary to defend the islands has been made, two vital questions remain unanswered. The first: Do we use nuclear weapons? Many policymakers have urged that Dulles, say that the use of atomic weapons against China would have fatal political consequences. But there are cogent arguments for using the decisive weapons if the mainland is to be attacked at all.

The second question is: What do we do if the island of Quemoy falls? President Eisenhower ruled against it.

If Quemoy is taken despite American bombing of the mainland, this would be a genuinely disastrous blow to American prestige in Asia. Yet current estimates are that it will appear that this is hardly the right time to begin reducing our investment in the defense.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I call attention to an observation or two by Stewart Alsop, for whose knowledge of Asiatic problems I have an exceedingly high respect, and in which I have great confidence. His article goes on to say:

The extraordinary gravity of the decision which President Eisenhower has now taken is not yet fully appreciated in Congress or the country. The decision is, essentially, to bomb the Chinese mainland if this is deemed necessary for the defense of the Nationalist-held islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

Both the mainland and the offshore islands, of course, with China. It could mean war with China's ally, Russia.

To risk a major war in the defense of these two islands represents a great victory for Admiral Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Last October, Radford first proposed that the 7th Fleet should bomb the Chinese mainland, if necessary, to hold Quemoy. That time, Radford suffered a defeat when President Eisenhower ruled against it.

Thereafter, Radford went to the Far East. He returned a couple of weeks ago, surer than ever that he was right. He immediately went to work to convince Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who had taken a middle position in the October dispute. Radford is a very persuasive man, and Dulles fell in with the substance of his views.

I digress to say that there is no doubt that Admiral Radford is not only a very persuasive man, but an exceedingly able man, a very forthright man, and a highly intelligent and courageous man.

One cannot listen to him testify, as I have listened to him, and as other members of the committee have listened to him, for the past 2 days, without knowing that he has all the great qualifications. They happen to be one, however, who believes that he is very wrong in some of the approaches he makes to American-Asian relations. I happen to be one who believes that he does not fully appreciate the very great probability that if we become involved in a strike against the mainland of China, we are going to have to put foot soldiers on the mainland of China. I feel certain that it is within the proprieties to say that Admiral Radford would not deny that to strike against the mainland of China might lead to that result. He does not guarantee that it would not. He
government, our military commitments are quite specifically limited (article VI) to Taiwan (the Chinese name for Formosa) and the Pescadores. The treaty promises nothing beyond this, and nothing about the offshore islands. But notes exchanged by Mr. Dulles and Mr. Yeh, the Nationalist Chinese and the United States, in January of last year, made known the decision not to intervene in the defense of the offshore islands. But we had left ourselves the option of acting if we chose.

Some time ago the Peiping government began to test our intentions in this unclarified situation. They took to shelling and bombing of Formosa, and by an amphibious operation they conquered one of them last week. It was at this point that the administration abandoned its policy of neutrality and made known the decision not to intervene in the defense of the offshore islands.

Thus, Formosa is described as a sound decision taken under embarrassing conditions that should have been foreseen and avoided. The policy until last week was a bluff that at the same time was in breach of the fact of Red Chinese military action. Since for good reasons we had never meant to fight beyond the limits we had set for ourselves, it was an error to give the impression that we might fight for them.

Moreover, the President gave a very poor reason for our decision to draw a line between the Formosa-Pescadores territory which we will defend and the offshore islands which we will not defend. He said that the Tachens and the small islands are not a "vital element, as we see it, in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores." This makes it for granted that we have a unilateral right to intervene in foreign territory for strategic purposes. In foreign affairs our policy is not law but strategy. This, to give it its true name, is militarism.

We do not need to resort to militarism to protect our interests in this area. There is a radical difference in law between the two sets of islands. Throughout the 20th century Formosa and the Pescadores belonged not to China but to Japan. They were captured from Japan by the United States, not China. Under the Japanese surrender terms of 1945, which were formally ratified by the 1952 Treaty of Peace (chap. II, art. 20) "Japan renounces all right, title, and claim to them". But now let us note this. Though Japan has renounced the title, no one else has acquired it.

In the President's message of January 10, 1952, submitting the Japanese Peace Treaty to the Senate, he put into the record the official statement of Mr. Dulles to the San Francisco Conference. In that statement Mr. Dulles said that "some Allied Powers suggested that article 2 should not merely delimit Japanese sovereignty according to Potsdam, but specify precisely the ultimate disposition of the Japanese territories." This, admitttedly would have been nearer. But it would have raised questions as to which there are now no agreed answers.

Clearly, the wise course was to proceed now, so far as Japan is concerned, leaving the future to resolve doubts by invoking international law and the practices of nations.

None of this applies to the offshore islands. They have always been Chinese. We have a right to defend them, and the Pescadores under the terms of the Japanese surrender of and the Japanese Peace Treaty. We have a right to see that their ultimate disposition is settled by force but in accord with the interests of the people of Formosa and of the interests of the powers which have a stake in Formosa.

For these purposes it is not intervention in the Chinese civil war. It is not intervention beyond our shores. But were we to intervene in the offshore islands, we would be acting on Chinese territory.

On these grounds we have obligations and rights in the disposition of Formosa, regardless of whether we think Chiang or Mao is the head of the legitimate government of the Chinese people. Our policy must depend upon Chiang. For Chiang has never secured a legitimate title to Formosa. Our policy is based on the Chinese civil war, and on that ground we can make a case before the opinion of mankind to invoke our collaboration in reaching an international solution.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, the Lippmann article, I submit, is a very persuasive document in support of the Humphrey amendment. Listen to what Lippmann says; speaking of the conference at Cairo to restore it to the Republic of China, Formosa is not now, it is yet, Chinese territory.

Until then our military commitments in this area had as a matter of policy been left undefined and uncertain. Our policy was to keep everybody guessing. This under the proposed security pact with the Nationalist government our military commitments are quite specifically limited (Article VI) to "Taiwan (the Chinese name for Formosa) and the Pescadores." The treaty promises nothing beyond that, nothing, that is to say, about the offshore islands. But notes exchanged by Mr. Dulles and Mr. Yeh, the Nationalist Chinese and the United States, with the proposed pact, do say that the United States could by joint agreement act in the offshore territory—which means the Tachens and the small islands. We would be acting on Chinese territory.

The President gave a very poor reason for our decision to draw a line between the Formosa-Pescadores territory which we will defend and the offshore islands which we will not defend. For these reasons our actual decision not to intervene in the offshore islands would not only look between the President and the Secretary of State, but also, based not on the strategical opinions of the White House and the Pentagon but on the President and the right about Formosa and the Pescadores.

Our right to defend Formosa rests on the fact that it is territory ceded by Japan about which no workable agreement has been settled by any treaty. Even though both Chinese governments claim Formosa as their own, it is clear to all outside observers that the Chinese Nationalists were left with only a shadow of a title when they went to Cairo to restore it to the Republic of China. Formosa is now, it is yet, Chinese territory. Because of that, our presence in Formosa is not intervention in the Chinese civil war.
unilateral right to intervene in foreign territory for strategic reasons—that the concern is primarily with the right of intervention rather than with strategy. This, to give it its true name, is militarism.

Mr. President, I too have a very high regard for this great student of international problems, Walter Lippmann, whose writing so penetrates and with great scholarship. I think this particular column, entitled "Reappraisal in Formosa Strait," and his most recent column, entitled the line of demarcation, which really is covered by the Humphrey amendment, represent a point of view to which Members of the Senate should give great weight before they vote for a resolution so broad in the territory it covers as is the resolution now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I have already received permission to have this commentary, when edited, printed in the Record.

I think Alsop and Lippmann have performed a great service for the American people by pointing out in their columns the dangers that are likely to flow if—and that is the assumption—it develops that a decision is made to strike on the mainland of China before a strike is committed against us.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in regard to a second Walter Lippmann article which I did not include, as I had intended to do, when I discussed the first Walter Lippmann article today.

The Presiding Officer: Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 5

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)

THE DEFINITION OF FORMOSA

The realities of the Formosa question are overlaid with so much propaganda, bluff, and face-saving that it is hard to find one's way around in it. The best clue to a clarified definition of the problem—I am not saying a solution of the problem—is to recognize that the first two columns mark the limits of what we call "Formosa."

The one line is known to the experts working on the problem as the "jurisdictional line." It is the line laid down in the Japanese surrender terms, the Japanese peace treaty, the proposed mutual security pact with China, and the line which Peking does not have any legal title; armed action would therefore be international aggression. West of that line the Chinese would be active in their cause, say that an insistence upon defending these offshore islands can but active in our cause, say that an insistence upon maintaining the Chinese territorial line would cut off the Pacific. The resolution in its full text would be the "jurisdictional line," that is to say, the line on which, in my speech this afternoon, the President predicated the Humphrey amendment, the proposed mutual security pact with Chiang's government and in the President's message to Congress, the line which the State Department, for example, would want to insert in the treaty now awaiting ratification. But in order to get approval at all, no matter how slowly and tortuously, it is necessary that we be clear in our minds about where we do and where we do not stand, and where we are not going and where we are going.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the Raccoon show, at that point in my speech this afternoon, the following brief comments on the Walter Lippmann article today, and what I refer to as the subject of the definition of Formosa.

In this very fine article Walter Lippmann discussed the problem of the definition of Formosa, and he used the following development.

The one line is known to the experts working on the problem as the "jurisdictional line." It is the line laid down in the Japanese surrender terms, the Japanese peace treaty, the proposed mutual security pact with Chiang's government and in the President's message to Congress, the line which recognizes the title to Formosa and the Pescadores but not the offshore islands. Though it is sometimes called "the "jurisdictional line," that is a misleading name for a line of which some of the islands at least, such as the Tachens now, and the Quehoy in September, have been declared of no decisive strategic importance. This second line is in fact the western boundary of the line which the Nationalist Government still holds. It is the line where the Nationalist retreat from the mainland.

The difference between these two lines, which involve the possession of the offshore islands, is probably the critical issue in the decision that is to be made by the Nationalist government and the President in the next few months. For it is the defense of Formosa which will almost certainly ensure the defense of our active allies in the Far East. It enables the powers who come to agree with the President to defend the Chinese island of Formosa and the Pescadores or to take any risks of war about going back to the mainland.

As the second disadvantage of the discouragement of non-Communist Chinese...
actions which, under current conditions, might determine the future or the success of such an attack. "The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts, or define preliminary steps, to an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores. (Quotation marks added.)"

Mr. Adams, most respectfully, that calls for an authorization to take preventive action. When we authorize preventive action, I say we close the books on all the past foreign policy of the United States in respect to our becoming involved in war, and we start a new chapter, whereby we serve notice—and I say we do it in a rather threatening manner, and it will be so interpreted—that we may engage, in accordance with judgment and discretion, in preventive action.

Mr. President, there is a very delicate point which I think must be considered in this connection, and that is whether we will make the decision that the Congress would be used an authorization to take preventive action. When we authorize preventive action, we must necessarily rely upon the recommendations and the views of the Secretary of State, whereby we serve notice—and I say, most respectfully, that calls for a war with Communist China, the strike would be taken as authority to prevent militarily "situations which are recognizable as parts, or define preliminary steps, to an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores."

Mr. President, I cannot speak for the thoughts in the minds of men in foreign capitals. The information we have received thus far is very scant. But today the ticker shows that Herbert Evatt, head of the Labor Party in Australia—the opposition party to the party now in control there—made the statement that the Formosan situation should be put before the United Nations at the earliest possible moment. That is a part of my argument. I think it should, too, Mr. President. I think the joint resolution should be very much strengthened in connection with the United Nations' obligations to act; and I think the Kefauver substitute as an alternative to the joint resolution now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that when we start talking about preventive action involving "definite preliminary steps" to an attack against the potential enemy, such action or the use of ships or planes of the Tenth Fleet to evacuate some 20,000 Nationalist troops from the Tachens might very well create a situation which would lead to war. To be frank about it, Mr. President, I think the Tachens situation is the most difficult problem for me to handle in my own capacity. I am human, and I must necessarily rely heavily, it seems to me, upon the recommendations and the urging of the areas of the world, including Formosa and the Pescadores.

We hear the argument that, "Of course, we do not have to wait until the first bomb is dropped if we know large numbers; when fighter jet planes are coming over Alaska and Canada on their way to drop bombs on the United States." Mr. President, of course, we do not have to wait, but because I have a difference in judgment and discretion, in preventive action. But in this discussion we are talking, I say, most respectfully, that calls for a war with Communist China, the strike would be taken as authority to prevent militarily "situations which are recognizable as parts, or define preliminary steps, to an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores."

Mr. President, this is taking Nationalist Chinese soldiers off the Tachens; and let us suppose we are giving cover to a Nationalist Chinese ship which is taking Nationalist Chinese soldiers off the Tachens; and let us suppose we are giving cover to an evacuation, too—to give protection to the Nationalist Chinese who are evacuating. But in this connection what I think is most important is that the Tachens situation is the most difficult problem for me to handle in my own capacity. I am human, and I must necessarily rely heavily, it seems to me, upon the recommendations and the urge of the areas of the world, including Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that when we start talking about preventive action involving "definite preliminary steps" to an attack against the potential enemy, such action or the use of ships or planes of the Tenth Fleet to evacuate some 20,000 Nationalist troops from the Tachens might very well create a situation which would lead to war. To be frank about it, Mr. President, I think the Tachens situation is the most difficult problem for me to handle in my own capacity. I am human, and I must necessarily rely heavily, it seems to me, upon the recommendations and the urge of the areas of the world, including Formosa and the Pescadores.
In hot pursuit—as I think they should be, under the circumstances—in following Mr. Chen, I want to make Red Chinese airplanes fly over the mainland of China. That could lead to an incident of war, although I do not think it necessarily would, as a consequence. But, I also think that from the historical law, the Red Chinese plane in making such an attack would know that in attacking that cover, it was in the first instance making a war strike against us. Of course, that is a different thing from our making a strike in the first instance against the mainland of China in the Quemoy area.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time to go into the further legal distinctions regarding this matter; but I think the broad distinction becomes perfectly clear.

However, I would hope—although I doubt that the time element was particularly considered, but I wish it could and would—that the evacuation, even though the military force being used for coverage would be ours, would be conducted under the auspices and the jurisdiction and authority of the United Nations. Then, Mr. President, an attack by the Red Chinese would have to be considered as an attack not only on the United States, but on the United Nations for which, under those circumstances, we would be acting as the enforcement officer of a program of evacuation.

