

H. R. 6262. A bill for the relief of Kikuko Shioya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
H. R. 6263. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Arnesch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 6264. A bill for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM (by request):

H. R. 6265. A bill for the relief of Marian Diane Delphine Sachs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 6266. A bill to provide for the restoration, maintenance, and care of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Circle of the Highland Lawn Cemetery, Terre Haute, Ind.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6267. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Nash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 6268. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Maragoudakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6269. A bill for the relief of Karl Beker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6270. A bill for the relief of Jane Loraine Hindman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 6271. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Music Supply Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 6272. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Monseu, Maria Monseu, and their minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 6273. A bill to amend the act relating to the incorporation of Trinity College of Washington, D. C., in order to make the archbishop of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Washington an ex officio member and chairman of the board of trustees of such college; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6274. A bill to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles I. Chattin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6275. A bill for the relief of Hector Ellsmore Chevannes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (by request):

H. R. 6276. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Mascalco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6277. A bill for the relief of Anna E. Hollander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6278. A bill for the relief of Samuele Rossi (also known as Renato Rossi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 6279. A bill for the relief of Alan Keith Stanfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6280. A bill relating to the conveyance of certain property in Shawnee, Okla., by quitclaim deed, to Alfred F. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 6281. A bill for the relief of Northeast Airlines, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 6282. A bill for the relief of Yajiu Yamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

518. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 45 members of the First Baptist Church of Beaver Falls, Pa., protesting the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

519. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Board of Aldermen, Somerville, Mass., memorializing the President and the Congress to take cognizance of the act and to alleviate the plight of the overtaxed American citizen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

520. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Townsend Clubs of Florida, Miami, Fla., relative to requesting passage of the bills, H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 10, 1952)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, from every direction ceaseless voices call to us until there is a confusion and contradiction of demands. But in all the clamor of the day let us hear the one voice that is consistent and clear. Thy voice, and we shall be satisfied. In the cross-currents of life catch us up in the very gale of glory that, as the winds of destiny blow over us, we shall know we have prepared ourselves for such time as this. Give us strength to bear the burden and battle of the day that we may be worthy to wear the crown of life. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 28, 1952, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and for the remainder of the week.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for

the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

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

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

##### REPORT ON HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipts and expenditures of the helium-production fund; to the Committee on Armed Services.

##### STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Chairman of the Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual stockpile report of the Board for the period July-December 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

##### AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT AND AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of November 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

##### AUDIT REPORT ON PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Panama Railroad Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

##### REPORT OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

##### REPORT ON RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no reservations from all appropriations lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, were made during the year 1951; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

##### REPORT ON EXCHANGE OF RECREATIONAL LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the year 1951, no exchanges were made of recreational lands for lands of equal value or equal quantity; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

##### REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Three letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Albert or Wojciech or Wocjciech Fuchs, Angela Louisa Sebazco, and Fanny Cassas, from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, and transmitted to the Senate on April 2, June 1, 1951, and January 15, 1952, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Agency, for the period January 1 to December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN GOVERN- MENT RECORDS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the disposal of certain Government records, for the calendar year 1951 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

##### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions adopted at the national convention, Blue Star Mothers of America, at Milwaukee, Wis., relating to universal military training, and so forth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Secretary of State of the State of Rhode Island, notifying the Senate an authenticated copy of an interstate civil defense compact entered into by that State had been submitted to the Senate on July 12, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The memorial of Lyle C. Doble, of Boulder Creek, Calif., relating to voluntary retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Stanley C. Barker, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the confirmation of the nomination of Harry A. MacDonald to the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Townsend Clubs of Florida, at Miami, Fla., relating to old-age assistance, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Nellie Quick, of Valrico, Fla., praying for the inclusion of widows of Spanish War veterans under the terms of House bill 4394, to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Queensboro Mothers' Club, Inc., at New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 4544, to establish in the Bureau of Customs the United States Customs Port Patrol and the

United States Customs Border Patrol in order to improve the enforcement of the anti-smuggling laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Luther League of America, Philadelphia, Pa., signed by Leslie Conrad, Jr., executive secretary, remonstrating against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Fancy Farm Baptist Church, of Fancy Farm, and the Eastwood Baptist Church, of Eastwood, both in the State of Kentucky, protesting against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of Pearl Oaby, of the United States, remonstrating against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Alameda, and the City Council of the City of Montebello, both in the State of California, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 940, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Federal Workers Union, Local 20, New York, N. Y., signed by Theodore R. Shipp, president, relating to the murder of Mr. and Mrs. Harry T. Moore (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATION- ALITY LAWS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1137) thereon.

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

The bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, reported by Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

##### By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2534. A bill for the relief of Catherine Nina Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. THYE:

S. 2535. A bill for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar; and

S. 2536. A bill for the relief of Branimir V. Popovitch and Mila B. Popovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2537. A bill for the relief of Stanley C. Lary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2538. A bill granting equipment allowances to postmasters at offices in which post-office fixtures and equipment are furnished by the postmaster; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

##### By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2539. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, with re-

spect to the use of broadcasting facilities by candidates for public office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

##### By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2540. A bill for the relief of Nahi Youssef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2541. A bill for the relief of Roy Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 2542. A bill to provide for a decrease in the rate of interest to be paid by the United States in the acquisition of lands under the power of eminent domain, title to which is taken in advance of final judgment; and

S. 2543. A bill to amend section 3055 of title 18, United States Code, entitled Crimes and Criminal Procedure, with respect to the powers of law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2544. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 2545. A bill to amend section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance or payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2546. A bill to provide attorneys liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 2547. A bill to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2548. A bill to make it unlawful for a member of a Communist organization to hold an office or employment with any labor organization, and to permit the discharge by employers of persons who are members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

##### By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2549. A bill to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2550. A bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he reported the above bill from the Committee on the Judiciary, which appear under a separate heading.)

##### By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2551. A bill to reduce individual income tax payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

#### RATE OF INTEREST TO BE PAID IN ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, by request of the Department of Justice, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a decrease in the rate of interest to be paid by the United States in the acquisition of lands under the power of eminent domain, title to which is taken in advance of final judgment. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Department with respect to the bill, be printed

in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2542) to provide for a decrease in the rate of interest to be paid by the United States in the acquisition of lands under the power of eminent domain, title to which is taken in advance of final judgment, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (by request), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, section 10 of the act of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1415, 1417; Title 16, sec. 16-1605, D. C. Code) and section 1 of the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421; 40 U. S. C. 28a) are hereby amended to provide that the rate of interest to be paid thereunder shall be 4 percent per annum instead of 6 percent per annum.

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

JUNE 4, 1951.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Department of Justice recommends the enactment of amendatory legislation to reduce the rate of interest that must be paid by the United States in condemnation cases where a declaration of taking is filed and the final award of just compensation exceeds the estimated amount of compensation deposited in the registry of the court.

Under the terms of the act of March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1415, 1417), an act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States, declarations of taking in condemnation proceedings vesting title immediately in the United States were authorized. By the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421) this authority was extended to all condemnation suits by the Government. Whenever the United States files a declaration of taking in a condemnation suit there is deposited in the registry of the court a sum of money which is estimated to be just compensation for the property taken. Subsequently, it may be judicially determined that the value of the property is greater than the sum estimated by the Government, and on this difference which is known as a deficiency judgment, interest must be paid at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the time of the taking. It is the view of this Department that this rate of interest is excessive and should be reduced to 4 percent per annum.

The enactment of this legislation would not only save large sums of money paid out annually as interest, but would discourage the prolonging of condemnation proceedings by condemnees. In several recent decisions by the Court of Claims in eminent domain cases, the rate of interest up to the time of judgment has been 4 percent. This has been done without statutory direction, and has been allowed as a measure of the additional amount needed to make just compensation. After judgment, the rate of interest as provided by sections 1346 and 2411 of title 28, United States Code, is 4 percent per annum from the date of the judgment up to, but not exceeding 30 days after the approval of any appropriation act providing for payment of the judgment. This rate applies to all interest payments on judgments against the United States au-

thorized by these two sections, except overpayments of internal revenue taxes.

The proposed change would make for greater uniformity in the interest payments made by the United States. Also, it is quite obvious that the present 6 percent rate applicable to condemnation cases where declarations of taking are used is higher than the prevailing interest rate. It is much higher than rates on Government bonds and even higher than first mortgage interest rates.

The foregoing recommendation may be effectuated by the enactment of the proposed bill which is attached for your consideration.

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

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,  
Deputy Attorney General.

#### AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO POWERS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS OF BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, by request of the Interior Department, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 3055 of title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to the powers of law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Department, and a memorandum be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2543) to amend section 3055 of title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to the powers of law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (by request), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the analysis of chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 3041 of such title, is amended by striking out item 3055 of such analysis and inserting in lieu thereof "3055. Powers of special law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

SEC. 2. Section 3055 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3055. Powers of special law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

"Special law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and their deputies, may carry firearms and may make searches and seizures permitted by law for the violation of any Federal law or regulation specifically applicable to Indians or their restricted or trust property. Such officers and their deputies may make arrests without warrant for any violation of such laws or regulations that has been committed in their presence, or for any felony cognizable under such laws if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony, may execute all warrants of arrest and other lawful precepts issued under the authority of the United States, and may command all necessary assistance in the execution of their duties."

The letter and memorandum presented by Mr. McCARRAN are as follows:

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, D. C., December 28, 1951.  
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 3055 of title 18, United States Code, entitled Crimes and Criminal Procedure, with respect to the powers of law enforcement officers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

I request that this proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and I recommend that it be enacted.

Numerous laws pertaining to Indians enacted by Congress have imposed duties upon the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs necessitating the employment of special officers and deputy special officers to enforce these various laws and to maintain law and order among Indians on Indian reservations.

For many years Congress recognized the need to vest in these law enforcement officers special powers to enable them to perform their work efficiently. The act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1017; 25 U. S. C., sec. 248) and section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 519; 25 U. S. C., sec. 250), conferred this necessary power in connection with the suppression of Indian liquor traffic. Among other things, these officers were granted the same authority in performing their duties that sheriffs in the States have in executing State laws. This authority usually includes the right to carry firearms, to make searches and seizures without a warrant where permitted by law, and to arrest without a warrant if a felony has been committed in their presence, or if a felony has been committed and reasonable grounds exist to believe that the person to be arrested has committed the felony.

When the present title 18 of the United States Code was revised and codified by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 683), as amended, section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 was repealed and section 3055 of title 18 of the United States Code was enacted in its stead. This section does not authorize special officers to carry arms, or to make arrests except on a warrant or other lawful precept. Other Federal law enforcement officials have such authority in the performance of their duties. For example, section 3053 of title 18 empowers United States Marshals and deputies to carry firearms and to make arrests without warrant for any offenses committed in their presence or for any felony cognizable under the laws of the United States if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony.

Many of those who violate the laws applicable to Indians, including Indians, carry weapons. Lack of specific authority on the part of the special officers to carry firearms places them at a distinct disadvantage. Although the work is dangerous, the lack of sufficient personnel requires that the special officers work alone most of the time. Of necessity, they work largely in isolated areas at long distances from communities. They should therefore be authorized to protect themselves by carrying firearms.

The authority to make immediate arrests is essential to the apprehension of criminals and the maintenance of law and order among Indians on Indian reservations. Because the special officers lack adequate authority, particularly since the enactment of section 3055, title 18, United States Code, and the repeal of section 1 of the act of August 24,

1912, the officers are seriously hindered in the performance of their duties. When a special officer leaves the scene of the crime to obtain a warrant, frequently at a distant place, future arrest becomes increasingly difficult to effect. The knowledge of this limitation of the arresting powers of the special officers tends to encourage offenders and to discredit the law enforcement officers in the local communities.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed bill to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DALE E. DOTY,  
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR McCARRAN

I want the record to show that I am not wholly in sympathy with this bill.

I think that the powers which were taken from the Bureau of Indian Affairs by the enactment of title 18, United States Code, into law ought to be restored. However, the draft of the proposed amendment to title 18 as submitted by the Department of the Interior goes beyond that objective.

Prior to the enactment of title 18 into law, the chief special officer for the suppression of liquor traffic among Indians and the duly authorized officers working under his supervision had, as the letter of transmittal points out, the same authority in performing their duties as sheriffs in the States have in executing State laws. While I have been unable to find any cases construing this particular grant of authority, such a grant usually includes the right to carry firearms, to make searches and seizures without a warrant where permitted by law, and to make arrests without a warrant if a felony has been committed in their presence, or if a felony has been committed and reasonable grounds exist to believe that the person to be arrested has committed the felony.

These powers just listed are granted specifically by the proposed bill. However, the proposed legislation grants these powers to an enlarged group of officers within the Bureau and it makes these powers available to this enlarged group in a number of instances not covered by the earlier grant of authority. More specifically, these powers were originally granted to the chief special officer for the suppression of liquor traffic and the duly authorized officers working under his supervision. The proposed bill grants these powers to all special law-enforcement officers of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Further, the earlier grant of these powers to the chief special officer for the suppression of liquor traffic and those working with him carried an implication that the exercise of these powers was restricted to their use in matters relating to the suppression of liquor traffic among Indians. The proposed bill permits the exercise of these powers in instances of searches and seizures permitted by law by the special enforcement officers for the violation of any Federal law or regulation applicable to Indians or their restricted or trust property. It should also be pointed out that these officers are permitted by the proposed bill to make arrests without a warrant for any violation of Federal laws or regulations relating to Indians committed in their presence. No authority was granted in the earlier section cited as justification for the enactment of this legislation to make arrests without a warrant for the violation of a Federal regulation.

The reasons for these extensions of the earlier statute are not readily apparent; nor is the letter of transmittal informative on this point. The extensions may prove as necessary as the restoration of the original authority seems to be, but it is my feeling that an explanation and justification of these extensions should be made by the Bureau.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT RELATING TO JUDICIAL RELIEF

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial relief. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a memorandum relating thereto be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2544) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial relief, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after subsection (g) thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Any person eligible for a return under this section who has timely filed a notice of claim for return or who may hereafter file a notice of claim within 2 years from the date of seizure by or vesting in the Alien Property Custodian, may institute a suit in equity to recover such money or other property in the manner provided by subsection 9 (a) hereof and with like effect: *Provided,* That said suit may be filed within 1 year from the date of enactment of this subsection, anything in section 33 hereof to the contrary notwithstanding, but in computing such 1 year there shall be excluded any period during which there was pending a claim for return: *Provided further,* That the court in which suit is filed shall advance the cause for hearing and determination with all possible dispatch."

The memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE AMENDMENT TO 50 UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 32

During the war, property of Americans in Germany was vested by the United States for protective purposes. Section 32 was enacted in order to facilitate returns of such property, their own property, roughly speaking, to Americans caught behind enemy lines and persecutees. But no provision was made for judicial review.

The amendment is designed to insure a judicial remedy to such claimants. It springs from the creeping pace at which returns to eligible claimants are being made, from the arbitrary manner in which some American claimants are being denied returns, and from the fact that the section 33 limitations provision has been read to deny existing judicial review to those Americans who relied on the administrative remedy to secure a return. In consequence, many Americans are being stripped of their property contrary to the intention of Congress and without a day in court.

The proposed amendment is modeled after section 9 (c) of the Trading With the Enemy Act. The proviso for advancement of the cause on the dockets of the district courts is copied in haec verba from 22 United States Code, section 403 (formerly sec. 240) which provides for the restoration of certain property seized by the Government. In many cases claimants have been waiting 5 years or more for restoration and in numerous instances the seized property is all that will shield the claimant from destitution. It is

well known that district court calendars are crowded and that an early return of property can be insured only by awarding such cases a priority on the court calendars.

A few case histories will outline the problem.

1. Carl G. Pass, a native-born citizen, returned to the United States in August 1946 and filed his claim with the Alien Property Custodian on September 23, 1946. At first he could not obtain a return because the custodian construed section 32 to deny returns to so-called "dual nationals," i. e., Americans who, Germany could claim, were also German nationals by reason of marriage or parentage. This indefensible interpretation was set aside by Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress, second session. Thereafter the Claims Branch of the Office of Alien Property advised that Pass could not obtain a return for the reason that he had violated Nazi exchange laws in an effort to conceal his American assets from the Nazis so as to escape Nazi coercion to transfer the assets to Germany.

Meanwhile, Pass instituted suit under section 9 (a) of the act. The suit was dismissed under section 33 as coming too late. Section 9 permits a citizen to seek either administrative or judicial relief or both. It contains no warning that administrative relief is a mantrap, that claimants should avoid it in favor of the judicial remedy. Originally section 33 provided that the period for bringing suit should be tolled by the filing of an administrative claim. Senate Report No. 1839 (79th Cong. 2d sess.) which accompanied section 33 said (p. 3) that "fairness requires" that the period during which a claim was pending before the administrator be subtracted from the time for filing suit. When section 33 was amended in 1948, the tolling clause was inadvertently omitted with respect to some claimants, but retained with respect to others. The legislative history shows that this discriminatory omission was never intended. The consequence is that Pass, a resident American who owns the vested property, will be deprived of his life work, contrary to the intention of Congress, unless the inadvertence respecting tolling in section 33 is corrected so that he may ask judicial protection of his rights.