Mr. President, we must consider whether the joint resolution goes too far. Should it not be limited literally to defensive actions and to the territory of Formosa and the Pescadores? I think so. One of the reasons why I voted against the resolution in committee is that I believe it goes too far. The Humphrey amendment sought to remedy this defect.

THE DESIRE FOR U. N. CONSIDERATION

Many people of the United States, and many people throughout the world, believe that this current threat to world peace should be confronted by the United Nations. We can and should secure Formosa and the Pescadores until the United Nations can act. We should do no more without the most searching consideration.

We must firmly resist Communist aggression. We must also avoid any action which would provide the Chinese Communists with a pretext for aggression. I shall vote against the position of the executive branch. I want the President to know I agree with his attitude in the course of the debate, but I also want to state my objections. The argument is advanced which shows that I am wrong in my present thinking and conclusion on the subject or it is amended by the Humphrey and Kefauver amendments. I have never hesitated to change my opinion on the floor of the Senate. But the arguments advanced by the top civilian and military officials in the field of military and foreign policy, I have come to the deep conviction that it would be a great mistake for the United States to follow the course of action contemplated or made possible by this resolution.

So, I say that, as was pointed out by witnesses, we must, of course, take the calculated risks of peace. I say that we cannot in good conscience flirt with a defensive war. In my judgment this resolution would legalize the position of a preventive war, which has been advocated in this country for the past several years.}

ENJOY 4

Senator Wayne Morse.
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Please speak out against hasty action which may plunge America into catastrophic world war.

ALLEN A. SMITH.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senate.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This appeal is addressed to you because I believe that you have a clearer and more independent mind than most of the other Senators, and, in addition, have the ability to see ahead.

It seems to me that Mr. Dulles, for it is he who is apparently propounding the theory of taking China out of the United Nations, is operating from a wishful thinking starting point. He wants China not to want a major war, but has he any basis for an actual belief that China, which has the Russian promises behind her, is not ready to risk one? Since victory today may well correspond in China, I am very much worried about what the final judgment of world public opinion will be. Early indications are that in Asia such public opinion involves great many reservations about the course of action which is being proposed by the resolution. In our own country there is no question about it. Already, as Senators, we are receiving a considerable number of communications. I do not know how they run in other offices, but in my office the communications are overwhelmingly against the adoption of the proposed resolution in its present form.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Caucus, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of the communications received in my office. I assure Senators that they in no way violate rule XIX.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the communications may be printed, as requested.

(See exhibit 4.)

CONCLUSION

Mr. MORSE. In concluding, Mr. President, for the reasons I have expressed today, and for others which I intend to set forth in greater documentation detail in subsequent speeches, I wish to say that I shall vote against the resolution unless, in the course of the debate, argument is advanced which shows that I am wrong in my present thinking and conclusion on the subject or it is amended by the Humphrey and Kefauver amendments. I have never hesitated to change my opinion on the floor of the Senate. But the arguments advanced by the top civilian and military officials in the field of military and foreign policy, I have come to the deep conviction that it would be a great mistake for the United States to follow the course of action contemplated or made possible by this resolution.

So, I say that, as was pointed out by witnesses, we must, of course, take the calculated risks of peace. I say that we cannot in good conscience flirt with a defensive war. In my judgment this resolution would legalize the position of a preventive war, which has been advocated in this country for the past several years.
There are other alternatives to our futile Asian policy than war. Mr. and Mrs. Richard A. Peterson.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: Unalterably opposed to the turn to pre-
ventive war indicated in reversal of previous China policy. As National magazine puts it recent treaty "is a document giving away an island which doesn't belong to us to a man whom we do not trust." Now we urge Chiang Kai-shek to new provoca-
tions by suggesting blank check commit-
tments. Chiang is hated by his own people because his government is a cruel, treacher-
ous, and corrupt dictatorship. Urge you do everything possible to stop administra-
tion from lighting matches around this powder keg.

Richard Lytten.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: All sections of America but especially the South have reason to recall how amazingly few outstanding national leaders stood out with wisdom and courage against the tragic drift toward war in the 1860's and 1880. I hope history will not repeat itself in this respect and that you will seriously consider whether we may not invite the world's worst war if we bypass the United Nations or act without the sincere approval both of our professed allies and of the great neutral nations. There will be almost equal danger in a general war as in the war in which the United States and China might almost destroy each other, leaving Russia unborn.

Claude Poe.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: Urge you vote against resolution authoriz-
ing use of armed force in Asia and work for peace in Asia and Europe through United Nations.

Alice Hubsay Balassa.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: The Hels Summit hinges on one that I hope will be looked upon with favor by Congress because it is vital and essential to the develop-
ment of industry in the Northwest.

My hope is that you will favor any aid in the way of equipment and supplies to Na-
tionalist China, as it is the belief of our Government seems to be one of appease-
ment to Red China, who has murdered many American citizens. No: I do not favor a block of Red China. I believe quite strongly that we should not tie the hands of the Nationalists. After all, Russia is constantly supplying Red China, News dispatches indicate that Red China is using Russian-born equipment, I have heard news commentators say that Nationalist China could only continue to invade the mainland if we would supply them with the necessary equipment, much of which we have in mothballs where it is doing no good but going to waste. This I believe is an important item to be considered.

Yours truly,

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: Sincerely hope you will back the Presi-
dent's request on the defense of Formosa.

F. J. Lawless.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: Honorable Sir: We do want peace but not at the price of appeasement. Patriotic Chi-

nese Nationalists are being murdered by gangsters. They do not have means to de-
fend themselves. Chiang does not ask for manpower, only for defense equipment. How come we can send fighter planes to Latin America and deny this so much greater need? In the name of suffering humanity, let us stop that cowardly government of Latin America and destroy it.

Now that the President said that we should never, and at once. Our stupidity gave away the mainland. Can we never learn? Please, please do something.

Yours hopefully,

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: Resolve Committee.


Senator WAYNE MORSE, Washington, D.C.: We know, gentlemen, that the Soviets want us to exhaust ourselves in peripheral wars. Why then do we fall into the trap of Form-
osa? There is nothing in the Formosa area in which we could possibly engage our strength. Will we win the battle of Formosa, drag on in a war with China as duped as we are, and be unable to parry the thrust of a completely un-
exhausted Russia? This is not statesman-
ship but idiocy.

Ann Jones.


Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: A synthetic war atmosphere has been built up by the Pentagon, the armament interests, and the China lobby, and it is apparently very thick around Washington. What would we say if Cuba were Communist and the Kremlin decided to maintain that island as part of a Kremlin defense line? That is not one bit more absurd than our policy in Asia, and mark my word, our system of free en-
terprise is going to collapse along with de-
mocracy if we follow the egg-head leadership now in the Washington.

Leo Gallagher.


Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: In heaven's name, please deny President's request for authority to intervene in Chinese civil war. We can see no logical, sane, or moral basis for such an act that could lead to an atomic world war. The U. N. is the only alternative to the frightful implica-
tions of President's request.

Dr. and Mrs. Z. Gross.


Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: Depending on you to lead and opposing granting Eisenhower war powers. Using United States forces, atomic weapons, at-
tack proconsular attackers before they leave home, are stupidly and absurd mea-
sures for attaining goal professed—peace.
that’s where the problem belongs. It’s a world problem, for if it calls for boys to be killed, then it asks all the nations to take part. We should not sacrifice our young American manhood any further on foreign soil, unless our country is directly attacked; and I don’t mean a token force, either.

As you well know, “Clang” was surrounded on the mainland by a bunch of grizzlies and crooks; if he hadn’t been, why was it that whole armies of his deserted and went over to the Commissars? They didn’t trust him or his advice. I don’t think he is any better than the Commissars. It’s six on one hand and half a dozen on the other.

Then, why I say, my dear Senator, one American boy’s life isn’t worth giving for the motley scum, so won’t you please do everything in your power to keep us from becoming involved, alone, on an all-out war in China?

Now, I am of middle age. I have no young boys to go, but I have some very dear friends who do, and I feel very close to these kids, and there are millions of other kids whom I don’t know but for whom I am writing this letter. May God direct you, for I know you have the courage to fight for what you think is right. I have followed you too long to rate for the fact that you are a great American, and you are one of the best Senators to sit in that august body.

With my best wishes for your success in all your undertakings.

Yours truly,

M. P. Yarborough


Senator Wayne Morse,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are about the only person on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee worth writing to, although you aren’t from my State. In today’s Plain Dealer was a big splash about “Warships moving” out of Manila, etc. Then a dispatch out of Washington, D. C., saying the President was going to draw a line between Formosa and the mainland and hold it against Communist aggression—and ask Congress to back him.

I realize that after World War I, we withdrew into our “shell” and let the rest of the world “steer our course”; I don’t think that kind of diplomacy but I think it is just as wrong morally or bad for the country diplomatically if we go too far the other way.

Just what does this Chiang Kal-shek have or represent that we feel we must back him and stay in his corner?

This Plain Dealer article spoke of the Tachens being an outpost guarding the approaches to Formosa. Then later we were told the islands were 250 miles away to the north—twice as far away as the actual mainland, China.

Why do we insist on holding Formosa, just to give a home for Chiang—our boy? And another one boiling over there?

Do you think that Red China could find a better issue to unite their people, to build up militarily over the years than this? Then we are fighting an endless battle when we are going to be realistic for the long pull ahead? Let’s eliminate tensions, not aggravate them—if we desire peace.

Yours truly,

G. ROBERT


Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

No further aid to Formosa. Peer atomic bomb threat.

LELLA BASCOM


Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Oppose any attack on the Formosa or coastal waters. Find cease fire outlet for peace.

Mr. and Mrs. ALFRED DAWSON


Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

You’re only person who can defeat or arrest this sudden recommendation for war with China. If Nationalists China wants cease fire and our protection; yes, fight her war now.

Respectfully submitted.

OLGA BURBROUGHS

PELLA, IOWA, January 23, 1955.

Senator Wayne Morse,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you because, I believe, you would rather serve the best interests of the American people than the war party in Congress which tries to get us involved in an Asian war.

America would expose any foreign power occupying islands along her coast. We wouldn’t want China in Puerto Rico, Cuba, or Alaska would we? By the same token let’s get out of Formosa and let the Chinese settle their own war.

Wendell通告 a long time ago told us that the jig was up for the white man exploiting the colored races. Apparently we need a war, possibly an atomic war to learn that lesson.

A vote for the Asian alliance or defense means that you support the Chinese lobby and the American privileged few as against the people of the United States.

Please vote against any Asian alliance. Yours respectfully,

PETER VAN ZANTZ, M. D.


Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Do not feel American people have any vital interest in Formosa nor preservation Chiang’s government worth single American life. Hope you will oppose pending resolution.

A. P. SAXTON


Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Under no circumstances allow attack on Formosa or other far distant Chinese islands. Danger of total war too real.

The meek shall inherit the earth.

G. S. JOHNSON

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 24, 1955.

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Beg you to vigorously oppose use of your forces to evacuate islands outside line we will defend.

WILLIAM H. DAVIS


Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

We’re inviting war by our actions on Formosa in defending the corrupt and anti-democratic Chiang regime. In Cincinnati you spoke of keeping faith with conscience. We urge you keep faith by speaking out against this suicidal policy and do all you can to get a peaceful solution.

Mr. and Mrs. BERNARD WAYNE

BURLINGTON, IOWA, January 25, 1955.

United States Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Please don’t sell out any further on foreign soil, willing to do likewise; and I don’t mean a token force, either. We cannot win an aggressive war with the awakened teeming millions of Asia. Don’t vote to wipe out the whole chance for peace. Yours for a free United States.

J. MONTGOMERY RATHBUN

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., January 22, 1955.

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: Since the President inclines to the military, such as Admiral Radford’s setting of foreign policy in the Far East, must the Senate, likewise, how to this military usurpation of policymaking? Cannot such rash, dictatorial promoters of hot war be called to account before the Foreign Affairs Committee and the American public in conformity with our longstanding, American constitutional subservience of the military to civilian policymaking authority?

I am against conceding to the President any power to take the “tough, insane” steps towards war involving America in the potential holocaust of hot war anywhere, especially in support of a corrupt Nationalist Government on Formosa or Tachen Island with American guns and lives.

Respectfully submitted.

SAML J. SPERING, M. D.

St. Louis, Mo., January 24, 1955.

The Editor, Post-Dispatch.

St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: I was glad to read this statement by Senator Morse in the Post-Dispatch of January 22:

“Southeast Asia should be brought under the United Nations jurisdiction as rapidly as possible, and * * * American unilateral action, particularly in the Formosa straits, should come to an end. I think of it as a great mistake for the United States to take upon itself the full responsibility of policing the Far East.”

Bravo to Senator Morse! One of the saddest ramifications is that this kind of thinking has not been openly and more confidently expressed in recent years.

Sincerely,

JOY C. GUEZ

My DEAR SIR: I don’t know whether this letter will be printed or not but my object is to get your words in the much-read Letters to the Editor column since I found them on one of the back pages.

I hope you will follow Senator Flinders’ example and speak fearlessly for peace and the United Nations.

Sincerely,

MRS. JOY C. GUEZ

PORTLAND, OREG., January 26, 1955.

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Your influence for rational approach Formosa crisis. Peace too precious to jeopardize by calculated-risk policy administran.

VIRGINIA MALIN


Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Senator WARREN MAGNUSON is right. This step can well lead to war.
and the end of civilization. It should be handled through the United Nations.

Sincerely, Warren Loyal Irwin.


Hon. Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Senator Morse: We are very disturbed by recent statements and actions of our President and Secretary of State in regard to the Formosa question. It is too much like a cleverly devised scheme to wring from Congress the power to declare war.

It was also stated that they would have to take action without the consent of the United Nations. This is another clever scheme to scrap the United Nations. May we count on your vote against this resolution? Yours very truly, W. L. Fowlkes.


The Honorable Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: It seems to me that a unilateral United States decision, not only to defend Formosa but also to take whatever steps necessary, including preventative action, might leave us in a shooting war without any allies. I think that the United States should have put up a resolution in the United Nations, in a sense, giving U. N. protection to Formosa. Then if a Chinese Communist invasion came, we would have other armed forces standing by our side.

Now that the President has sent this message to Congress, it appears that the implementing resolution will pass. I think it is important that an amendment be made on the floor instructing the United States delegation to the U. N. to press for parallel United Nations action. If the United Nations is to mean anything, we should bring our problems to the U. N. first and take our unilateral action only if the U. N. fails to act.

Sincerely, D. R. Willner, Attorney at Law.


Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. and Mrs. Frank R. Stovall.

We strongly urge that you vote against the Eisenhower resolution for United States intervention in the Formosa question. United States has no jurisdiction over Chinese civil problems and we urge that such problems be referred to the U. N. In the interest of world peace.

Molly Cavanaugh, Los Altos, San Jose, New Jersey, June 19, 1955.


Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sirs: We hope you will vote against the Eisenhower resolution and for United States non-involvement in the Formosa dispute—whether within or beyond the framework of the United Nations. We believe that the Chinese people should be left to decide their own fate. We are confident that the United Nations has the strength to stop any Chinese aggression. We feel that war is outmoded in international affairs and that the United Nations should be used to settle its problems.

Yours sincerely, Mrs. Lohn Newman.


Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are absolutely opposed to a defensive war in China, such as Eisenhower seems to be suggesting, or any other kind of a war. We feel that war is outdated in international affairs since it is not only a waste of human lives but also a waste of resources. We believe that the United Nations should be used to settle its problems.

Yours sincerely, Clarence and Mildred Burck.


Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.


Sincerely, Leslie C. Davis, Clara J. Davis.


Hon. Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Please vote against any move by our Armed Forces which might involve United States in Far East war.

Sincerely, Patricia Zahumensky.


The Honorable Wayne L. Morse, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

I am against defending Formosa. Believe it will precipitate a full-scale war.

Dr. Thomas M. Hunt.


Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Considering danger of atomic holocaust, strongly urge you oppose Formosa resolution. Let United States not bypass U. N. Road to peace is not via ultimatum and war threats.

Dr. and Mrs. M. Malbin.


Hon. Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We strongly urge that you vote against the Eisenhower resolution for United States intervention in the Formosa question. The United States has no jurisdiction over Chinese civil problems and we urge that such problems be referred to the United Nations. In the interest of world peace.

Molly Cavanaugh, Los Altos, San Jose, New Jersey, June 19, 1955.


Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We hope that you will examine your conscience and see that such a move could only lead to a disaster war, and we do not want another war.

Sincerely, Mrs. Lohn Newman.

St. Alban's Episcopalian Church, Tualatin, Oregon, January 23, 1955.

Senator Wayne Morse, Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sirs: Evidence indicates that peaceful coexistence between the eastern and the western alliances can be achieved through the following adaptation of the traditional principle of self-determination and monomic equity, which will most likely prove acceptable to both East and West:

- Providence has composed the world into the form of world islands and continents and their adjacent islands and peninsulas. Today, each world island is struggling to achieve self-sufficiency in essential resources, prospering and independent, largely by means of inward migration. Areas within a world island are economically and geographically similar (that is, in natural resources and productivity), which leads to interdependence. Consequently, every world island today is driven by this natural urge to achieve effective political unity as the only means to economic interdependence and consequent prosperity and security; two of the main purposes of government are those of maintaining the security and the prosperity of the area governed.

In other words, each continental world island is by nature endowed with its own Monroe Doctrine. This is not too easy for the nations to see and agree upon in principle. However, in practice present boundaries would presumably remain, and every maladjusted area which by its present sovereignty, alliance, hostilities, and geographical situation cannot last (namely, the world islands of which it is part), would be bound and benefited by treaties of peace, limited armament and economic aid, guaranteed by all concerned, thereby increasing their mutual good faith (and note that political destiny is generally determined in large measure by apparent economic advantage). Such is the long-sought-after modus vivendi, the condition for peaceful coexistence, the formula for peace—geopolitical hegemonic equity.

If this peace formula is not adopted, war between Russian-Chinese Eurasia and the United States alone may occur, perhaps reducing both powers to exhaustion or atomic rubble and leaving the other nations, until then under-judged and relatively helpless, to compete for world dominance.

Of course, this is my personal message to you. (And, of course, you are welcome to read it to Congress if you should so desire.) With all good wishes,

The Reverend J. J. Hancock.

Mr. Knowland, Mr. President, I had not intended to speak this afternoon, but the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] are so far reaching in their implications that I feel in the interest of national security the Record must not be allowed to go unchallenged at this point.
Mr. Hruska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the adoption of a quorum roll.

Mr. Knowland. I yield for that purpose provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. Knowland. Mr. President, as I stated at the outset, I had not intended to speak today on the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 28, which has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly.

However, after listening to the speech of the senior Senator from Oregon, the implications and deductions he apparent made from testimony given before the committees are so far reaching in their nature that I believe great damage can be done to the national security position of the United States and, indeed, the security of the 7th Fleet and our other Armed Forces in the far Pacific. Therefore, insofar as something may be said to clarify the Record in that regard, I believe it needs to be said here and the quorum can be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Thurmond in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.
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However, after listening to the speech of the senior Senator from Oregon, the implications and deductions he apparent made from testimony given before the committees are so far reaching in their nature that I believe great damage can be done to the national security position of the United States and, indeed, the security of the 7th Fleet and our other Armed Forces in the far Pacific. Therefore, insofar as something may be said to clarify the Record in that regard, I believe it needs to be said here and the quorum can be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Thurmond in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Thurmond in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.
been done—leaned over backward to preserve peace with honor, which is far different from peace at any price.

Mr. President, I again plead with every Member of the Senate to look at the record, to read the record, to go to the committee room this afternoon, or to go there tonight and read the record. They have a right, which is more important to them than to read the entire record even if they have to cancel every engagement they have made. If that were not true we could safely draw the deduction that this resolution was either intended or meant to provide for preventive war, or provide for aggression against the Chinese Communist regime, or against any other nation on the face of the earth.

It is not only the high responsibility of the Senate of the United States, but, according to my view, the high responsibility of the American press, that that fact be made clear to the people of this nation and to the people of the world, before great damage is done to the security of the United States and to the security of the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield when I have completed my statements on the record. I am pleased to note that he be not interrupted during the course of his remarks. There were several times when I would have liked to interrupt him. I think it would have been to the benefit of the Senator if he had not been interrupted on a colloquy during his remarks. But he preferred it the other way, and I think he was entirely within his rights. Yet it is evident that there is a serious problem, one which could, to be sure, ultimately lead to peace or war, but there is a considerable body of opinion on the part of those who are just as much devoted to the cause of peace, just as much interested in the American people, just as much interested in the children and grandchildren of America and the heritage we shall pass on to them as are any other Senator who has just as sincerely hoped that the alternative of doing nothing or of passing an emasculated resolution will more quickly and more directly lead to war than will the action proposed by the President, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and by the Secretary of State, having in mind our obligations under the United Nations Charter, our obligations to our allies in Europe, and our obligations to our allies in the Pacific, as well as the fact that we have a mutual defense pact with the Republic of Korea, with Japan, with the Philippines—and also historic ties with the Philippines and with the Annu powers, including Australia and New Zealand. There is before the Senate a treaty, not yet acted upon, dealing with southeast Asia, the so-called Manila Charter. There will be a similar mutual defense pact with the Republic of China on Formosa, which is the only gap in that long area of defensive chains.

There have been some who have suggested that the joint resolution should be changed. Changed how? One of the suggestions was that the reference to certain other areas now in friendly hands should be eliminated. Presumably it was thought on the part of the proponents of that amendment that to do so would further limit the action of the United Nations in the Pacific area. If such an amendment had a perfect right to submit their proposal, I am not complaining about it.
that. Men may honestly differ. No one is infallible. But the proposal was that there should be a formula for peace, which would mean, quite frankly, that regardless of what might occur, the United States should not, even if in the judgment of the President and his advisors, there was no basis for a friendly hand, which means that only a friendly hand, which means that not be used under the resolution, on the forces, we shall do what? We shall be our Armed Forces be used. They could be to impose, in a way, restrictions upon presently held by other than friendly China.

"Come and get them, and get them now."

There is a school of thought that believes that the proponents of the amendment, that is, the drafters, claim that the amendment would accomplish would be to impose, in a way, restrictions upon the President, because now he is limited in that particular field, so far as the resolution is concerned, to his hands, which means that only on those islands or areas in friendly hands, which in his judgment, and that of the Security Council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are believed to be essential to the protection of Formosa, could our Armed Forces be used. They could not be used under the resolution, on the mainland of China, or even on the islands presently held by other than friendly hands.

But let us look at this picture in its entirety. What is the proposal again? In the Government of the Republic of China believes that it would serve the mutual defense interests to reemploy its forces, we shall do what? We shall be in a position, if the President and his advisors, Mr. President, I wish to point out that on April 29, 1954, during the Geneva conference, Mr. Chou En-lai gave a formula for peace in the Pacific which I think we should bear in mind. I read the first speech by Mr. En-lai on the first page of the New York Times of April 29, 1954, with the dateline Geneva, April 28.

In part, the article reads:

"In his first speech before the Geneva conference and in the Western World, Peking's Premier and Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, assumed a role for his country of sharp reflexes, cool judgment, even if they were read in a quiet, indeed monotonous, high-pitched voice. Mr. En-lai stated that the United States had occupied Formosa in June 1945 and that this was Chinese territory.

Every Member of the Senate knows there is no occupation of Formosa by the United States. We have a relatively small military mission there. The island does contain a military presence Chinese, and an armed force of more than 350,000 non-Communist Chinese. The population is larger than that of 30 nations are members of the United Nations and are sitting in the General Assembly. So it is no small, inconsequential island. It is larger than Denmark, Switzerland, New Zealand, and Ireland. It is the approximate size of the population, of Australia. So let us put the island in its proper perspective.

Let me continue to read from the article of Mr. Sulzberger:

He proposed that "all foreign military bases in Asia be removed."

He stated, in effect, "Be prepared to withdraw from Japan, from Korea, from Okinawa, and your military mission from Formosa from the Philippines, from southeast Asia, and you can have a temporary settlement in the Pacific." Mr. Chou went on to say:

"The militarization of Japan be removed, all economic blockades and restrictions be abolished."

Later a spokesman from the Chinese Communist delegation clarified this implied demand in alleging that the United States had "more than several hundred military bases in Japan."

The formula has been laid out. It was laid out there at the Geneva Conference. It had been repeated time and time again. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a part of the remarks of Mr. Chou which was published in the New York Times of April 28, 1954, and a part of the text which appears on page 4, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

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

"In his first speech before the Geneva conference and in the Western World, Peking's Premier and Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, assumed a role for his country of sharp reflexes, cool judgment, even if they were read in a quiet, indeed monotonous, high-pitched voice. Mr. En-lai stated that the United States had occupied Formosa in June 1945 and that this was Chinese territory.

He proposed that "all foreign military bases in Asia be removed, foreign armed forces stationed in Asian countries be withdrawn."

He stated, in effect, "Be prepared to withdraw from Japan, from Korea, from Okinawa, and your military mission from Formosa from the Philippines, from southeast Asia, and you can have a temporary settlement in the Pacific."

Mark my words and listen to the statement of Mr. Chou En-lai, as he made it at the Geneva Conference, at the Geneva Conference, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a part of the remarks of Mr. Chou which was published in the New York Times of April 28, 1954, and a part of the text which appears on page 4, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

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

"In his first speech before the Geneva conference and in the Western World, Peking's Premier and Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, assumed a role for his country of sharp reflexes, cool judgment, even if they were read in a quiet, indeed monotonous, high-pitched voice. Mr. Chou En-lai stated that the United States had occupied Formosa in June 1945 and that this was Chinese territory.

He proposed that "all foreign military bases in Asia be removed, foreign armed forces stationed in Asian countries be withdrawn, the militarization of Japan be removed, all economic blockades and restrictions be abolished."

Later a spokesman from the Chinese Communist delegation clarified this implied demand in alleging that the United States had "more than several hundred military bases in Japan."

The formula has been laid out. It was laid out there at the Geneva Conference. It had been repeated time and time again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a part of the remarks of Mr. Chou, as the article which was published in the New York Times of April 28, 1954, and a part of the text which appears on page 4, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

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

"In his first speech before the Geneva conference and in the Western World, Peking's Premier and Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, assumed a role for his country of sharp reflexes, cool judgment, even if they were read in a quiet, indeed monotonous, high-pitched voice. Mr. Chou En-lai stated that the United States had occupied Formosa in June 1945 and that this was Chinese territory.

He proposed that "all foreign military bases in Asia be removed, foreign armed forces stationed in Asian countries be withdrawn, the militarization of Japan be removed, all economic blockades and restrictions be abolished."

Later a spokesman from the Chinese Communist delegation clarified this implied demand in alleging that the United States had "more than several hundred military bases in Japan."
This is the first time that the foreign ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Republic of France, the People's Republic of China and the countries concerned have met together, at the same table, to examine and solve the major problems of international relations in an atmosphere of mutual respect. The delegation of the People's Republic of China hopes that all the delegations concerned will make due efforts to fulfill this task.

The government of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese people consistently work for peace and against war. We have never committed and will never commit a single gull to the 500 million Chinese people; but we most emphatically shall not tolerate aggression against us by any country. We respect the right of all the nations to choose their own way of life and their own state system without interference from outside. At the same time we insist that all the nations in the world observe these principles and are motivated by them in their cooperation for peaceful unification of the world.

The People's Republic of China has already become the largest state in the world with a large population. The Chinese people have recognized the People's Republic of China and endeavor to ignore the right of the Chiang Kai-shek clique—a remnant clique (the Nationalist government in Formosa), a clique long ago thrown out by the 500 million Chinese people. 

Up to now, at various international conferences they are still planting the henchmen of the Kuomintang clique to pose as representatives of all the people and all the states and countries. We believe all the nations of the world will observe these principles and are motivated by them in their cooperation for a peaceful unification of the world. We believe the presence of American troops in Korea is menacing with the restoration of the peace and security of China and the whole world, and the presence of the American troops in Korea directly affects the preservation of peace in Korea and the security of the People's Republic of Korea. The peaceful unification of Korea is a matter for the Korean people themselves. We hope the Korean people will carry on the work of restoring the peace and security of the Far East together.