2. Clare Raffloer Droesse, an aged American citizen now resident in Germany, illustrates another deficiency of the present law. Public Law 859 imposed a ceiling of \$5,000,000 on the amount of property which may be administratively returned thereunder to American citizens. This affords an absurd if not unconstitutional spectacle: only those Americans who got in line first may get their property back. Being far down the list of claimants Mrs. Droesse is unlikely to obtain her property administratively.

The courts have held that an American resident in Germany, still "enemy" territory for purposes of the act, is an "enemy" who is ineligible to sue for recovery of his property. Since the government has seized all of Mrs. Droesse's American assets, she is unable to return to the United States with the object of filing suit. Public Law 859 permits administrative returns to Americans resident in Germany. It is the purpose of the amendment to insure a return to such Americans by opening the door to judicial relief.

3. The amendment goes beyond relief to American citizens in that section 32 includes refugees and persecutees. It is almost 6 years since Congress provided relief in section 32 for those unfortunate victims. In the interim the mountain of these claims has not been appreciably reduced. If the Congress wishes these claimants to enjoy their property during their lifetime, it must open the court room doors and order that their cases be advanced for hearing.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO  
PAYMENT TO CERTAIN FEDERAL EM-  
PLOYEES OF TRAVEL AND SUBSIST-  
ENCE EXPENSES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, by request of the Department of Justice, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance or payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Department be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2545) to amend section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance or payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (by request), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, be amended by the addition of a sentence reading as follows:

"In any case which does not involve its activity, any department or agency may advance or pay the travel expenses and per diem allowance of its officer or employee in attending court as a witness and later obtain reimbursement from the department or agency properly chargeable with such witness' travel expenses."

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1952.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
United States Senate, Wash-  
ington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Department of Justice recommends the amendment of section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance or payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency.

It is often necessary to use personnel of the various agencies and departments of Government as witnesses in litigation which, although not affecting the operations or activities of their respective offices, affects the interests of the United States. For example, in the trial of a considerable number of cases brought under the Federal Tort Claims Act it is essential that the Department of Justice obtain the attendance and testimony of persons in the Department of Defense. Many of these witnesses are unable to finance trips to places distant from their duty stations, and in the absence of advances by their agencies, they are unable to appear for the Government.

In a recent decision, dated May 18, 1951 (B-97772), the Comptroller General ruled that agency advances of travel expenses and allowances to personnel attending court as Government witnesses in cases not affecting the activities of the agency are improper. Despite the ruling, however, the Comptroller General has recognized the difficulty of the situation confronting the Department of Justice and has suggested that "the matter . . . be submitted to the Congress for its sanction."

Accordingly, there is attached a draft proposal to amend section 1823 (a) so as spe-

cifically to authorize the advances of such funds and the subsequent reimbursement of the advancing agencies.

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

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney General.

ATTORNEYS LIENS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for attorneys liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States. In my opinion, such a statute is greatly needed; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2546) to provide for attorneys liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That from the commencement of an action, or other proceeding, in any court or before any department, agent, or agency of the United States, or the service of an answer containing counterclaim, an attorney whose appearance has been entered for a party shall have a lien upon his client's cause of action, claim, or counterclaim, which shall attach to any verdict, report, determination, decision, judgment, or final order in his client's favor, and the proceeds thereof in whatever hands they may come. Such lien shall not be affected by any settlement between the parties before or after judgment, final order, or determination. The court, department, agent, or agency entering such final order shall, upon petition of the client or the attorney, determine and enforce such lien.

SEC. 2. No statute forbidding or limiting the assignment of a claim against the United States shall be deemed to apply to the lien established as aforesaid.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO  
DOCKET FEES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of Justice, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Department and a memorandum prepared by the staff of the Judiciary Committee, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2547) to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, by request, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first item listed in section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"\$20 on trial or final hearing (including a default judgment whether entered by the court or by the clerk) in civil, criminal, or admiralty cases, except that in cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction where the libellant recovers less than \$50 the proctor's docket fee shall be \$10."

The letter and memorandum presented by Mr. McCARRAN are as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1952.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Department of Justice recommends the amendment of section 1923 of title 28, United States Code, so as to clarify the intent of the section to authorize the taxation of attorney's and proctor's docket fees as costs upon the entry of default judgments.

Section 1923 of title 28 provides in pertinent part:

"(a) Attorney's and proctor's docket fees in courts of the United States may be taxed as costs as follows:

"\$20 on trial or final hearing in civil, criminal, or admiralty cases."

Time and again the question has been raised as to whether entry of a default judgment constitutes a "final hearing" within the contemplation of the language above quoted. It has consistently been the view of the Department of Justice that such an entry is a final hearing, and, therefore, that an attorney's docket fee of \$20 is taxable as costs in any case where a default judgment has been entered.

Section 1923 of title 28, United States Code, is a consolidation and revision of sections 823 and 824 of the Revised Statutes (secs. 571 and 572 of title 28, U. S. C. 1940 ed.), and section 6 of the act of May 28, 1896, 29 Statute 179, as amended (28 U. S. C. 1940 ed., 578). The reviser's note to section 1923 indicates clearly that in consolidating and revising the predecessor sections it was intended to eliminate the earlier limitation of \$10 in "cases at law when judgment is rendered without a jury" and to provide that in all cases which reach final hearing or trial—whether in law or in equity, and whether with or without a jury—a docket fee of \$20 would pertain. No other substantive changes were contemplated, and so the same definition of "final hearing" which previously had applied in equity and admiralty cases under section 572, would apply to civil and criminal cases under the revised section. It having been clearly established by judicial determinations that a docket fee is taxable where a final decree is entered on an order pro confesso in equity, the same rule should apply to the counterpart of such a judgment in law, a default judgment.

A further question arises with respect to a default judgment when it has been entered by a clerk pursuant to rule 55 (b) (1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the argument sometimes being made that even if a default judgment entered by a judge constitutes a final hearing, one entered by a clerk does not.

Although the Department of Justice has been of the view that all default judgments are final hearings within the contemplation of section 1923, irrespective of whether they are entered by judges or by clerks, and although this view of the Department has been supported generally in the courts, it is considered advisable to so clarify the section as to eliminate the possibility of any further controversy with respect to its scope.

There is attached for your consideration a draft bill which would effectuate this recommendation.

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

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney General.

MEMORANDUM FOR STAFF INFORMATION RE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PROPOSAL TO AMEND  
SECTION 1923, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

Costs are taxed as an ordinary incident of litigation (*F. D. I. C. v. Billings County, N. D.* (168 F. 2d 452, CCA-8, 1948)) under statutory authority. Costs as known today were unknown to the common law and, without the aid of statute, liability therefor rests only on the party incurring them (*Vincennes Steel Corp. v. Miller* (94 F. 2d 347 (CCA-5, 1938))). Under common law costs were not recoverable against the opposing party and one requiring a service to be performed was required to pay the legal charges therefor (*United States v. Ringgold* (33 U. S. 150 (1834))).

Mr. Harry M. Hull, Clerk of the local district court, advises that the \$20 docket fee was not taxed in his office in cases terminated by default judgments prior to the decision in *United States v. Bowden* (182 F. 2d 251 (CCA-10, Apr. 28, 1950)). That case arose in the United States District Court for the District of Utah, being an action by the United States against Bowden for the balance due on a note. Judge Ritter entered a default judgment for plaintiff, and thereafter a motion was made to retax costs.<sup>1</sup> The district court refused to tax an attorney's docket fee (under 28 U. S. C. 1923 (a)) and plaintiff appealed. The circuit court of appeals concluded its decision in this manner:

"4. While we entertain no doubt that the entry of the default judgment was a final hearing within the meaning of the statute, we conclude that the taxation of costs is a matter vested in the sound discretion of the trial court.

"The cause will be remanded with instructions to the trial court to vacate the order denying the motion to retax the costs and to determine in the exercise of its discretion whether an attorney's docket fee should be taxed as costs against the defendants below" (182 F. 2d, p. 252).

After this decision came to his attention, Mr. Hull advises, his office began taxing attorneys' docket fees in default judgment cases.

Although the Tenth Circuit did not cite the decision in the Bowden case, the United States District Court for the Western District of South Carolina had previously held flatly that a default judgment entered by the clerk is a final hearing within the meaning of 28 United States Code 1923 and allowed taxing of the attorney's docket fee of \$20 in *United States v. Herlong* (13 Fed. Rules Serv. 55 b. 14, Case 1; 9 F. R. D. 194 (1949)).

On the other hand, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio held in 1951 that the United States (as plaintiff) was not entitled to the \$20 docket fee in a case settled by consent judgment in its favor (*United States v. New York Cent. R. Co.* (97 F. Supp. 727)). The court went further, however, by instructing the clerk to disallow the item of \$20 charged as docket fees under section 1923 in any future case involving the entry of a default judgment (at p. 729).