The People's Republic of China is a state of independent, democratic nature. The Yangtze River and the Yellow River are the cradle of Chinese civilization, the cradle of the Chinese nation. The Chinese nation, consisting of 500 million people, has been a continuous entity from ancient times to the present day. The whole world recognizes the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate government of China and the only representative of the Chinese nation in international affairs.

The Chinese people, after their liberation from the enslavement by Japanese imperialism, have consistently aspired for the realization of their independence and unity. The unification of China should be achieved through the holding of the free and fair elections in all parts of China, and the holding of general elections in Korea to form an all-Korean Government and reunite Korea in a united, independent, and democratic state. The Yangtze River and the Yellow River are the cradle of Chinese civilization, the cradle of the Chinese nation. The Chinese nation, consisting of 500 million people, has been a continuous entity from ancient times to the present day. The whole world recognizes the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate government of China and the only representative of the Chinese nation in international affairs. That is why we consider that in order to safeguard world peace it is most important to press on with the democratic reform of Germany and to hold free all-German elections included.

The view was most vividly expressed by the delegate of the People's Republic of Korea when he spoke of the foreign troops in Korea. He pointed out that the foreign troops in Korea are dreaming to impose upon the Chinese people the regime of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, and incessantly press their will under peaceful conditions. The Peiping government has never caused tension in the Far East and Asia. That is why we consider that in order to safeguard world peace it is most important to press on with the democratic reform of Germany and to hold free all-German elections included.

The peaceful unification of Korea is a matter for the Korean people themselves. The Chinese people, on the other hand, are determined to liberate their own territory—Taiwan (Formosa). Since the recent successful liberation of Yungkingshan by the Chinese people, the United States Government on the part of the United Nations authorizes military operations to make war provocations, and has, on the other hand, been providing various types of arms and ammunition to the Chiang Kai-shek clique. The Chinese people, determined to liberate Taiwan (Formosa), are entirely fair and reasonable.

The Chinese people, in the face of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, and incessantly press their will under peaceful conditions, the Chinese people, on the other hand, are determined to liberate their own territory—Taiwan (Formosa). Since the recent successful liberation of Yungkingshan by the Chinese people, the United States Government on the part of the United Nations authorizes military operations to make war provocations, and has, on the other hand, been providing various types of arms and ammunition to the Chiang Kai-shek clique. The Chinese people, determined to liberate Taiwan (Formosa), are entirely fair and reasonable.

Allow me to express the hope that the delegations concerned will keep the interests of consolidating peace and security in Asia and in the whole world, will make joint efforts to solve the present urgent problems listed on the agenda of this conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as a part of my remarks a statement by Premier Chou En-lai, and which is dated "Tokyo, Tuesday, January 26, 1954." There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

"Tokyo, Tuesday—Text of a statement by Chinese Communist Premier Chou as broad­cast by the Peking radio:

"The Government of the People's Republic of China has repeatedly and in solemn terms declared to the world: The Chinese people are determined to liberate their own territory of Taiwan (Formosa). Since the recent successful liberation of Yungkingshan by the Chinese people, the United States Gover­nment has, on the part of the United Nations, authorized military operations to make war provocations, and has, on the other hand, been providing various types of arms and ammunition to the Chiang Kai-shek clique. The Chinese people, determined to liberate Taiwan (Formosa), are entirely fair and reasonable.

"Therefore, we have a right to demand that the United Nations will take necessary steps toward the settlement of the Taiwan question. Therefore, we have a right to demand that the United Nations will take necessary steps toward the settlement of the Taiwan question.

"Taiwan is an inalienable part of China's territory. The liberation of Taiwan is a mat­ter of the Chinese people's sovereignty and internal af­fairs. No outside interference is acceptable. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter also explicitly stipulates: "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in the matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit such matter to settlement under the present charter."

"Given the Buyer, no country, be it China or any foreign country has the right to intervene in the Chinese people's liberation of Taiwan. The liberation of Taiwan is a matter of the Chinese people's sovereignty and internal af­fairs. No outside interference is acceptable. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter also explicitly stipulates: "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in the matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit such matter to settlement under the present charter."

"Moreover, no country, be it China or any foreign country has the right to intervene in the Chinese people's liberation of Taiwan. The liberation of Taiwan is a matter of the Chinese people's sovereignty and internal af­fairs. No outside interference is acceptable. Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter also explicitly stipulates: "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in the matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit such matter to settlement under the present charter."

"It should be pointed out that the Chinese people's exercise of their own sovereign rights in liberating China or the Chinese people's liber­ation of Taiwan is essentially different from the fact that the United States Government has occupied Taiwan, shielded the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique, and directed subversive activities and war threats against the People's Republic of China.

"Mr. President, January 26, 1954."
The so-called mutual security treaty concluded between the United States and the Chiang Kai-shek clique has further heightened this tension and is seriously threatening peace in the Far East.

"It is very obvious that the source of this tension is the United States and not China. This tension will be eliminated as a matter of course, if the United States stops its intervention in China's internal affairs and withdraws all its Armed Forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait.

The so-called cease-fire between the People's Republic of China and the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique has further heightened this tension and is seriously threatening peace in the Far East. If, and only if the United States stops its intervention in China's internal affairs and withdraws all its Armed Forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait.

I continue to read:

Therefore, neither the United Nations nor any foreign country has the right to intervene in the affairs of the People's Republic of China. The Government of the People's Republic of China absolutely cannot agree to a so-called cease-fire with the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique repudiated by the Chinese people.

The Chinese people's exercise of their own sovereign rights to liberating China's mainland and many coastal islands has never caused tension in the Far East. The present tension of the Taiwan area can only be attributed to the fact that the United States Government has occupied Taiwan, shielded the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique, and incessantly directed subversive activities and war threats against the People's Republic of China.

The so-called Mutual Security Treaty concluded between the United States Government and the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique was designed to engineer, is in actuality intervention in China's internal affairs and withdrawal of the United States' military operations to make war possible, and has, on the other hand, been engineered as a conspiracy for a so-called cease-fire through the United Nations, to intervene in the Chinese people's liberation of Taiwan.

I might say parenthetically at this point that I wonder whether my distinguished friend and colleague from the State of Oregon really believes that Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung and the other members of the hierarchy of the Communist regime in China will be a bit interested in this so-called cease-fire as a question of whether there is a difference between Taiwan and the Pescadores, on the one hand, and Quemoy and the Matsu Islands and, indeed, even the Tachen groups of islands, and that they are all a part of China. Taiwan and the Pescadores were promised to the Republic of China by the Cairo agreement. They were promised to be returned to the Republic of China, and that is to whom they have been returned. The Chinese title may not be settled, but certainly the possession is in the hands of the People's Republic of China. There will be no shooting in that area of the world, in my judgment, unless the United States, in trying to stabilize, in the interests of world peace, the area there is fired upon; and in my judgment, unless the American people would expect our forces there to act as sitting ducks.

At that point I might say, parenthetically, that the Government of the Republic of China is recognized by most of the United Nations as a member of the United Nations organization. What forces we have there for training purposes have been there by invitation of the legal, recognized Government of the Republic of China, one which sits on the Security Council of the United Nations. And we, therefore, have no need, hardly had time to dry? In view of the difference in time between the Far East and here, it was probably almost before the message was off the presses in America, that Chou En-lai even repudiated a cease-fire engineered by the United Nations, as being an intervention in the Chinese war; and I suppose that in that event he would consider the event itself an act of aggression.

I read further:

They are using war threats and brandishing atomic weapons in an attempt to force the Chinese people into tolerating the occupation of Taiwan by the United States, giving recognition to the United States-Chiang Kai-shek Mutual Security Treaty and permitting the use of Taiwan by the United States as a military base for preparing a new war. The Chinese people absolutely cannot tolerate this; they firmly oppose it.

To safeguard China's sovereignty and territorial integrity, to safeguard the security of the Chinese people, the Chinese people must liberate Taiwan, and the United States must stop intervening in China's internal affairs and withdraw all its Armed Forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now read from the statement:

The Government of the People's Republic of China has declared to the world: The Chinese people are determined to liberate their own territory (Taiwan, Formosa, and the Pescadores). Since the Chinese people's successful liberation of Yikiangshan by the Chinese people, the United States Government has, on the one hand, stepped up its military operations to make war provocation possible, and has, on the other hand, been engineering a conspiracy for a so-called cease-fire through the United Nations, to intervene in the Chinese people's liberation of Taiwan.

Does he want a peaceful settlement? Is that statement by him an indication of his intent on his part?

Is that statement by him an indication that he respects international law and order? Is it an indication that he is interested in the legalistic question as to whether there is a difference between Taiwan and the Pescadores, or whether there is a difference between Taiwan and the Pescadores, on the one hand, and Quemoy and the Matsu Islands and, indeed, even the Tachen groups of islands, and that they are all a part of China. Taiwan and the Pescadores were promised to the Republic of China by the Cairo agreement. They were promised to be returned to the Republic of China, and that is to whom they have been returned. The legalistic title may not be settled, but certainly the possession is in the hands of the People's Republic of China. There will be no shooting in that area of the world, in my judgment, unless the United States, in trying to stabilize, in the interests of world peace, the area there is fired upon; and in my judgment, unless the American people would expect our forces there to act as sitting ducks.

I continue to read:

Mr. President, that statement by Chou En-lai, at Geneva, "Then we shall have Asia for the Asians."

But, Mr. President, the free people of the United States can know that there is no such thing as semantics, and that it means that Asia will then be for the Communists. Thus there will be full realization of the prediction made 30 years ago by Lenin, when he said, "The United States will be for Peking"—meaning that if the Communists can get control of China, they will ultimately have control of all of Asia, with its 1½ billion people and its vast strategic resources; and once the Communists have consolidated their power in Asia, including the manpower and resources of Asia, they will then be powerful to exercise such power over the West. In that event, neither Paris nor Berlin nor Madrid nor Rome nor London would be likely to stand up against that overwhelming might.
165 million, the most productive, agriculturally and industrially, the world has ever known, with the highest standard of living for its people; and a Nation, which time and time again, at great sacrifice to itself, has poured forth its resources, in order to help maintain which time and time again, at great "free world of free men."

I wish to make only passing reference to the statement by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Mossbarger] regarding a so-called United Nations trusteeship over Formosa. That suggestion, or a similar suggestion, was made some time ago, officially, by some of the Communist powers. It is a great temptation in population. I regard Mr. Nehru as a very sincere man. I think he hopes he can maintain a sort of balance between the East and the West. He has his hands full with the domestic Communists, although at the United Nations, and in his diplomatic action, he is neutral on the side of the Communist world. Some time ago he suggested the possibility of a trusteeship over Formosa, and at one time over Korea.

How do the people of those two sovereign nations look upon such a suggestion? Mr. President, I am trusteehip by the United Nations with respect to either Korea or Formosa would be looked upon by the sovereign people of those two nations as nothing but multiple colonialism. Colonialism in Asia is dead. The people on our side want no part of it. The people who are neutral want no part of it. Even the people who are on our side want no part of it. They are gradually learning the bitter lesson that one type of colonialism has been supplanted by the greatest godless empire in history. So they would reject such a proposal.

I ask the Senator from Oregon, What United Nations mouse would bell the cat with respect to Formosa? Formosa has a population of 9½ million. I have already said that that is a larger population than that of any 50 members of the United Nations who sit in the General Assembly. When the war in Korea broke out and the United Nations called upon its members to come to the aid of the little victim of aggression, the United Nations bitterly and it will be remembered that the Communists charged that that, too, was a civil war—how many responded? Of 60 members that offered to help Korea, all 16 of them sided with the United States, and the United Nations responded, and all 16 of them together supplied only 45,000 troops. The United States alone supplied more than 450,000, and we rotated some 1 million around the island of Formosa. Korea. The little Republic of Korea, which was the victim of aggression, supplied 650,000 troops, and today has the largest standing army in that area of the world. Indeed, it is the fifth largest standing army in the world. They are our allies and our friends. They gave a good account of themselves, but the two nations together could not prevent aggression and the United States—supplied 95 percent of the manpower and 95 percent of the resources.

How do Senators think those people would react to being trusted? How do Senators think the people on Formosa would react to a trusteeship? Inasmuch as all the members of the United Nations together supplied only 45,000 troops in Korea, it was the first test of whether or not we could preserve a system of international law and order, are they going to disarm the government of the United States, or the United Nations, and the United States—supplied 95 percent of the manpower and 95 percent of the resources.

If it were not a fact that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that this proposal is in the vital interest of our country, there might be a question involved. But the purpose of our action, the purpose of our diplomacy, is to disarm the people of China as such—and although it would help it, of course—any such agreement with the Japanese and the Philippines is only for the purpose of helping them.
tnguished Senator from Oregon, and another of which I represent, in part. That would be my principal interest or the interest of the free world.

So, Mr. President, I hope that at least I have been able to afford some clarification on this question. It is the desire and the wish of the President and of the Government that the proposed course of action shall be an act of peace and of stabilization in the Pacific. It will be nothing more than that unless the Chinese Communists themselves make it war.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I congratulate the able minority leader on his fine presentation of the essence of this issue. He will recall that in 1949, I believe, he and I visited the Far East a number of times. Our visits were not limited to Formosa, and they were not concerned solely with that issue. They related to Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and the entire Southeast Asia area, including Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia. The present message of the President of the United States relates to that entire area and its relation to the other areas of the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator also bear in mind when I suggest that those of us who have been there in person and have studied the areas and talked with the leaders of those countries perhaps be better qualified to express a global view on this question than those who have not been there? I express the thought that every member of the Foreign Relations Committee and every member of the Armed Services Committee should be familiar with that area before criticizing the President of the United States for what seems to us to be obviously a step which he feels he must take at this time, with the full cooperation and concurrence of the Secretary of State and the members of his administration in the interests of the security of the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TURKMOND in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to place myself on record as concurred in the remarks of the distinguished minority leader (Mr. KNOWLAND). He has well stated the issue. I was in the committee room the first day of the hearing on this resolution, when the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, appeared before the committee. At that time I endeavored to acquire an accurate knowledge of the entire question, as best I could. I was in the Far East a year ago. I believe the President has taken the only sane, sound, and proper course of action in laying before this legislative body, representing the people of the respective States, a resolution which would give him the assurance that we, as a legislative body, stand behind him, in the event that his action may in any sense affect our nation in a military role in the Far East.

The Senator from California has stated the case ably, and I wish to commend him for doing so. He has expressed views which I believe have expressed my conviction and opinion on this very grave question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words to those expressed by the senior Senator from California this afternoon, in support of the resolution, which was reported jointly by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. I do so because I join him in wishing to leave no false impression either with the Senate, or with the people of our country, or with the peoples of other countries as to the feeling of many of us who have considered and discussed the subject, not only today, but over many years.

Let us never forget the primary purpose of this resolution. Let us keep ever before our eyes the primary purpose of the President, and the purposes of each case is to maintain the security of our country, with the least possible bloodshed by American boys. We wish to do everything we can to keep peace in the world, and to cause as little harm as is possible to those of our boys who must fight for us.

Let us never lose sight of that primary purpose. Let us never forget that that is the primary obligation of the President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and as head of our diplomatic and policy-making establishment, responsible for our foreign relations.

The senior Senator from California has emphasized the fact that the President's only motive is to keep the peace.

I have seen and heard, at which this vital subject has been discussed, at which the President has led the discussion. Certainly, as one who has listened to him, I have always heard him state that his one motive was to keep peace in the world and to obtain a better and more durable peace than exists in the world at the present time. Certainly his intention is not to initiate an act of war.

I have served on the military committees of the Senate since I have been a member of this body, first on the Naval Affairs Committee, and then on the Committee on Armed Services, over a period of more than 10 years. During that time the committees on which I have served have authorized new aircraft carriers. They have authorized new types of weapons. They have increased the manpower of the Armed Forces, and have considered measures increasing the pay of the members of the Armed Forces. I have served.

Those of us who have served on these committees have taken all manner of steps designed to improve the defense of our country, to enable our country to obtain military efficiency, and to strengthen the morale and efficiency of our armed services.

We have done that over the past 10 years. The purpose of the resolution which we shall consider tomorrow, and which was reported jointly by these two committees, after considering it for 2 days, is to make certain that the peace is kept. It is not to authorize any action which would be an act of war, or any action which would be opposed to the policies of our military forces which we have built up, and which we want to make ever more efficient, will be able to act to maintain and protect our security with the least possible bloodshed by those of our boys who would be the first to fight in our behalf.

In all the briefings of the military committees which I have had, it has been made perfectly clear, as it has been made expressly to the people of the United States by the Secretary of State and by the President and others, that our first line of defense runs from the Aleutians in the north, through Japan and Okinawa, and the Philippines, down as far as Australia and New Zealand.

As the senior Senator from California has pointed out, if Formosa is taken out of the 7th Fleet, which has been so skillfully maintained not to fall into unfriendly hands, the airline between Okinawa and the Philippines and the seascapes between Japan and Australia could be cut off. In that way our military forces which we have established and strengthened on Okinawa and Formosa and in the Philippines could be seriously interfered with.

Therefore, as the President has stated, Formosa is important to our security. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that it remain in friendly hands. The purpose of this resolution is to support the President in that fact that—keep Formosa in friendly hands.

Since 1950, the 7th Fleet has been patrolling the seascapes off Formosa in an effort to maintain the defensive attitude toward the danger of invasion of Formosa and to keep it from being invaded from the mainland, which is only a little more than 100 miles away.

In the resolution which the President has requested he asks to be given authority to defend Formosa and Okinawa, and certain other islands which are in friendly hands, in order to make sure that no enemy will land on Formosa. I am not disclosing any security information when I say that if we permit hostile Communist troops to board junks in certain island harbors, it will be much easier for the enemy to approach Formosa than otherwise. It would create a grave danger for our boys who may have to defend the area between Formosa and the mainland. If those islands with those harbors are protected and kept in friendly hands, the possibility that junks could use those harbors for the purpose of invasion becomes more remote.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would rather not yield, because I do not desire my trend of my thought to be interrupted.

The purpose of the resolution, as I say, and the purpose of the vote of the committees in supporting the resolution, is to maintain our security with the least possible bloodshed of American boys. Let us never forget that fact.
That is the thought I try to keep ever-lastingly before me in considering this subject. The distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] laid the course of his remarks, to which I listened attentively, and which the senior Senator from California [Mr. Knowland] answered so ably, makes four points as I understand. The first point is that the constitutional authority of the President permits him to act without any action on the part of Congress. The second point is that the resolution initiated an act of aggression. The third, the senior Senator from Oregon states, the passage of the resolution may involve the question of usurping the sovereignty of another nation. Finally, he asks, can we continue to act? We are an aggregation of the United Nations, and the question of making more use of the United Nations. So far as the constitutional power of the President is concerned, let me say that if immediate action is required, the President certainly can be relied upon to act. If there is involved a situation which will continue for several weeks or months, even months, no President may prove to be the case when it comes to the protection of the Formosa Strait, there is the privilege of asking the Congress to join with him in assuming responsibility.

As I see it, it is what he is doing in this instance. Congress must appropriate the funds. Congress must build up the manpower of the Nation to the point where it is entirely involved in any act of this kind. It is not an act of aggression but an act that will maintain the security of our country with the least possible loss of blood. Let us not forget that fact for a single minute. I am much concerned. The thought I try to keep ever-lastingly before me in considering this subject.

In the world of sport, which we all love, let us consider football, which I used to play badly. A player, let us assume, is about to throw a forward pass. Is the opposing team going to let him throw the forward pass without any effort to defend its goal line, or is it going to stop him? We see that situation in every game of football we watch. When we see the massing of junks or of planes and note what Chou En-lai has said about our activities in Formosa, are we going to stand with our hands at our sides, or are we going to maintain our security with the least possible bloodshed on the part of our Armed Forces?

That, as I see it, is the important question. There is no question of sovereignty of nations involved. We are not going to attack any nation unless our own security is in danger. If our own security is in danger, we must be guided by circumstances as to what will best preserve our security with the least possible loss of the blood of American boys.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to say something about the United Nations. There is no one who desires to see the United Nations succeed more than I do. I was for the League of Nations in 1920. I voted for the United Nations when that question came before this body in 1945 and 1946. I wanted the United Nations to succeed. But if we assume an organization with tasks that it clearly cannot accomplish, it will lose its prestige and its opportunity for doing future good. If we ask the United Nations to bring about a cease-fire now, we are placing a burden on that organization which it will be very difficult for it to bear.

We are even now asking the United Nations to help us to get back some of our prisoners of war. I hope it will succeed. If it does not, we must do something about it. The United Nations can accomplish it only by persuasion, and it is going to take a great deal of time, in my opinion, to attempting to influence men like Chou En-lai.

So the President, in sending his message to the Congress, asks us to join with him in carrying out the great responsibility which is his in the first instance. He is asking us to help him carry it, because he thinks it will offer the best opportunity for maintaining peace in the world and maintaining our security with the least possible loss of blood. Let us not forget that fact for a single moment when we vote on this question tomorrow or the following day.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like the Senator to clear up 1 or 2 points with which I am much concerned. The Senator is a member of the Armed Services Committee, and a member of that committee last year. He is familiar with many of these problems. The Senator made the statement that he was in favor of maintaining our security with the least possible loss of lives. Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like the Senator which would tend toward the least possible cost in lives, the holding of an island 75 miles away from the shores of an enemy power, when we have the most powerful navy in the world to defend the straits, or the holding of an island right at the entrance of an enemy harbor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The holding of an island at the entrance of an enemy harbor is primarily to be done by the Chinese troops who are on the island today. The furnishing of air cover, our ability to support the troops by airpower, and perhaps from the sea, will provide nullification of the enemy source of power to those islands and will keep the harbors free.

Mr. LONG. The question I had in mind was, Which would tend to cost us the greatest amount of life, the greatest cost in life, which would be the most difficult—hold an island lying against the shoreline at the mouth of an enemy harbor, or to hold an island 75 miles away?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think what we want to do, clearly, is to prevent an invasion of Formosa. If we allow ships to be collected in those harbors to invade Formosa, it makes it much more difficult for us, and it makes it possible for them to land a greater number of troops successfully.

Mr. LONG. The Senator agrees with me, does he not, that Communist China has very few fighting ships, particularly very few modern ones?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator; but it has many, many thousands of junkies. It has not much regard for human life; and if a large number of junkies start out at night, it is very difficult.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is not concerned about the firepower of a Chinese junk, is he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; but I am concerned about the number of junkies which can do damage at night.

Mr. LONG. I know of no seaworthy craft that could not be picked up by radar. Certainly, we would defend at night as well as in the daytime.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to make it clear to my colleague that I do not think any naval officer will testify that every junk can be picked up.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator agrees with me that there are at least 500,000 well-trained troops on Formosa.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Less than that, but there is a substantial number. The Senator from California mentioned 350,000. I should think he is correct in that figure.

Mr. LONG. We have spent large amounts of money in connection with those troops, and they are well equipped and well trained.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; and we hope they are being better equipped and trained as time goes on.

Mr. LONG. In order to have our ships in a position to support islands such as Quemoy it would be necessary to bring the ships within range of Communist land-based guns.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would agree with the Senator's statement in that regard.

Mr. LONG. The Senator would agree that those ships would be in much more hazard, would he not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would agree that they would be closer to the shore, but if the harbors are kept clear, the danger of troops landing in Formosa is that much less.

Mr. LONG. Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind whether Formosa can be held without attacking Communist harbor prior to the time the fleet puts to sea?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would hope that that question can be answered "Yes." I know I cannot answer the Senator. In other words, I would not agree with the Senator from Louisiana on that point. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. LONG. Yes. Would the Senator agree with me that this resolution accepts in advance the President's judgment as to whether it is desirable and necessary to bomb the Chinese mainland prior to the time a Chinese fleet with a
Chinese troop concentration could be put to sea?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say that the resolution, if passed, would recognize the principle that the Commander in Chief can use his best discretion, his best experience, and his best knowledge in handling the situation for the security of Formosa and the Pescadores and with the least loss of life of American citizens.

Mr. ALL. Does the resolution state, by its terms, state specifically that the President should take such action as in his judgment would hold those islands which he believes should be in friendly hands?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Those are the islands which are in friendly hands today.

Mr. LONG. Therefore, this resolution does accept in advance the judgment of the President as to whether we should bombard or bomb the Chinese mainland?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that what it does is to place reliance on the Commander in Chief; and this particular Commander in Chief has given his whole life to a comprehensive understanding of military problems.

Mr. LONG. The resolution relies upon his judgment, but it accepts his judgment in advance, in that it instructs him to take such action if, in his judgment, he deems it to be proper.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If he did not come to Congress, but exercised the constitutional authority he has for the direction of our Armed Forces in an emergency, the President should have to rely upon his judgment anyway.

Mr. LONG. The point I have in mind is that, once again, the President, not being in the field, would necessarily be forced to accept the judgment of the commander in the field as to whether or not it was necessary and desirable, all facts considered, to undertake to bombard the Chinese mainland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He could accept the recommendation of the commander in the field, and then exercise final judgment himself, as has been stated in the press. That authority he has used in one or two instances already.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator agree with me that even without this resolution, if the President felt that it was essential and necessary to undertake to attack the Chinese mainland prior to the time our own units were attacked, in that event this Nation would expect the President to take such action?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the act of aggression by China were made evident by the concentrations of planes and ships, then the President would, in his discretion, have to do what I have tried to indicate, and that is to undertake to defend, namely, defend and protect this country by taking appropriate action at that time.

Mr. LONG. Whether or not Congress would support such action would then depend upon the particular case. Would not that be correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Whatever occasion arose, naturally, Congress would have to determine what action, if any, was necessary afterward. My understanding is that no action would be necessary, except, of course, action on our own defense.

Mr. LONG. In view of that fact, why should it be necessary for Congress to approve in this case the basis upon which the President should undertake to attack the Chinese mainland, without our knowing what the facts are?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I disagree with the Senator’s premise. I do not agree that the President necessarily would expect an attack upon the Chinese mainland. I should hope that it would not be necessary. But the President has appropriate constitutional powers. This situation is not going to end overnight. It will continue for a week or 10 days, 6 weeks or 2 months, or perhaps 10 months. Therefore, the President has asked us to join with him, and to have the American people join with him, in undertaking to carry out his responsibility for the security of the country.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Massachusetts explain why Congress should undertake to approve the President using his discretion to attack the Chinese mainland, without our knowing what the facts might be whenever that should occur?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Louisiana continues to refer to my attack on the Chinese mainland. I should hope that it would not be necessary to attack the Chinese mainland. I hope that by the policy we are now considering we will prevent any effort on the part of the Chinese Communists to build up and activate their forces.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts has already agreed with me that the joint resolution would approve of the President using his judgment in undertaking to attack the Chinese mainland, if he thought it necessary to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think the placing of ground troops on the Chinese mainland is at all contemplated. So far as I can foresee in the future, there will be no use for ground troops on any of the islands or, in any event, on the mainland.

Mr. LONG. We are speaking of air bombing and naval fire.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Naval fire and air bombing, at the most.

Mr. LONG. The point I make is, why approve such action in advance, without knowing the facts upon which action might be based at a particular time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because it affords us the greatest opportunity for securing the bloodless solution of the problem. By letting Chou En-lai know that we are going to stand our ground and are not going to hold back helplessly, we hope that we will prevent any attack. That is the basis for our action, as I see it.

Mr. LONG. How can we be sure in our judgment that the Chinese Reds are actually going to be able to attack Formosa?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is a risk. Of course any positive policy is a risk these days. This is the least possible risk to our security.

Mr. LONG. Would not that be a case of our firing the first shot, in that sense?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot say it would not; I would hope not.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts upon his very clear statement, which is entirely extemporaneous. There is one thing at this time about which I wish to question him, since he is a very distinguished representative of the State of Massachusetts, as we know it, in our relationship with the Red forces in China. There is a de facto ability on the part of the Red forces in China to exercise force. But sovereignty among nations, much better than I can explain it, is a technical situation, in which the recognition of de jure rights is accorded by the nations of the world, and such recognition is generally considered to be binding upon the nations of the world.