The annotations in United States Code Annotated substantiate the statement in the attached letter that it is well established by judicial determinations that a docket fee is taxable where a final decree is entered on an order pro confesso in equity proceedings.

<sup>1</sup>Mr. Hull explains that the attorney for the prevailing party submits an affidavit to the clerk of court stating a bill of costs. The clerk then taxes such costs as he deems just and authorized, and the opposing party then has 5 days to respond or to move for retaxing of the costs. The prevailing party has the same period of time to make such motion if he regards the clerk's action erroneous. In either event such motion is considered and determined by the court, subject to appeal.

Since a clerk is authorized to enter a default judgment under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it would seem that no distinction is necessary in this respect between the entry by the clerk and entry by the court. The decision in the Herlong case, supra, observed that the clerk's function in such a matter is not merely perfunctory, since he must examine the affidavits filed and satisfy himself that they meet the requirements of rule 55 (a). The court said further that the clerk merely acts in place of the judge, in entering a default judgment, and the function is the same whether exercised by judge or clerk.

In these circumstances it appears that clarification of the statute with reference to default judgments is desirable, and from a practicable standpoint it seems that in a default judgment case the judgment creditor is as much entitled to recovery of the docket fee as in the case which proceeds to final hearing. Therefore, acceptance of the Attorney General's proposal to amend the statute is recommended.

EMPLOYMENT BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS  
OF COMMUNISTS

Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make it unlawful for a member of a Communist organization to hold an office or employment with any labor organization, and to permit the discharge by employers of persons who are members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2548) to make it unlawful for a member of a Communist organization to hold an office or employment with any labor organization, and to permit the discharge by employers of persons who are members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

During the first session of this Congress, I introduced legislation, S. 1975, having as one of its purposes the protection of loyal labor unions against infiltration by Communists and members of communistic organizations. I am sure my colleagues all recognize the importance of this problem, and that legislation must be enacted to combat the vigorous and subversive activities of Communists in the labor movement.

Since the introduction of S. 1975, numerous conferences have been held with representatives of the American Federation of Labor and the CIO in an effort to reach some agreement on language which would accomplish our purpose without weakening the position of honest and loyal men in the labor field.

Today I have sent to the desk a bill which I might have chosen as an amendment to S. 1975. This is a modified form of the recent bill and is not intended as a final answer to the problem. I expect to appoint a subcommittee to proceed at once so that full and complete hearings will be given. It is my desire that legislation giving legal protection for both unions and employer from the cancerous growth of communism be enacted by the Senate.

This bill differs from S. 1975 in two respects: (1) Section 2 of the amendment will amend subsection 5 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 instead of section 4 of that act. The original bill and the amendment both make it unlawful for a Communist to hold office or employment in a labor union. (2) Section 3 of the original bill was found to be too indefinite in its provisions and the amendment specifies the instances in which a Communist may be discharged by an employer.

You will recall that S. 1975 was introduced following a recommendation of members of the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and this bill is being introduced today in order to carry out the wishes of this subcommittee.

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

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address entitled "American Foreign Policy in the Far East," delivered by him at the Institute of Far Eastern Studies, Seton Hall University, South Orange, N. J.

By Mr. TAFT:

Article entitled "War by Executive Order," written by Senator WATKINS, and published in the December 1951 issue of the Western Political Quarterly.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

An article entitled, "A Formula for Clean Government," written by Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, and published in the New York Times supplement.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him, address delivered by him, and attached material relative to investigation of the Office of Alien Property.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Address on the importance of the St. Lawrence seaway to Indiana and other Midwest States, delivered by Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration at the Indiana State-wide meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., January 24, 1952.

Address regarding the Canadian viewpoint on the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, delivered by Rt. Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of the Canadian Government, Departments of Trade and Commerce and Defence Production, at the annual dinner of the Washington Society of Engineers, Washington, D. C., November 28, 1951.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

A column by Constantine Brown on the subject of the offshore procurement program.

TREATIES OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE,  
AND NAVIGATION WITH THE ITALIAN  
REPUBLIC AND THE KINGDOM OF DEN-  
MARK—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF  
SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive H, Eighty-second Congress, second session, an agreement supplementing the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Italian Republic, signed at Washington on September 26, 1951, and Executive I, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Denmark, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Copenhagen on October 1, 1951. The

Chair understands that the State Department has no objection to the removal of the injunction of secrecy from the treaties. Therefore, without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaties, and the treaties together with the messages from the President will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's messages will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's messages are as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith an agreement supplementing the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Italian Republic, signed at Washington on September 26, 1951.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the agreement.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 29, 1952.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) agreement supplementing the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States and Italy, signed at Washington, September 26, 1951.)

*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 treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Denmark, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Copenhagen on October 1, 1951.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the minutes of interpretation, initialed on the same date the treaty and protocol were signed, and a report on the treaty and protocol made to me by the Secretary of State.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 29, 1952.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol, signed at Copenhagen October 1, 1951; (3) minutes of interpretation, initialed at Copenhagen October 1, 1951.)

REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to recommit Senate bill 2104.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for that purpose.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Alken	Hendrickson	McMahon
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bridges	Holland	Moody
Connally	Ives	Murray
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Dirksen	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Dworkshak	Lehman	Sparkman
Ferguson	Magnuson	Thye
Fulbright	Maione	Tobey
George	McClellan	Underwood
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPEL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNING, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, since the majority leader is present, and also the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I am wondering whether we might not get a unanimous-consent agreement, or some indication as to when we may vote on the pending measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey may yield for that purpose only by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose. I told the majority leader that if Senators desired to bring up the question of a unanimous-consent agreement, I would yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have been endeavoring to work out a unanimous-consent agreement whereby the pending bill could be disposed of tomorrow. Several telephone calls are now being made. Perhaps a little later on we may be able to do that, though we are unable to do it at the moment.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, with the same understanding, namely, that I do not lose the privilege of the floor.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. This is a matter which could be settled before the Senator proceeds with his speech.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very happy to yield, upon unanimous consent being given that I shall not thereby lose the privilege of the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from New Jersey yielding to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield to either the majority leader or the minority leader, provided I do not thereby lose the privilege of the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that it is possible to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote tomorrow, upon the following conditions, namely, that the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be temporarily withdrawn. I understand that the Senator from Arkansas is willing to accept the Bricker amendment, and we would then be able to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, as follows, namely, to limit the debate, beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock, to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side, on all motions and amendments, and 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side, on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me see whether my understanding is correct. I have talked with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and he is willing to withdraw temporarily his motion to recommit. We might then reach a unanimous-consent agreement that, starting at 12 o'clock tomorrow, debate upon any amendment, or upon a motion to recommit, or upon the bill itself, shall be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield, with the same understanding.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The understanding would be, would it not, that immediately after the Bricker amendment is disposed of, the Capehart motion would be re-

stored automatically to its present position?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is such an understanding necessary? I had anticipated discussing with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] one or two other amendments which I believe may be acceptable, before a vote is taken on a motion to recommit. The Senator from Indiana could make such a motion at any time he desired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield, I was merely suggesting that taking up the Bricker amendment is entirely a matter of a temporary suspension, and that the Capehart motion would then resume its former position, after the Bricker amendment shall have been disposed of.

Mr. McFARLAND. I can make the suggestion to the Senator from Arkansas in that manner, and can discuss with the Senator from Indiana when he returns any further suspension of his motion.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Capehart motion to recommit be temporarily withdrawn or set aside in order that we may dispose of the Bricker amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that all?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is all I want to ask at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how would the time be divided—1 hour, 30 minutes to a side?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The majority leader has not yet come to that.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have not yet come to that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, has the distinguished majority leader made a request to fix the time for a final vote on this bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not as yet.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator contemplate doing so?

Mr. McFARLAND. I contemplate doing so, if and when we shall have disposed of the Bricker amendment; that is, I contemplate at that time proposing a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate, beginning tomorrow, to 1 hour on all amendments and motions, and on the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, does the majority leader expect to add to the unanimous-consent request a provision that no amendment, not germane to the bill, may be proposed?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I shall do that when the unanimous-consent agreement is proposed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Did I correctly understand that after action on the Bricker amendment the motion to recommit would then resume its place automatically?

Mr. McFARLAND. I asked that the motion to recommit be temporarily laid aside, which would make it the pending question following disposition of the Bricker amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that the motion by the Senator from Indiana be temporarily laid aside, that

the Bricker amendment be regarded as the immediate pending question to be disposed of, and that thereupon the motion of the Senator from Indiana shall automatically resume its legislative status. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield, upon the previous understanding.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I ask that his amendment be considered and acted upon immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will automatically become the pending question.