The United States has never recognized the sovereignty, the political integrity, or the right of the Government of Red China to speak for the Chinese people. As a result, the United States has continued our recognition, official and otherwise, of the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Republic of China as now exercised by the Nationalist Government, which presently has its seat in Formosa.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree, therefore, that the question of sovereignty pertains primarily to the claimed authority of the Red government in China?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Iowa has expressed the situation much better than I could express it. I agree with him entirely, and I repeat one point I tried to make earlier. I do not ask Senators to agree with me, but it is my feeling that that question would not arise unless the Chinese forces themselves are imperiled. If our own security were imperiled, then it would be necessary for the United States Government to take whatever steps were necessary at that time to save the territory already, and not to have our grandchildren or great-grandchildren raise questions at some later time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In connection with the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus, which are I believe, the other series of islands in the vicinity of Fuchow, is there any question in the Senate that the Chinese themselves have ample troops on those islands to defend the islands, and that at present there is no particular indication that they will need additional military support? If they are not provided they receive adequate logistical support, and that they can defend themselves for an indefinite period against the announced intended attacks on the part of the Red forces of China?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the information which has been supplied to us. The Senator has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Therefore, the defense of those islands by Chinese
Nationalist troops themselves would be, in fact, a defensive action, which would postpone or eliminate the threat of action by the Reds against Formosa, a threat which might, indeed, call for the shedding of American blood.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, if the bastions are now being protected by Nationalist Chinese troops in sufficient numbers, provided the danger of shedding American blood is just that much further away from Iowa, it would be to our interest, in my view, to remove the Nationalist manpower in position to do that job in the foreseeable future.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Iowa has expressed the situation well and clearly. His view is in accordance with the evidence which has been given to us. I believe that such a purpose only was in mind in requesting the passage of a joint resolution by Congress at this time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator. Before I conclude my remarks, and I wish to congratulate him for the vigor, clarity, and force with which he has set forth the position of the United States and of President Eisenhower in the effort to preserve the peace of the world, in seeking international justice and standing for justifiable rights, so that we will not be all alone, if such a horrible catastrophe should befal us. In other words, we must try to have, as the Senator said, a fair and equitable final disposition of the island of Formosa.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish first to agree with the last statement made by the Senator from Iowa. I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from California think there would be more benefit if some of the so-called neutral nations who have been playing "footsy" with the Chinese Communists, both in the United Nations and in the world at large, would step in and take an active and forceful part in the whole situation, or, in any other situation, that I have heard since I have been on the floor of the Senate. I wish to congratulate him for the vigor, clarity, and force with which he has set forth the position of the United States and of President Eisenhower in the effort to preserve the peace of the world, in seeking international justice and standing for justifiable rights, so that we will not be all alone, if such a horrible catastrophe should befal us. In other words, we must try to have, as the Senator said, a fair and equitable final disposition of the island of Formosa.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish first to agree with the last statement made by the Senator from Iowa. I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from California think there would be more benefit if some of the so-called neutral nations who have been playing "footsy" with the Chinese Communists, both in the United Nations and in the world at large, would step in and take an active and forceful part in the whole situation, or, in any other situation, that I have heard since I have been on the floor of the Senate. I wish to congratulate him for the vigor, clarity, and force with which he has set forth the position of the United States and of President Eisenhower in the effort to preserve the peace of the world, in seeking international justice and standing for justifiable rights, so that we will not be all alone, if such a horrible catastrophe should befal us. In other words, we must try to have, as the Senator said, a fair and equitable final disposition of the island of Formosa.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish first to agree with the last statement made by the Senator from Iowa. I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from California think there would be more benefit if some of the so-called neutral nations who have been playing "footsy" with the Chinese Communists, both in the United Nations and in the world at large, would step in and take an active and forceful part in the whole situation, or, in any other situation, that I have heard since I have been on the floor of the Senate. I wish to congratulate him for the vigor, clarity, and force with which he has set forth the position of the United States and of President Eisenhower in the effort to preserve the peace of the world, in seeking international justice and standing for justifiable rights, so that we will not be all alone, if such a horrible catastrophe should befal us. In other words, we must try to have, as the Senator said, a fair and equitable final disposition of the island of Formosa.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish first to agree with the last statement made by the Senator from Iowa. I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from California think there would be more benefit if some of the so-called neutral nations who have been playing "footsy" with the Chinese Communists, both in the United Nations and in the world at large, would step in and take an active and forceful part in the whole situation, or, in any other situation, that I have heard since I have been on the floor of the Senate. I wish to congratulate him for the vigor, clarity, and force with which he has set forth the position of the United States and of President Eisenhower in the effort to preserve the peace of the world, in seeking international justice and standing for justifiable rights, so that we will not be all alone, if such a horrible catastrophe should befal us. In other words, we must try to have, as the Senator said, a fair and equitable final disposition of the island of Formosa.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?
have a moral and a legal obligation to protect Formosa; that is our obligation under the treaty of peace, and in view of our having occupied Formosa, after our forces captured it during the last war. Come what may, no vote in the Senate should be interpreted by anyone as meaning that any Member of the Senate is not willing to vote to have the United States use all its forces for the protection of the Pescadores and Formosa.

Mr. President, I feel very sincerely that agreement to use our forces to defend Quemoy and Matsu, and the coastal islands, would mean that we were prepared to become involved in a general war. There is no doubt that military people are also of that opinion. Senators who read the record will see that is true. No one believes the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Tennessee feels the same as some of the others of us do, although perhaps we are in the minority. At any rate, some of us feel reluctant to approve the particular language of the Senator's amendment, in the first blow because we think the enemy will strike us if we do not. However, it seems that that is a strong possibility, in view of the use of the joint resolution of the language—

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the express purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; there is no doubt that that result would in breach of the language, if it be struck out it would be the same as some of the others of us do, although perhaps we are in the minority. At any rate, some of us feel reluctant to approve the particular language of the Senator's amendment, in the first blow because we think the enemy will strike us if we do not. However, it seems that that is a strong possibility, in view of the use of the joint resolution of the language—

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the express purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Mr. LONG. Once those harbors were used in an effort to make a landing in an attack against Formosa, if we saw other concentrations of those who were attempting to make such a landing, it would then seem appropriate that those concentrations might be attacked while they were still in the harbors. But to attack them before an effort was actually made, even though an invasion would be to assume that those forces were going to launch such an invasion, whereas an error might be made in making that assumption.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It has been said we would not use our own troops. Of course, it has been said for a long time that Chiang Kai-shek would need only our military power. Our Senate might be willing to act for assistance. But I cannot see how we can even use our air cover or our naval cover, for that would involve shooting down their planes; and, as we know, that would be the last step.

The Senator from California said that such a limitation as has been proposed would be an open invitation to the Communists to take the islands. Of course, no one here wants to interfere with anything Chiang Kai-shek wants to do, for that is his business. If he wants to continue to fight for those islands, as he has been fighting for them, that is his business. We did not put him on those islands, and I do not think it is up to us to help him defend them. That is a matter between himself and the Chinese Communist Government. But if he wants to fight, he has a great deal of our material which he can use. But we are not going to use the Armed Forces of the United States if he assumes that those forces are going to keep him from fighting on his own islands, so he can mount an invasion of the mainland of China. That is the issue here.

What happens if we are in those areas? If we see such action as a grave risk or grave danger, militarily, of getting into war; and we also shall have this difficulty: We shall place our future and what will happen in the future, that is, what is going to happen to Chiang Kai-shek, on the mainland of China, and who apparently would give anything in the world in order to get us involved in a war with Communist China, who would use our military power against the mainland of China, by using our troops and our military power. The decisions thus made by his people would involve us. If we are going to take over these coastal islands, I am sure we should call the signals. His motive is not the same as ours. Our motive is peace. His motive is the re-emergence of the continent of Asia. I am sure all of us remember seeing, about the first of the year, an item about an Associated Press and, I believe, a United Press press conference at which Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek said he expected a general war would be launched within a few weeks; and he said that after having had a 4-hour conference with Admiral Radford. I have the news clipping around somewhere, and I am certain that all Senators remember that incident.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Tennessee has referred to a statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts. Of course, the Senator from Massachusetts left the Chamber briefly, and thereafter was engaged in conversation. I do not wish the record to stand, as I understand it has been made to stand, as showing that the Senator from Massachusetts either underwrote or admitted or advocated that either this policy or this joint resolution was intended to or would be used to bring about or to authorize a preventive war. The Senator from Massachusetts is on the floor at this time, and of course can himself clarify the matter. However, as I understood his remarks.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Massachusetts was here when I made the statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. He was in and out of the Chamber.

As I more of the situation, and I think the record regarding it is perfectly clear, the Senator from Massachusetts said that if the United States or if the President, in his desire for peace, and the President has made that very clear in his message to the Senate and in the joint resolution, had furnished cover and support for the evacuation of the Tachens, if that is determined upon by the Nationalist Chinese forces that are there, and if our planes were subject to attack by Chinese Communist planes, or if the Chinese Communist planes could provide cover and overt act, and thus if they themselves determined whether there would be war or would not be war, if they had committed that act, it would be the President's responsibility, or he found they were building up in the harbors of Foochow or Amoy a vast invasion fleet, we were not going to let our forces be sitting ducks. I think that is an entirely different premise, as compared to the one the Senator from Tennessee has tried to write into the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts, namely, that this would have to be determined by the President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; I entirely disagree with the Senator from California; that is not what the Senator from Massachusetts said. He said, in effect, that if the Chinese President from Massachusetts left the Chamber briefly, in effect, to throw a forward pass, you jump in, first, to break it up.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; but after the football game is over.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; he did not say anything about waiting until after the football game had started.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I think the record is quite clear, namely, that if we see a concentration of shipping or if we see an airport being built in that area, under the terms of the joint resolution as it is now written, we would be leaving the difference between the President and a million military men who might be trigger-happy, to begin with, whereas we do not know how their decision might be influenced by their frame of mind; or we would be leaving it to the responsibility of Chiang Kai-shek and his people, and we might be leaving it to their decision; and they might decide that in the case of a small activity, in one place or another, it might be a concentration leading to an invasion, and therefore we should bomb it.

I say that is too great a risk for us to take, considering how awful a war would be.

Now I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was out of the Chamber for a few minutes, having been called to the telephone.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thought the Senator from Massachusetts was present when I referred to his statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was told of the statement the Senator from Tennessee made. At that time I was in the lobby.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sorry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The President from Massachusetts was present when I referred to his statement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sorry.
Mr. KEFAUVER. In short order the fur will fly. The unfortunate thing is that when the fur starts flying, we shall not have a neighbor to look after us there alone, or with Chiang Kai-shek. If the fur must fly, I want it to be on a high legal basis. I want us to be in a position where the nations of the world will have to join us.

We can do that so long as we confine ourselves to Formosa, where we have a legal obligation to be, and where other nations have just as much right as we have. All the nations which joined with us in the war against Japan are just as much interested as we are. Britain is interested in Hong Kong. France is interested in their positions in Australia, and all the other nations have interests. But if the fur started to fly, we would be in the fight by ourselves, on our own, without any help. I am afraid, from our friends and allies, I think that would be very unfortunate.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. A few moments ago I heard my distinguished friend and colleague from Tennessee discuss the point that, should the resolution be passed, we might give control over some coastal islands along the Chinese coast, to the Chinese Communists, that the President is going to fire on our ships.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, they will fire on our ships.

Mr. LONG. If we send our ships in to evacuate Chinese Nationalist troops in Formosa, will the President and his commanders fire on us from land-based Communist guns, is there any reason to believe that those guns will stop shooting merely because our ships come near them?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. I think we must realize that our ships and planes are going to be hit and our men killed.

Mr. LONG. Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind as to what course of action starts, our side will be shooting, too?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is no doubt in my mind about it. These things spread very rapidly.

Mr. LONG. In short order the fur will fly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In short order the fur will fly. The unfortunate thing is that when the fur starts flying, we shall not have a neighbor to look after us there alone, or with Chiang Kai-shek. If the fur must fly, I want it to be on a high legal basis. I want us to be in a position where the nations of the world will have to join us.

We can do that so long as we confine ourselves to Formosa, where we have a legal obligation to be, and where other nations have just as much right as we have. All the nations which joined with us in the war against Japan are just as much interested as we are. Britain is interested in Hong Kong. France is interested in their positions in Australia, and all the other nations have interests. But if the fur started to fly, we would be in the fight by ourselves, on our own, without any help. I am afraid, from our friends and allies, I think that would be very unfortunate.
olution which sets forth that the resolution is for peaceful purposes, is all that is in my mind. The question about it is his whole life and all his acts throughout his life have demonstrated that. I believe that is true in large part of our high military officers and of the civilians who have had to deal with them. However, I submit to the distinguished Senator that we must face the realities of what the resolution would do.

After all, in spite of our confidence in the President, all of us have our responsibilities to the people who send us here. I have such a responsibility to my people.

I quote from the resolution:

"The authority to include the securing and protection of such positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands, that can mean one and only one thing, namely, that Congress specifically authorizes—it may be considered as a supreme act of war." Senator from Massachusetts.

If we vote to those islands must be eliminated from the resolution, because they are in a different situation. They must be eliminated, because I do not understand how we can operate in those islands without getting into a shooting war. There is shooting going on there.

If the substitute amendment I have offered is adopted, or if the Humphrey amendment, or if the President, after exhausting all other efforts, believes it to be absolutely necessary to take some action in connection with those islands, he would have the constitutional right to do so.

At least the implication in the resolution before us is that we take that burden and responsibility upon ourselves.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Tennessee has stated that if we limit our direction in the substitute amendment, he believes he must go beyond it, he will have the constitutional power to go beyond it. Assuming that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee were in the White House, would he, after Congress—

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me say that that is a violent assumption in the first place. I would agree to a question from the Senator from Massachusetts were in the White House.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am citing a hypothetical case. Suppose the Senator were in the White House as President, and Congress had stricken from the resolution the authority he had requested in the regard mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee, as President, then go forward assuming even greater responsibility, without again coming before Congress, although it might then be too late?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will tell the Senator what I believe a reasonable man would think about it. He would feel that the sense of Congress was that we should not get into war over coastal islands; that we would be glad to have Chiang Kai-shek remain and remain with us, and we have a great deal of our material—but we would not want to take the risk—and I think it is almost bound to happen—of getting into a general war over some islands of which Chiang Kai-shek is in possession and which he has great difficulty holding, by sending our airplanes and troops and ships into the islands, where they would be bound to get hit. When we get hit, we will be in an all-out, general war.

I believe everyone would understand that it was the intention of Congress that Chiang Kai-shek should remain in the islands, but that we would not want to get mixed up with him in a war.

In holding Formosa and the Pescadores, with the greatest Navy and Air Force, it avoids, at least, greatest Navy—and with about 148 miles between the mainland and Formosa and the Pescadores, it might be a little more difficult to hold those islands without the harbor of Formosa. Those coastal islands, but I think the greater difficulty would be more than offset by the lesser chance of getting us into a war.

If we are going to do in Formosa, then I think the President would have the constitutional right to do it. However, that would not be a suggestion or an invitation by Congress to do it in the first place.

Mr. President, I have talked too long already. The substitute I offered for the joint resolution is not necessary.

First, it avoids reference to the unratiﬁed defense treaty and other language which recognizes Formosa and the Pescadores as a part of China.

Secondly, it avoids the legal and constitutional right to do so.

At least the implication in the resolution before us is that we take that burden and responsibility upon ourselves.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Tennessee has stated that if we limit our direction in the substitute amendment, he believes he must go beyond it, he will have the constitutional power to go beyond it. Assuming that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee were in the White House, would he, after Congress—

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me say that that is a violent assumption in the first place. I would agree to a question from the Senator from Tennessee, as President, then go forward assuming even greater responsibility, without again coming before Congress, although it might then be too late?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will tell the Senator what I believe a reasonable man would think about it. He would feel that the sense of Congress was that we should not get into war over coastal islands; that we would be glad to have Chiang Kai-shek remain with us, and we have a great deal of our material—but we would not want to take the risk—and I think it is almost bound to happen—of getting into a general war over some islands of which Chiang Kai-shek is in possession and which he has great difficulty holding, by sending our airplanes and troops and ships into the islands, where they would be bound to get hit. When we get hit, we will be in an all-out, general war.

I believe everyone would understand that it was the intention of Congress that Chiang Kai-shek should remain in the islands, but that we would not want to get mixed up with him in a war.

In holding Formosa and the Pescadores, with the greatest Navy and Air Force, it avoids, at least, greatest Navy—and with about 148 miles between the mainland and Formosa and the Pescadores, it might be a little more difficult to hold those islands without the harbor of Formosa. Those coastal islands, but I think the greater difficulty would be more than offset by the lesser chance of getting us into a war.

If we are going to do in Formosa, then I think the President would have the constitutional right to do it. However, that would not be a suggestion or an invitation by Congress to do it in the first place.

Mr. President, I have talked too long already. The substitute I offered for the joint resolution is not necessary.

First, it avoids reference to the unratiﬁed defense treaty and other language which recognizes Formosa and the Pescadores as a part of China.

Secondly, it avoids the legal and constitutional right to do so.

At least the implication in the resolution before us is that we take that burden and responsibility upon ourselves.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Tennessee has stated that if we limit our direction in the substitute amendment, he believes he must go beyond it, he will have the constitutional power to go beyond it. Assuming that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee were in the White House, would he, after Congress—

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me say that that is a violent assumption in the first place. I would agree to a question from the Senator from Minnesota, and if then the President believes he must go beyond it, he will have the constitutional power to go beyond it. Assuming that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee were in the White House, would he, after Congress—

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me say that that is a violent assumption in the first place. I would agree to a question from the Senator from Massachusetts were in the White House.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am citing a hypothetical case. Suppose the Senator were in the White House as President, and Congress had stricken from the resolution the authority he had requested in the regard mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee, as President, then go forward assuming even greater responsibility, without again coming before Congress, although it might then be too late?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will tell the Senator what I believe a reasonable man would think about it. He would feel that the sense of Congress was that we should not get into war over coastal islands; that we would be glad to have Chiang Kai-shek remain and remain with us, and we have a great deal of our material—but we would not want to take the risk—and I think it is almost bound to happen—of getting into a general war over some islands of which Chiang Kai-shek is in possession and which he has great difficulty holding, by sending our airplanes and troops and ships into the islands, where they would be bound to get hit. When we get hit, we will be in an all-out, general war.

I believe everyone would understand that it was the intention of Congress that Chiang Kai-shek should remain in the islands, but that we would not want to get mixed up with him in a war.

In holding Formosa and the Pescadores, with the greatest Navy and Air Force, it avoids, at least, greatest Navy—and with about 148 miles between the mainland and Formosa and the Pescadores, it might be a little more difficult to hold those islands without the harbor of Formosa. Those coastal islands, but I think the greater difficulty would be more than offset by the lesser chance of getting us into a war.

If we are going to do in Formosa, then I think the President would have the constitutional right to do it. However, that would not be a suggestion or an invitation by Congress to do it in the first place.

Mr. President, I have talked too long already. The substitute I offered for the joint resolution is not necessary.

First, it avoids reference to the unratiﬁed defense treaty and other language which recognizes Formosa and the Pescadores as a part of China.

Secondly, it avoids the legal and constitutional right to do so.

At least the implication in the resolution before us is that we take that burden and responsibility upon ourselves.
Korea. The dangers of that action which the resolution supports do not arise from anything other than the security of Formosa and the Pescadores. The doubt, the uncertainty, the ambiguity relate to the protecting of "related possessions and territories of that area." The assumption is that this joint resolution authorizes the defense of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands though those are not named in the resolution.

In the public press of this country, in the comment from abroad, this assumption is made and the assumption is supported by the briefings we have had during the past few days.

The dangers of this situation can be expressed in a very few words. If the island of Quemoy, for instance, is to be defended by our armed strength, the commitment is a grave one. Should Communist China make a massive attack upon it, our defense must be correspondingly increased attack by the Communists cannot be kept within narrow limits. It is they who will determine the scope. The danger is disastrous than that. We have had intimations from the highest quarters that it would be militarily advisable to prevent the massing of troops and equipment gathered for the purpose of incurring an assault on the island. Put in plain English, this is preventive war. And it is seriously proposed as a possible action pursuant to the purposes of this resolution.

We have already lost military face in Asia. We lost this in the summer of 1951 when General Van Fleet had the Communist armies retreating in disorder, out of ammunition and abandoning their equipment. He was told not to pursue them. Militarily we then and there lost face. There is no hope of recovering it by any action contemplated in this present connection.

Had we adhered to the narrow waist of the Saigon, we could have bargained for peace terms from strength and the whole Asian situation would have been infinitely better than it is today. We could indeed have gained not merely military face but moral face as well, for the opportunity was open to us to propose peace terms which were right for all the people involved in the Korean situation. We could have adhered to this narrow waist of the Saigon.

Yet, the fact that we do not have a free choice in this matter, the fact that we must overwhelmingly give to the President by an overwhelming resolution the power he requests, is unspeakably deplorable. For this reason I shall vote for the treaty guaranteeing the independence of Formosa and the Pescadores, but without prejudice to other resolutions, I shall vote against this resolution.

Mrs. Smith of Maine. Mr. President, we are about to take very grave action that concerns the vital security of every family in this country. The risk in the action is tremendous. But I think that we have no other choice than to give the President, by an overwhelming vote, the power he requests. For that reason I shall vote for the treaty guaranteeing the independence of Formosa and the Pescadores, but without prejudice to other resolutions, I shall vote against this resolution.

We all know the criticism leveled at the Truman administration. We lost military face and threw away the opportunity to propose peace terms from strength and the whole Asian situation would have been infinitely better than it is today. We lost military face and threw away the opportunity to propose peace terms from strength and the whole Asian situation would have been infinitely better than it is today. We lost military face and threw away the opportunity to propose peace terms from strength and the whole Asian situation would have been infinitely better than it is today.

The resolution before us presents an unusual situation in at least two respects. First, the resolution calls upon the President to have the Senate participate in foreign policy formulation, for partnership with the President in a field heretofore reserved for the President. It is not actually a sharing of power but the acclamation of the President in foreign policy formulation with the President, simply because under the circumstances we have no free choice in the matter.

What it is, is actually a sharing of the responsibility for the grave decision with the President. That is a responsibility that I am quite willing to accept, even though it is not accompanied by authority. As Representatives of the people, however reluctant we may be to have this awesome responsibility thrust upon us, by the President, and regardless of the traditional separation of powers under the Constitution, I shall not vote for the treaty guaranteeing the independence of Formosa and the Pescadores, but without prejudice to other resolutions, I shall vote against this resolution.

The fact is that we do not have the luxurious freedom of choice in this matter. There is no choice. The circumstances do not permit us the luxury of freedom of choice in this matter. There is no choice. The circumstances do not permit us the liberty to vote against any such similar criticism of President Eisenhower, because he has been accused of not having had the will to resist Communist aggression.

We have already lost military face and thrown away the opportunity to propose peace terms from strength and the whole Asian situation would have been infinitely better than it is today. We lost military face and threw away the opportunity to propose peace terms from strength and the whole Asian situation would have been infinitely better than it is today.

We all know the criticism leveled at the Truman administration. We lost military face and threw away the opportunity to propose peace terms from strength and the whole Asian situation would have been infinitely better than it is today.
advance, a ratification by both the House and Senate of a future declaration of war between the United States and the Reds. I do not know. I do not think the people of America know. I think that they are entitled to know, because I think they are entitled to know as far as possible what this resolution is getting them into. If the answer is "Yes," then I am confident that the American people have such confidence in President Eisenhower that they are willing to give such a declaration of war in advance.

This leads me to the very core of what troubles me the most about this resolution: the question of what it actually is. The real contrast here is with what it seems to be to the American people. There should be no difference. It should be what it seems to be.

It is my impression that to a majority of the members of both parties, it seems to be an ultimatum to the Red Chinese that we will take so much and no more; that we have drawn a line which we have warned the Red Chinese not to cross; that if they cross we will be war. Grave and awesome as that is, I think the American people have come to the conclusion that we must do what the Red Chinese have given us no other way to do. If they cross the line, we must cross it in advance.

The least that we can do for the American people is to give them all the facts we can—to tell them the risks, the problems, what can and cannot be done. For example, suppose that our intelligence forces determine that the Reds have massed forces on the coast of the mainland of China in the first step of an assault on Formosa. Do we wait until those forces have crossed 1 inch over the drawn line? Or do we strike those forces on the mainland before they get that far? Do we alter the risk of whether the Reds go 1 inch over that line?

For example, suppose that our intelligence forces determine that the Reds have massed forces on the coast of the mainland of China in the first step of an assault on Formosa. Do we wait until those forces have crossed 1 inch over the drawn line? Or do we strike those forces on the mainland before they get that far? Do we alter the risk of whether the Reds go 1 inch over that line?

Suppose that the answer is "No," then what do we do if the Red planes take to the air or if the Red mainland or the island of Formosa and the assault ships start cruising in the waters, headed for the assault on Formosa? Do we make a defensive strike at these planes and ships so obviously headed for an assault on Formosa? Do we make a defensive strike in the area between the coast of the mainland and the island of Formosa?

No; it is not as simple as this catchy concept of drawing a line.

The least that we can do for the American people is to give them all the facts we can—to tell them the risks, the problems, what can and cannot be done.

For example, suppose that our intelligence forces determine that the Reds have massed forces on the coast of the mainland of China in the first step of an assault on Formosa. Do we wait until those forces have crossed 1 inch over the drawn line? Or do we strike those forces on the mainland before they get that far? Do we alter the risk of whether the Reds go 1 inch over that line?

One thing is as contrasted with what it seems to be to the American people. There should be no difference. It should be what it seems to be.

It is my impression that to a majority of the members of both parties, it seems to be an ultimatum to the Red Chinese that we will take so much and no more; that we have drawn a line which we have warned the Red Chinese not to cross; that if they cross we will be war. Grave and awesome as that is, I think the American people have come to the conclusion that we must do what the Red Chinese have given us no other way to do. If they cross the line, we must cross it in advance.

This leads me to the very core of what troubles me the most about this resolution: the question of what it actually is. The real contrast here is with what it seems to be to the American people. There should be no difference. It should be what it seems to be.

It is my impression that to a majority of the members of both parties, it seems to be an ultimatum to the Red Chinese that we will take so much and no more; that we have drawn a line which we have warned the Red Chinese not to cross; that if they cross we will be war. Grave and awesome as that is, I think the American people have come to the conclusion that we must do what the Red Chinese have given us no other way to do. If they cross the line, we must cross it in advance.

This leads me to the very core of what troubles me the most about this resolution: the question of what it actually is. The real contrast here is with what it seems to be to the American people. There should be no difference. It should be what it seems to be.

It is my impression that to a majority of the members of both parties, it seems to be an ultimatum to the Red Chinese that we will take so much and no more; that we have drawn a line which we have warned the Red Chinese not to cross; that if they cross we will be war. Grave and awesome as that is, I think the American people have come to the conclusion that we must do what the Red Chinese have given us no other way to do. If they cross the line, we must cross it in advance.

This leads me to the very core of what troubles me the most about this resolution: the question of what it actually is. The real contrast here is with what it seems to be to the American people. There should be no difference. It should be what it seems to be.

It is my impression that to a majority of the members of both parties, it seems to be an ultimatum to the Red Chinese that we will take so much and no more; that we have drawn a line which we have warned the Red Chinese not to cross; that if they cross we will be war. Grave and awesome as that is, I think the American people have come to the conclusion that we must do what the Red Chinese have given us no other way to do. If they cross the line, we must cross it in advance.

This leads me to the very core of what troubles me the most about this resolution: the question of what it actually is. The real contrast here is with what it seems to be to the American people. There should be no difference. It should be what it seems to be.
Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I decline to yield at this time.

So, Mr. President, Red China liquidates them in that way. No one can question that she rules and controls the mainland of China by these repressive acts, and, as far as I am concerned, she is in de facto control there, and we know her to be a de facto government.

The Senator from Massachusetts cannot cite a single instance in history where the President has exercised his emergency powers to revoke his action. I respectfully submit that under the Constitution he has no right to commit an act of war upon a de facto government without violating the long history of our country, which shows that we have never committed acts of war by way of aggression.

That is my position; and everything I have said this afternoon on the doctrine of self-defense does not start, Mr. President, until he begins the assault, the one who proceeds to beat him up cannot invoke the right of self-defense. Every lawyer in the Senate knows that.