Mr. McFARLAND. We are trying to dispose of it now, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad to yield, provided I have unanimous consent that I do not thereby lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the clerk will read for the information of the Senate the pending Bricker amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. The enactment of this act shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is my understanding that the managers of the bill which is before the Senate are willing to accept the Bricker amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, that is correct. I am willing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question, therefore, is on the Bricker amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Capehart motion to recommit now automatically resumes its former status.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield with the same understanding.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. BRIDGES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at 12 o'clock tomorrow, debate on the

pending bill be limited to 1 hour on any motion, amendment or appeal, or in the bill itself, the time to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment or the maker of the motion and the Senator from Arkansas, in the event that he is opposed to the amendment or the motion and in the event that he is in favor of it, the time to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader; the time on the bill to be controlled by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the minority leader or any Senator whom he may designate; with the further provisions that all amendments must be germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that amendments may be offered during the course of the debate?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, with a limitation of 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Thirty minutes on the bill itself as well as on amendments?

Mr. McFARLAND. On the bill itself and on any amendments.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

*Ordered*, That on Wednesday, January 30, 1952, beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock noon, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and upon the question of the final passage of the said bill, be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, in the case of amendments, motions, or appeals, by the mover of any such amendment or motion (including appeals) and Mr. FULBRIGHT: *Provided*, That in the event Mr. FULBRIGHT is in favor of any such amendment, motion, or appeal, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That upon the question of the final passage of the said bill, the debate shall be equally divided and controlled by Mr. FULBRIGHT and the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

#### REPORT ON FAR EASTERN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a member of the Far East Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, I recently returned with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and Mr. John Foster Dulles, from a trip to Japan and other places in the far-eastern area. This is the second time I have been to that area, having made a visit there in 1949.

While my remarks today will be directed primarily to the Far East, I want to invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that in the past year or two I have twice been to Europe and have studied the situation in the Atlantic Pact nations. So, although I am focusing my remarks today on the Far East, I am



trying to relate the problems there to the whole foreign relations picture, for, of course, I realize the importance of the North Atlantic area.

In the past 2 years we have come to the decision that the concept of collective security is the basis of our foreign policy, because the Communist threat is obviously world wide. Furthermore we are aware that the United States has the responsibility of leadership of the free world in building collective security both in Asia and in Europe. While I recognize the importance of the Atlantic Pact area and the very important work which General Eisenhower is doing in bringing about participation by the western European nations in collective defense, I have the feeling, which I think is shared by many other persons, that the Middle East and the Far East present the two most immediate threats to world security.

I have not been to the Middle East; the problems there are now being studied by the Middle East Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee; but I have been to the Far East, and, therefore, I shall confine my remarks to the Far East in my address to the Senate today.

#### YEARNING FOR FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

Mr. President, let me state, first of all, as the foundation of everything I shall say, that from my trip in 1949 and my trip in the past year, in which I visited Japan, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Korea, and Formosa, which is all that is left of free China, I believe the basic cause of turmoil in this area is a deep-rooted yearning for freedom and independence. The people are seeking to be free of the old traditional colonialism and imperialism, and they resent exploitation by any outside powers, especially by the so-called white man.

As Americans, we have a problem because we are identified with our good friends France and Great Britain in their world-wide position, and, unfortunately, they have a certain reputation for imperialism and colonialism among far eastern and many middle eastern peoples.

Unfortunately, in Asia many people fail to realize the imperialistic implications of Russian domination, and they are led astray by Russian propaganda which falsely promises freedom if the communistic system is followed. This has already resulted in Communist domination on the mainland of China, and has thus been the direct cause of one of the greatest threats to the security of the free world.

#### FREE AND INDEPENDENT CHINA

So, Mr. President, in considering the whole picture, I have come to the conclusion that if we want a free and independent Asia, which might well mean the freedom of the world, we should think in terms of a free and independent China.

I emphasize a free and independent China as a basis for peace in Asia. That was my conclusion 2 years ago, but it was not so clear in my mind as it is today. Two years ago I felt very strongly that we should not recognize Communist China, because we had evidence that it was simply a puppet government of Rus-

sia. At that time I also took the position that the Island of Formosa, which is all that is left of free China, was absolutely vital for our own security and that we should not permit it to fall into hostile hands. I am glad to say that both those ideas have proved to be correct and that our own policy today is along the line of nonrecognition of Communist China and of protecting Formosa from any possible hostile invasion.

From my studies and my trips to the Far East I am perfectly convinced that a Russian-controlled China, continuing indefinitely, will mean a Russian-controlled Asia. If China remains behind the iron curtain it will be very difficult for other countries in Asia which are outside the iron curtain to develop as free and independent nations. On the other hand, a free and independent China, together with a free and independent Japan, which is about to be brought about by the Japanese peace treaty—and I may say parenthetically that I hope to address myself to the subject of the Japanese peace treaty very shortly when it comes before the Senate for ratification—a free and independent China, together with a free and independent Japan and, I hope, a free and independent India, might very well lead to sound democratic government for all of Asia. We cannot compromise. China must become free and independent and play a significant role in a free Asia. This must be an important key to our far-eastern policy.

#### COMMUNIST AGGRESSION IN KOREA

Mr. President, the next point I wish to discuss—and it has to do immediately with our problems in Korea—is how to stop Chinese Communist aggression. I am absolutely convinced that Chinese Communist aggression is inspired by Moscow and directed by Moscow, that all orders are taken from Moscow. The leadership does not move without Moscow. Therefore we are faced with a continuing threat in the far-eastern area which has been evidenced first by open aggression in Korea, and by threats of aggression elsewhere, in every case using alien peoples as puppets of the Russian policy. This is evidenced in Korea, first, by the use of the North Koreans, and now of the Communist Chinese. It is my firm conviction that wherever aggression appears, it can be stopped only by a courageous and determined policy, not only on our part, but also on the part of the western powers and of our United Nations associates. A weak policy has invited and will invite further aggression.

Let us consider, then, the problem of Korea. In my judgment, the intervention of the United Nations in 1950, when the aggression first occurred, was justified. The North Koreans attacked, and the United Nations helped South Korea to resist. I did not approve of our taking that action without endorsement by action of Congress, especially by the Senate of the United States. I think there should have been a resolution of endorsement. Regardless of that, it would not have been possible for us to stay out of Korea without surrendering that whole area to the Communists, thereby endan-

gering Japan and our own island chain in the Far East. From the standpoint of our own self-defense, the United States was compelled to act; certainly from the standpoint of the United Nations, the United Nations had to act, because the aggression was clearly defiance of the authority of the United Nations, which could not be tolerated.

Under the wise leadership and strategy of General MacArthur we were successful in pushing the North Koreans back to the Yalu River. But when the Chinese Communists entered the war, a new situation arose. The greatly reinforced enemy pushed our forces back, and at present the line of defense is at a place which we have partially determined as being slightly north of the thirty-eighth parallel. For 6 months precious time has been consumed in discussing proposals for a truce or armistice.

My own observation, based on my trip and discussions with military people, is that if there could be an honorable armistice, which would save human lives, no effort should be spared to achieve it. But every time we have approached agreement on an armistice, the Communists have countered with another suggestion or an objection to the terms that have been proposed. The result is that an armistice has not been achieved after more than 6 months of discussion.

Meantime, it is perfectly clear to anyone who visits Korea that the Communists have increased their fire power by making available more artillery and ground forces. Worse than that, they have increased their air power by constructing airfields behind the Yalu, and even south of the Yalu, in North Korea, thus placing the position of the United Nations in jeopardy, in the event the truce talks collapse.

I was interested to read an article published in the U. S. News and World Report of January 11, 1952, entitled, "How To Deal With Communists." This article is based on the views of our own military and naval authorities who have been engaged in the negotiations. According to the editor's note, this article was submitted, before publication, to the Press Advisory Division of General Ridgway's headquarters. I shall quote from it as a build-up, I might say, for the argument I intend to make for the policy I advocate in Korea:

Communist leaders, fundamentally, are convinced that the United States is afraid to risk major war and can be bluffed and forced to make sacrifices if treated roughly. \* \* \* If the Communists are convinced that the West really will fight, then there will be no fight. \* \* \* They seem to respect only power that can and will be used to back up a United States position. It must be power in being and in place, where it can be seen and believed unquestionably.

The inevitable conclusion from that would be that we have been willing to be pushed around in the truce negotiations and that we are at a great military disadvantage in our dealings with the Communists on the Peninsula of Korea.

#### EXTREME SANCTIONS AGAINST AGGRESSION

It is my considered judgment that we must now be prepared to apply extreme sanctions, and I shall shortly define

what I mean by those words. We should not limit our retaliation only to action on the Korean Peninsula, where we are at a great military disadvantage. I suggest that extreme sanctions should very definitely be applied in the following circumstances:

(a) If, for a time that may be designated, the Communists continue to stall the truce talks; or

(b) if they agree to a truce but then do not abide by it.

The sanctions should apply also if the Communists engage in aggression elsewhere in the Far East. I shall discuss that matter a little later. I am now speaking of Korea. If the Communists continue to stall or if they agree to a truce and then break it, we must not hesitate to take effective action by the application of extreme sanctions.

What are extreme sanctions? Whenever I have used that expression, many people have asked me what I mean. I shall give examples, although they are not all-inclusive. Many things might be considered:

First, a blockade of the Chinese coast by the United Nations. That would mean cutting off China from all seaward intercourse with other powers, if China continues to defy the United Nations.

Second, air, sea, and matériel support for the Nationalist Army on Formosa, for the purpose of guerrilla attacks on the mainland of China. I am not advocating all-out war on the mainland, because the Chinese Nationalists are not in a position to conduct such a war today. However, they could cause a great amount of trouble by making guerrilla raids on the mainland of China from Formosa. I may remind my colleagues that Formosa is at the moment the last bastion of the free Chinese, who are opposing the Chinese Communist movement.

Third, air and sea attacks should be made on vulnerable Chinese ports and military supply lines, if that should be necessary. I hope it will not be necessary. I doubt that such bombing will be necessary if an effective blockade is applied; but if it is necessary, we should not hesitate to take these steps rather than continue to have our boys killed in Korea.

The next step, in my opinion, is most important, and I wish to emphasize it. It is the withdrawal of recognition of Communist China by those countries which have recognized the Communist regime. I refer especially to our British friends, but there are also other free-world countries which have recognized Communist China. To me it seems perfectly absurd that members of the United Nations, whose forces are engaged in fighting in Korea against Chinese Communist aggression, should still continue to recognize the aggressor government.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I had overlooked saying, as I began my remarks, that I hoped I might make my statement consecutively, and that questions would then be asked.

If the Senator from California has no objection, I should prefer to complete my entire statement.

I shall continue to emphasize this point because my own mind is not clear as to what argument our British friends can continue to make for the recognition of Communist China, especially in light of the way they have been abused by the Communists. The British themselves have not been recognized by the Communists. Of course, if there were a discontinuance of recognition, there might be an interference with trade, but I cannot believe that trade is as important as the saving of human lives, which are now being lost in Korea, especially when 90 percent of the United Nations armed forces there consist of our own sons who have gone into that war.

Despite the fact that I have been critical of the far-eastern policy of the administration, I am happy to say that I think we are moving in the direction I have been discussing. I cannot help but feel, from a reading of the newspapers and periodicals that there is a trend toward a firmer attitude in the event that aggressions continue or break out elsewhere.

Let me quote from an article which appeared in Time magazine on January 14, which to me was very illuminating. I have no idea whether it is authoritative, or whether it really expresses the policy of our Government. I hope either that it does express it, or that something along this line is being contemplated. I have no way of knowing.

The United States Government, for the first time since the Chinese Reds attacked 14 months ago, has finally figured out what it is going to do about the Korean war. The new policy has been approved, tentatively and in principle, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council, of which the President and the Secretary of State are members. The policy may be abandoned later. It may not survive the opposition of allied governments, with which it is now being discussed. But as of now, this is the plan:

Whatever the Communists do, the United States will not be drawn into a resumption of the struggle on the Korean Peninsula, which is not a good place for the United States to fight. Therefore the United States will be able to reduce greatly its present forces in Korea.

If the Reds sign a truce and then break in with another offensive in Korea, the United States will not confine its resistance to Korea or even concentrate on Korea. Instead, it will blockade the coast of China and attack Chinese coastal cities by air.

That was one of the suggestions I made in my earlier remarks defining extreme sanctions.

If the Reds do not sign a truce and do attempt to resume offensive war in Korea—either in the air, or on the ground, or both—the main United States reply will come not in Korea but by air-sea attack on the Chinese coastal cities.

How to limit a war: This does not mean a threat of unlimited war with Red China. The limits of the present war are set by the enemy and are to his advantage. Under the new Washington plan, the United States would set the limits to its advantage.

Whether this is our present policy, I do not know. I have reason to believe that our authorities are discussing these

points with our allies, and are thinking seriously of taking these drastic steps. This is certainly an encouraging indication that we are considering the employment of more stringent measures.

In this connection I call attention to an article published in the New York Herald Tribune of this morning, with regard to action reported yesterday in Paris. The New York Tribune, in an article dated Paris, January 28, by Mr. John G. Rogers, a correspondent of the Tribune, says:

The western Big Three warned Russia and the Chinese Peking regime today, in effect, that any new Communist aggression in southeast Asia would be met by United Nations force.

American delegate John Sherman Cooper led the way before the Political Committee of the General Assembly by asserting "at this time I must, on instructions from my Government, state clearly" that any attempted Red grab in southeast Asia "would, in the opinion of my Government, be a matter of direct and grave concern which would require the most urgent and earnest consideration by the U. N."

Then follow a few paragraphs quoting a similar British and the French position on the same subject. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the remainder of this article.

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

British Minister of State Selwyn Lloyd followed with a declaration to the Russians and the Chinese Communists that, in case they had any aggressive Asian plans, they had better take into consideration that Great Britain stood squarely with the United States on the issue of opposing them.

French delegate Francis Lacoste stressed that any intervention from outside to support the rebel Vietminh forces the French are fighting in Indochina would constitute cause for immediate and effective action by the U. N.

The American-British-French statements were prompted by a recent accusation made by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Y. Vishinsky, who charged that the United States was ferrying Chinese Nationalist troops to Burma and Thailand for aggression against Communist China. Western diplomats speculated that Mr. Vishinsky might have been trying to build up advance justification for Communist military intervention in southeast Asia.

Today before the political committee, which is debating a Chinese Nationalist charge of Russian treaty breaking, Soviet Delegate Yakov A. Malik repeated the flavor of the Vishinsky charge and said the Western Powers are planning an aggression against Red China from southeast Asia.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am mindful of what the Senator said previously, and I would not, except under the circumstances I shall outline, interrupt him at this point, because I can realize his desire for continuity in his remarks. However, I have a luncheon engagement to which I shall be called very shortly, and I am afraid that perhaps I shall miss the remainder of the Senator's remarks, though I will read them in the RECORD.

On this particular point I thought it might be helpful, both to the Senate

and to the country, to raise now a point which I think needs to be discussed. If the Senator still feels, under the circumstances, that he would prefer to continue, I shall, of course, not pursue the matter.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad to yield to the Senator if he must leave. I know that he is familiar with this entire subject. I should like to use his observations to support the entire argument which I am making.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that I think the time has come when this country must stop yielding to international blackmail on the part of the Soviet Union and its satellites, either in Asia or in Europe.

I quite agree with the Senator from New Jersey that the United States cannot continue for a prolonged period of time to take 93 percent of the casualties, supply 90 percent of the United Nations forces in Korea, and ask men to fight and die, while denying them the right to win. On that point I think there is no general disagreement between the Senator's position and mine.

However, I am concerned by the statement made yesterday by Mr. Cooper, the American representative in the United Nations, to the effect, as I understood it, that if the Communists either break the truce or move in southeast Asia, it will be considered a matter of grave concern to the Government of the United States, and will require us to take the matter up immediately with the United Nations.

The reason I am concerned is this: When Chinese Communists crossed the Yalu in force in November and December of 1950, despite the fact that it was a clear-cut case of overt aggression, it took the United Nations more than 6 months to call it aggression.

In case the Communists move in southeast Asia or move against our forces now involved in Korea, if the matter is merely to be taken up before the United Nations, the United Nations may still be debating the question after southeast Asia has fallen, or after Formosa has been invaded, or after our troops have been jeopardized in Korea.

I am wondering what assurances either the State Department, Mr. Cooper, or the Senator from New Jersey could give that taking up the matter before the United Nations would be effective action so far as stopping aggression is concerned. We cannot escape the realities of the situation. Eighteen months after an overt aggression has taken place in Korea, out of 60 members of the United Nations, deducting 5 as representing the Soviet Union and its satellites, leaving 55, up until today, as the Senator is speaking, only 17 of those nations have sent a single soldier, sailor, or airman to resist aggression in Korea. All 17 of them put together have contributed only approximately 35,000. The United States of America alone has contributed more than 350,000. The Republic of China on Formosa alone offered 33,000 of its best troops 4 days

after the aggression took place, but that offer was declined by the United Nations for fear that it might antagonize the Chinese Communists.

What I want to know is, what assurances have we that if further aggression takes place we shall get more than a 10-percent contribution from the other members of the United Nations?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to have the Senator's question. I point out to him that before I conclude my remarks I shall try to deal with the very situation which he suggests. I am perfectly satisfied that we cannot wait upon the United Nations if adequate preparations are not made in advance for prompt U. N. action. The extreme sanctions to which I have referred are not necessarily limited to action by the United Nations. I would first take the question up with the United Nations; but if the United Nations would not act, I should try to persuade Britain and France to go along with us. If they would not do so, we would have to explore the possibility of going it alone. As matters are now, we cannot continue to let the situation drift. It does not make sense.