Therefore, I wish to say that I do not think we can escape the fact that under the record which has been made in connection with the joint resolution, the President goes beyond his emergency power on the basis of present facts. This joint resolution implies clearly that we would be authorizing, in advance, preventive war. That is an argument of analogy used by the President of the United States, but not in free America. We have the clear constitutional obligation, when we take our oath of office, to enter service in this body, to exercise a freedom of choice in the Senate. If we think the President is making a mistake, we owe a serious patriotic obligation to the man in the White House to express to him our honest differences of opinion with him, and to let him know as to the implications, the effects, and the possible results of this resolution.

One of the main bound arguments I have heard in connection with this subject—an argument which we heard in committee, and an argument which was repeated by the Senator from Maine, and by the Senator from Kansas, and is going to let the record stand exactly as I said it to the Vice President's desk at the time we entered this body, to exercise freedom of choice. No President of the United States can be authorized, in advance of any exercise of power, take away from a Member of the Senate the duty to exercise freedom of choice.

One of the main bound arguments I have heard in connection with this subject—an argument which we heard in committee, and an argument which was repeated by the Senator from Maine, and by the Senator from Kansas, and is going to let the record stand exactly as I said it to the Vice President's desk at the time we entered this body, to exercise freedom of choice. No President of the United States can be authorized, in advance of any exercise of power, take away from a Member of the Senate the duty to exercise freedom of choice.

One of the main bound arguments I have heard in connection with this subject—an argument which we heard in committee, and an argument which was repeated by the Senator from Maine, and by the Senator from Kansas, and is going to let the record stand exactly as I said it to the Vice President's desk at the time we entered this body, to exercise freedom of choice. No President of the United States can be authorized, in advance of any exercise of power, take away from a Member of the Senate the duty to exercise freedom of choice.

One of the main bound arguments I have heard in connection with this subject—an argument which we heard in committee, and an argument which was repeated by the Senator from Maine, and by the Senator from Kansas, and is going to let the record stand exactly as I said it to the Vice President's desk at the time we entered this body, to exercise freedom of choice. No President of the United States can be authorized, in advance of any exercise of power, take away from a Member of the Senate the duty to exercise freedom of choice.
That is the position I have taken, in urging in the Senate in years gone by that we take advantage of every opportunity to build up the system of international relations which the great Senator Vandenberg of Michigan used to proclaim so effectively from his desk on many a pertinent occasion where he was the other Member of this body. In those historic speeches he pleaded for support for a system of international justice through law. If one rereads those speeches, he will see that time and again he pointed out that the hope of permanent and lasting peace in the world will never be attained until we use international judicial processes to accomplish it.

I think Russia will not go along for a long time, but I want to keep her in such a position that we can show the rest of the world that when she has an opportunity to support a system of international justice through law, she will not go along. That is why I have urged on more than one occasion that we call her bluff, that we show the falsity of her hand, so to speak, by asking her to take a dispute to the World Court. We shall not get her before the World Court as of the present. When do I think we will start getting her there whenever we become successful in keeping the free nations of the United Nations united shoulder to shoulder.

Another great lesson Vandenberg taught us was that one of the devices of the so-called neutral nations is the strangest interpretation of what the United Nations trusteeship is to suggest that the United Nations trusteeship for Formosa would be weakened one iota. I am not one for labels. I do not care what might be called a U.N. neutral nations' commission, which would endanger the defense of Formosa. If one reads the speeches of Senator Wiley, he will see that time and again he pointed out that there would be leakages through the Soviet world and its allies back to Communist China, which would endanger the defense of Formosa.

Therefore I think it is a very practical problem that we must face. Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

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

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Let us call Russia's bluff, in the light of all the phony, false peace propaganda she is sending around the world. If she means it when she implies that she wants peace in the South Pacific. One of the best tests as to whether or not she means it is whether or not she would join us in any proposal of a U.N. trusteeship on Formosa. Let us call Russia's bluff on that point.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Why, under the same circumstances, and with a good

Switzerland in North Korea are limited to the ports of entry.

I should think that the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa would have to have their heads examined if they ever permitted a similar neutral nations' commission to roam around the fortifications and beach defenses and gun emplacements on Formosa, when the information that such representatives obtained would go to the Security Council of the United Nations, which every 6 or 7 months is heard to be the effective agency of the United Nations, and to the Military Applications Commission, of which every 3 or 4 months a Soviet representative shows up as chairman.

From public admissions of representatives of the Soviet Union during the Korean war we know that at the U.N. they not only gave moral support to the aggression in Korea, against the authority of the U.N., but that they supplied the arms and equipment and MIG planes and tanks and ammunition, and practically every other type of equipment, and defined U.N. military facilities.

Under those circumstances, how could any responsible Nationalist Chinese official on Formosa, with any sense of responsibility, say, in the face of the tens of 9½ million people, to whom he has a great responsibility, upon the U.N., which did not produce the force to resist aggression in Korea, particularly when we knew there would be leakages through the Soviet world and its allies back to Communist China, which would endanger the defense of Formosa.

I never tolerated another man's money, but on the basis of our colloquy I would infer that the Senator from California thinks it is impossible to develop a trusteeship for Formosa which would be satisfactory and practical.

If we let us think that we would not in any way weaken the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa, because they would still be under our protection until we were convinced that the U.N. protectorate would protect their interests and until the people on Formosa were convinced that it would protect their interests.

I am not for 1 second advocating the weakening of the protection of the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa. I am saying, however, that we ought to carry this propaganda fight to the Russians, and I think that end could be brought about by the willingness to propose and advocate a U.N. protectorate over Formosa which would avoid the kind of impractical problem the Senator from California and I would have, and which would advance a system of international justice through law.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Why, under the same circumstances, and with a good
deal of justification, should we not say—and I am saying this in all seriousness—that the United Nations is threatened in the peace of the world. Therefore, let us arrange a supervised U. N. election on the mainland of China, as well as on the islands of Formosa, and let us give the people of China an opportunity to express their views as to what kind of government they would like to have.

Why must we always pick out our friends in the list of the free nations of the world, particularly when the Senator has so ably pointed out the ruthless type of tyranny which exists in Communist China, and never be allowed to make a suggestion or proposal that the same question be submitted to the people of China, who are unfortunate enough to be on the mainland, as to whether they wish to live under that type of government they would like to have?

We could make a little propaganda out of that suggestion going behind the Chinese equivalent of the Iron Curtain, whether it be a bamboo curtain or a similar suggestion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall take only another minute or two to say that there is a great deal of talk about two Chinas existing over Formosa at the present time, which is not to our best interest. It is a great deal of talk about two Chinas existing over Formosa at the present time, which is not to our best interest.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon advocates doing everything we can possibly do to explore any possibility of developing the kind of protectorate in Formosa that the British have with the Chinese, and at the same time remove us from what I believe to be the singular position of maintaining a jurisdiction over Formosa at the present time which the United States is not interested in.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall take only another minute or two to say that there is a great deal of talk about two Chinas existing over Formosa at the present time. It is always Formosa that is stressed.

If there is to be a discussion or any proposal made for a trusteeship with respect to the island of Formosa, where the free Chinese are in possession, I believe that any government, whether it be the Indian Government or the British Government or any other government, has an equal responsibility to suggest that the United States is interested in the Communists. Let them submit the issue to their people under a U. N. trusteeship or under a U. N. supervised election.

We suggested such a course in Korea, but I think it is the duty of the Government, who apply the force, so to speak, to the Republic of China on the island of Formosa, but not make a similar suggestion with respect to the Chinese mainland?

The second point I should like to bring up is that perhaps the analogy which has been drawn by the Senator from Oregon and by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] is a little wrong with relation to this situation.

The Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon during the colloquy spoke of the man in the back-yard who has a lawyer and his neighbor. I quite agree that under those circumstances the neighbor would not be justified in going over and knocking off the other United Nations is interested in, even though he had shown an unfriendly attitude.

The Senator from Oregon is the former dean of a law school and an able lawyer, while I am not a lawyer, but a newspapersman. Let me suggest a little closer analogy. Suppose in the Senator's neighborhood there was a person who had killed his brother and perhaps one of his sons, and had recently kidnaped three of his children, and then he had publicly and unequivocally stated that at the first opportunity he would shoot the Senator from Oregon; and suppose that when the Senator from Oregon went out into his yard, within view of his neighbors, his brother had shot the son and kidnaped three of his children, and his neighbor pulled out a Colt .45 and started to load it, as well as a sawed-off shotgun, and then proceeded to point it at the Senator from Oregon. I ask the Senator whether under those circumstances he would not be justified in at least assuming that his neighbor was going to kill him at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. MORSE. I say goodnaturedly that I would not run over to my neighbor's yard.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] is about to make a request of me, as acting majority leader, for some time. I wish to serve notice on him that if I yield for a very definite purpose, and that I do not wish him to be as extravagant with time as was the Member of the Senate to whom I yielded 5 minutes.

I inquire of the Senator from Minnesota as to the amount of time he may require.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my good friend from Kentucky that my request for time will be for less than the 5 minutes under the normal clock arrangements which are customary in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield, with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor; but let me urge the Senator to confine his remarks to as many minutes less than 5 as may be possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Inasmuch as I am a similar suggestion, I merely want to announce that the amendment which I introduced, relating to Senate Joint Resolution 28 as it is found on page 2, is cosponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], and I seek unanimous consent that we may hold it open for others who have indicated to me that they want to join in cosponsoring the amendment. However, they were not present when I offered it, and I did not feel at liberty to add their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota understands that it would not be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not so understand, Mr. President. Then I shall leave it at that.

I should like to make this observation in reference to the amendment, so that my colleagues may know its purpose as they read the Record tomorrow morning.

What it does is to strike out the language on page 2, after line 11, insert a period after the word "attack" and strike out the remainder of the sentence down through line 11.

The language which would remain would be:

It is that language which will authorize the President to do what he says he wishes to do, namely, to safeguard and protect the vital interests of the United States by the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

I would merely cite, Mr. President, what I read recently in the dispatches in the Senate lobby from the Associated Press and the United Press, to the effect that a foreign minister of the chief ally of the United States of America, that ally being Great Britain, and that Foreign Minister believes, in reply to questions this afternoon, in the House of Commons, stated that he considered the offshore islands which have been referred to so frequently in these debates, particularly Formosa, to be within the territorial jurisdiction of the Communist government of China. He considered that the island of Formosa is in a separate category, in view of the relationship of the United States to the island and the disposition of that island since that time, and, therefore, its defense and security is obviously the legitimate interest of the nation.

I merely make this observation because, while the Secretary of State has informed many of us that the relationships between our chief ally, Great Britain, and the United States, and in accord, it is perfectly obvious that there is a great difference of opinion as to the right of a nation such as ours to interfere in what is considered to be a domestic matter, a civil war, and the right and the obligation of our country to take a stand in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, which by the regular relations of our country to the conflict of World War II are outside the jurisdiction of the Communist government of China.

I further add, Mr. President, that when I stated today that the Senate should reject the resolution which is before the Senate is submitted for us to consider before the decision is made, I felt that I should sharply dissent from that attitude and that observation. The truth is, as the Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smoot], who made that general observation stated, herself, that we have no choice. The President has already announced what he has constitutionally do, and he placed before us his desire, his objective, and his purpose by formal resolution. So that the resolution is not one which we are permitted to design; it is one which we are permitted to accept or reject; and to reject it would be to undermine the President's authority completely and totally.

I regret to say that we find ourselves in that particular position. I feel that my amendment, however, will do much to clarify the intent and purpose which have been stated again and again as to our objective in defending Formosa and
the Pescadores and which may very well save us from a debacle second to none if we accept such tenuous and uncertain language as is found in the resolution relating to island territories and posession if held in unfriendly hands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at (6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 27, 1955, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Re: Paul R. Abbott, Church of the Advent, Episcopal, Brownsville, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our only governor and king, who hast brought us from many places in this vast country, who hast committed to us, through Thy people, the solemn trust of government, we confess that we are creatures of weakness, that we are often tempted to do the evil we know not. We are divided and torn between many loyalties, sometimes taking the easy way to avoid criticism and seeking the easy honor of popularity.

Yet Thou hast made us as Thine own children and hast said in Thy holy word: "Yet Thou hast made us as Thine own children, and hast said in Thy holy word, 'Come near to Me, I will speak unto thee in easy speech, and make it known unto thee in the words of My heart'," and shall not hear even the search.

In some cases of ship loss at sea there are no survivors and none knows just when the ship went down, or in what area. So it is that I raise once more the question of mandatory radio contact and I agree with the words of the New York Times, as follows:

As far as we know there is no valid argument against such a rule, and not to have it simply is to ignore an ordinary safety precaution that would be neither difficult nor costly.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I introduce this bill, to require certain ships to report by radio their position every 24 hours.

CONTINUATION OF EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO PERSONS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 111, Rept. No. 9), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 587) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration the bill shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

THE DEBATE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 159

Mr. OLIVER B. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Bevran] stand in the Raccoon.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I regretted to note yesterday, during the debate of House Joint Resolution 159, the gentleman from California took advantage of the opportunity to accuse President Eisenhower of duplicity in the message to the Congress of January 24 regarding the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. I resent this attack upon the President of the United States, and I endeavor to state the facts in their correct sense.

The gentleman referred to the President's message of February 2, 1953, which revoked the earlier order given by former President Truman in June 1950 that the 7th Fleet was not to prevent Formosa from being used as a base of operations against the Chinese mainland. The gentleman terms this statement "brazen partisanship" and apparently is under the impression that the President's message of January 24 represents a retreat from this position.

He goes even further in stating that President Eisenhower knew that he was speaking an untruth when he made this statement approximately 2 years ago.

I confess myself completely unable to follow the gentleman's logic. In June of 1950, at the time of the Communist invasion of South Korea, former President Truman ordered the 7th Fleet to prevent attack upon Formosa and to prevent from moving to it any Formosan troops or national guardsmen of the Communist-held mainland. It is a well-known fact that the United States has no troops or national guardsmen of the Communist Chinese mainland. It is also a well-known fact that the Communists in their attempt to extend their domination over Formosa and across the Taiwan Strait, have moved troops into Manchuria and then into Korea. Two months ago, the Communists had no concern for the protection of their long and exposed coastal line from attack by the US Navy. It was, to say the least, an unnecessary advantage to give to a country with whom we were at war for all intents and purposes. President Eisenhower was right in correcting this mistake in his message of February 2, 1953 and in ordering the 7th Fleet to be used solely for the defense of Formosa and not also as a defense of the Chinese Communist-held mainland.

There was no objection. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?