As I have suggested earlier, in case the truce talks should fail, or in case a truce should be agreed to and then violated, or in case of aggression anywhere else, the extreme sanctions principle should be applied at once at least by the three major powers, as I understand is implied in the article from Time magazine from which I have read. We ought to put the heat on them to go along in such action, because it must be taken if we are to get results. While I have always favored taking these matters up before the United Nations, which has a primary responsibility, we cannot wait for the United Nations to act while our boys are being killed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield once more so that I may ask him a question on this point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from New Jersey that with the facts as they were available on the 25th day of June 1950, had the administration frankly taken Congress into its full confidence it very likely could have secured approval by congressional resolution. That may be a debatable point, but I believe that anyone who examines the evidence presented at the time would be inclined to believe that that would have been so. I also agree with the Senator from New Jersey that the President and the State Department made a very serious error in not following the Constitution and bringing the matter to the attention of Congress.

Does not the able Senator from New Jersey believe that even at this late date the President of the United States and the Secretary of State have certainly an equal obligation—and I believe under the Constitution a higher obligation—to consult with Congress on the effective steps which may have to be taken in southeast Asia, or wherever aggression may break

out, as they have consulted with the United Nations? The United Nations is a parliamentary body, in a sense representing the nations which have joined together under the Charter.

However, I do not believe that the executive branch of the Government of the United States should be allowed to overlook the primary duty it owes to Congress. The Senate and the House are entitled to have the same free and full consultation and the same taking into confidence on the part of the executive branch as is being accorded to the United Nations, by having statements made on the floor of the United Nations by one of our able representatives in the organization.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There can be no question about the correctness of the statement of the Senator from California. Earlier in my remarks I stated that when the Korean question arose I urged that it be referred to the Senate and to the House of Representatives for the purpose of confirming the action which had been taken by the administration. Before the brief interruption I was discussing the Korean situation and where we would find ourselves in the event that the truce talks should break down.

#### POSSIBLE AGGRESSION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

I move now to southeast Asia where we know there is a large Communist build-up. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and I had contemplated going to Indochina, Malaya, Thailand, and Indonesia, to observe the Communist threats and the general situation in those countries, but, unfortunately, we did not have the time to make the trip. However, from the information available, there can be no doubt at all that there is an enormous concentration of Communist troops in that area ready to strike somewhere in that region.

Mr. President, the argument I am presenting is that we should make our position perfectly clear, and get our allies to join us in serving notice, not only on Communist China, but on the Soviet Union, that aggression will result in the kind of sanctions I have been discussing. I refer to extreme sanctions. This policy should be developed, as the Senator from California has pointed out, through full cooperation between the executive branch and other arms of the Government.

Mr. President, there is one point I desire to make perfectly clear. I want the RECORD to show that I do not believe in putting American boys ashore on the mainland of Asia. I am not advocating any such thing. My recommendations are limited to naval and air forces.

I do not know whether the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was present on the occasion, but during my trip I had a very interesting experience. I had an interview with the President of South Korea, Dr. Syngman Rhee. He was disturbed by the possibility that a truce would divide Korea again. He said, "We do not expect your boys to be called on to give us a free Republic of

Korea. All we ask for is that you give us equipment and that you train our own people. We do not want you to sacrifice your own boys. It is much better for Asians to fight Asians, for South Koreans to fight the Communists of China. It is better to do that than to have Occidentals fighting against Asians."

He also pointed out that they were eager to get into the fray and to be trained for that purpose. He implied that we had neglected the opportunity to train Asians in the numbers that should be trained.

Another interesting part of our trip took us to Formosa. I talked to General Chiang Kai-shek, and much to my amazement he made exactly the same comment. He said, "It is much better for you to train our boys. We do not want your boys on the mainland. We want to have Asians trained who are opposed to communism. All we ask is your assistance in training them and in equipping them."

Naturally I took the matter up with our own officials. I was told earlier that the policy would be agreed to by our military authorities, and that they were training the natives as rapidly as they could, but that they did not feel that they could train a sufficient number of them to hold the fort. That may be a military question. I am certain that such a policy would meet with the approval of the people of the United States. American boys should not be sent to the mainland of China, and should be relieved of duty in Korea as soon as we feel that the situation permits such action.

#### POSITIVE PROGRAMS FOR FREE CHINA

Mr. President, earlier in my remarks I referred to a free and independent China as the key to a free and independent Asia, and as the foundation for our far-eastern policy. Although we know that there is an underground movement in China, if we dawdle along there, and temporize on the policy for a free and independent China, we will be on completely unsound ground in our far-eastern policy. My suggestion is absolutely in line with our "open door" policy with respect to China which we have maintained for 50 years. It is in line with our territorial integrity policy toward China. Yet, at the present time we are not willing to take a stand for a free and independent China.

If we are to threaten the Communist Chinese Government with extreme sanctions, I want to be in a position to hold out hope to the people within China who are opposed to Communist control that there is a policy somewhere in the world looking toward their freedom.

I cite Formosa as an example of the success of such a policy. I was there 2 years ago, and I was there again last fall. We have there an example of what can be done in the Far East in helping people defend themselves. We have given economic aid to Formosa. We had a hand, I believe, in the appointment of a key civilian to the governorship. He is

a man to whom I am proud to refer, because he is a graduate of my own university, Princeton. I refer to Mr. K. C. Wu. For 2 years Mr. K. C. Wu has been acting as civilian governor with the distinct purpose of setting up a democratic administration based on participation of all the people—and that includes the Formosan people themselves—in governing themselves. As a result, much of the prejudice toward the presence of the free Chinese in Formosa seems to have subsided, and the Chinese and Formosans there are working together in their determination to prevent the further spread of communism in Asia and to bring about a free and independent China. Formosa is an example of what may be done in any area which is under the control of free Chinese.

As I said a moment ago, there are many anti-Communists on the mainland who need encouragement. If we keep presenting the idea that we favor a free and independent China, we shall bring them encouragement. However, I would go even further than that; I would let those people know that we are prepared to propose to them a program of technical and economic aid, if they need it, as an alternative to what they are getting from the Communists. I would show the Chinese the help which China would receive from the free world if she were to free herself from Soviet domination, if she stopped what I have called aggressive expansionism, if she stopped being the menace she is to the world today under the prodding of Moscow, and if she became a part of the free and independent Asia movement. We should emphasize our objective of building up a strong, free China as a full partner with the rest of the free world rather than as a colonial subject of an imperialistic power, which she is today.

So, Mr. President, there are two prongs to my proposal for a free and independent China. One is to stop aggression by the Chinese. We should tell them that they must stop their aggression and cease a policy which menaces the free world and harms China as well. We must make them understand the importance of that. The other part of my proposal is to get them to understand that we propose to help them if China becomes free and independent as part of a free and independent Asia movement. We should outline the position of China in the new, specific collective-security arrangements.

Presently the Foreign Relations Committee will report to the Senate, as the Chair knows, the Japanese peace treaty and the security treaties based on it, which contemplate joint security arrangements between the United States and the Philippines, the United States and Japan, and the United States and Australia and New Zealand. Those arrangements are designed to protect all those areas from aggression, and if China becomes a free and independent nation, of course, she will be included. In other words, our so-called extension of the Monroe Doctrine principle to the Far

East would include such an area as China.

However, we cannot rest after merely making that statement; we must do more than that. We must publicize throughout Asia our program of economic aid and collective security. I would stop using the Voice of America in Asia, for I think it has caused some misunderstanding and some difficulty. I would help it to be turned into a Voice of Free Asia. I would make the key to our Far Eastern policy the growth of free and independent nations in Asia, and I would continue to propagandize that idea and to talk about it and tell what it means, and I would send that word to every corner of that continent.

It is my considered judgment that a free and independent China on our side will cost vastly less than military preparedness against an aggressive Communist China. We must use the methods I am proposing to stop aggression by Communist China and to make China a free and independent nation.

So much for China for the moment.

#### PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN JAPAN

My next comment is on the progress and problems of Japan. I shall not develop those fully now, because presently there will come to the floor the Japanese peace treaty, and then we shall have occasion to discuss that treaty and the related problems.

However, there has been considerable discussion, which I have not touched on thus far, as to whether the Japanese Government, after the peace treaty is ratified, will recognize Communist China or will recognize Nationalist China.

There is no doubt in my mind as to what the Japanese want to do. Mr. Dulles, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and I were able, when talking with the Japanese leadership, to get from them the clear impression that they want to be aligned with the western free powers and want to remain that way. They want to recognize the Nationalist Chinese and to make appropriate arrangements with the Nationalist Chinese. They do not want to recognize the Communist Chinese. The Japanese leaders took the position that they hoped that Japan would soon be admitted to the United Nations, and wished to cooperate with the objectives of the United Nations; and as long as the Communist Chinese were in the other camp and were defying the United Nations, they had no interest in dealing with them.

There was another question which troubled the Japanese, namely, the question of their trade, because in some places it was felt that trade with Communist China was necessary for the economic survival of Japan. I have received communications which will be presented in connection with the Japanese Peace Treaty, and which I think will show that it will not be necessary for Japan to trade with Communist China, but, instead, with southeast Asia and eventually, of course, with the free and independent China about which I have been talking.

At this stage in my remarks I think it would be wise to submit for inclusion in the RECORD the letter which Premier Yoshida sent to Mr. John Foster Dulles a few days ago. That letter has been the cause of considerable comment both here and in the Far East. I can say from my personal knowledge that we discussed the letter extensively with Mr. Yoshida, who wrote it, and it was entirely voluntary on the part of the Japanese. In our discussions we tried to communicate to the Japanese what we meant by a free and independent Asia and what it would mean to Japan to be a part of that group, rather than to be a satellite behind the iron curtain of Russia. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Yoshida letter printed at this point in the RECORD. It states the intention of the Yoshida Government to enter into a bilateral treaty with the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa, insofar as the Nationalist Chinese control any area in China, after the ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty with us.

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

(Following is the text of a letter from Shigeru Yoshida, Prime Minister of Japan, to John Foster Dulles which was made public by the Prime Minister last night (January 16, Tokyo time):)

THE GAIMUSHO,  
December 24, 1951.

His Excellency JOHN FOSTER DULLES,  
The Department of State,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AMBASSADOR DULLES: While the Japanese Peace Treaty and the U. S.-Japan Security Treaty were being debated in the House of Representatives and the House of Councillors of the Diet, a number of questions were put and statements made relative to Japan's future policy toward China. Some of the statements, separated from their context and background, gave rise to misapprehensions which I should like to clear up.

The Japanese Government desires ultimately to have a full measure of political peace and commercial intercourse with China which is Japan's close neighbor.

At the present time it is, we hope, possible to develop that kind of relationship with the National Government of the Republic of China, which has the seat, voice, and vote of China in the United Nations, which exercises actual governmental authority over certain territory, and which maintains diplomatic relations with most of the members of the United Nations. To that end my government on November 17, 1951, established a Japanese Government Overseas Agency in Formosa, with the consent of the National Government of China. This is the highest form of relationship with other countries which is now permitted to Japan, pending the coming into force of the multilateral treaty of peace. The Japanese Government Overseas Agency in Formosa is important in its personnel, reflecting the importance which my government attaches to relations with the National Government of the Republic of China. My government is prepared as soon as legally possible to conclude with the National Government of China, if that government so desires, a treaty which will reestablish normal relations between the two governments in conformity with the principles set out in the multilateral treaty of peace. The terms of such bilateral treaty shall, in respect of the Republic of China,

be applicable to all territories which are now, or which may hereafter be, under the control of the National Government of the Republic of China. We will promptly explore this subject with the National Government of China.

As regards the Chinese Communist regime, that regime stands actually condemned by the United Nations of being an aggressor, and, in consequence, the United Nations has recommended certain measures against that regime, in which Japan is now concurring and expects to continue to concur when the multilateral treaty of peace comes into force pursuant to the provisions of article 5 (a) (iii), whereby Japan has undertaken "to give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter and to refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations may take preventive or enforcement action." Furthermore, the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance, concluded in Moscow in 1950, is virtually a military alliance aimed against Japan. In fact there are many reasons to believe that the Communist regime in China is backing the Japan Communist Party in its program of seeking violently to overthrow the constitutional system and the present Government of Japan. In view of these considerations, I can assure you that the Japanese Government has no intention to conclude a bilateral treaty with the Communist regime of China.

Yours sincerely,

SHIGERU YOSHIDA.

#### NEED FOR FREE WORLD COOPERATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the big problem of obtaining the full cooperation of our allies in an effective far-eastern policy is a matter about which I am very much troubled and about which I think we should really talk very frankly among ourselves and with our allies. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has raised the question of whether, if we try to deal with the United Nations in developing a policy, the United Nations can act fast enough on taking adequate preparatory steps to assure united resistance to aggression. Of course, if we can get the United Nations to take such action quickly, all well and good. However, I am not willing to wait for the U. N. if prompt countermeasures are not promptly agreed upon to meet another aggression.

So I wish to review for a moment the position of Great Britain, which, after all, has been our friend down through the years, and whose support we need to help us in developing these policies.

I wish to begin by reading a statement which Mr. Anthony Eden made on January 11 at Columbia University. That statement gave me great hope because of the words he used, although until I know what the British are actually going to do about this matter, I am still troubled. On the eleventh of January, Mr. Eden made this statement at Columbia University:

These positions—

Meaning Korea, Indochina, and Malaya—

must be held. It should be understood that the intervention by Chinese Communists in Southeast Asia—even if they were called volunteers—would create a situation no less

menacing than that which the United Nations met and faced in Korea. In such an event the United Nations, I trust, would be equally solid to resist it. \* \* \* We have reasons to expect that so long as our own purpose is made clear, and so long as we are plainly capable of punishing an aggression, there will be no major war.

I do not know exactly what Mr. Eden means by that statement, but it looks as if his face was set toward firm action in cooperation with us in case of any additional aggression, such as in Indochina or Malaya.

Would Britain withdraw her recognition of Communist China under the hypothesis of a Communist aggression in Indochina or Malaya? Will Britain join with us in the extreme sanctions which I have recommended, and which I have tried to define? Those are questions which I think can be answered only by our British friends, and I hope they will answer them presently.

On January 16, when addressing the Congress, Mr. Churchill made the following statement in connection with this point:

Our two countries—

He was referring to Great Britain and the United States—

are agreed that if the truce we seek is reached only to be broken, our response will be prompt, resolute, and effective.

There again, Mr. President, I am encouraged; I think the British are thinking in our direction on these matters. However, I still raise a question as to what they mean. I am troubled, because I read in the New York Herald Tribune only a few days later, January 21, a column by Mr. David Lawrence, which was entitled "Foreign Office Stand Called Stab in Back for Churchill." I shall not read all of it, but I shall ask that, after I have read two or three paragraphs of it, the entire column by Mr. David Lawrence be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at that point. I shall only read several especially pertinent paragraphs in Mr. Lawrence's statement. Shortly after his opening paragraphs, he says:

The British Prime Minister told Congress last week: "Our two countries are agreed that if the truce we seek is reached only to be broken, our response will be prompt, resolute, and effective."

That is the quotation I read a moment ago. Mr. Lawrence then continues:

Here was a warning that the Communists could not possibly misunderstand. They had been counting on the division between Britain and America over Korean policy.

Further on, Mr. Lawrence says:

Now, at the moment when the warning words of Churchill were calculated to show the Communists that Britain and America stood together, the British Foreign Office pulls the rug from under the feet of both Governments. It also weakens the hand of the U. N. negotiators who are trying to work out an armistice that calls for the return of prisoners and also carries the assurance that the flow of blood—largely American—will cease.

Then later:

Thus the London correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune described the conference of the Foreign Office spokesman with the press as follows:

"It was explained here—

That was in London—

that Mr. Churchill's statement was not intended as a blanket approval for any action which the United States might like to adopt in retaliation for a Communist violation of a Korean truce. Britain, it was explained, has not finally agreed to any specific action, and adheres to the principle of prior consultation and agreement before any new action is taken."

I continue the quotation:

"At the same time, Mr. Churchill's statement was said to have been intended as a warning to Communist China that Britain will not necessarily withhold approval of any forceful action proposed by the United States, such as direct air attack on China proper, in the event that a truce is violated."

That is still a quotation regarding the Foreign Office spokesman's statement to the press, as reported in the Tribune.

Mr. Lawrence continues:

This is the kind of double talk which not only confuses Americans but encourages the Communist negotiators to believe that they can break a truce and there will be a prolonged palaver about it such as has been going on for months in the Korean negotiations. It also misleads. For the implication there is that if a truce is broken, the United States alone would plan to take action and the British in their own time would give it lukewarm consideration.

I call attention to that, Mr. President, because I am trying to bring out here the vital necessity of our having a complete and clear understanding with our partners in this matter of what we are going to do, and we cannot have double talk at a critical time like this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire column by Mr. David Lawrence, published in the New York Herald Tribune, January 21, 1952, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN OFFICE STAND CALLED STAB IN  
BACK FOR CHURCHILL  
(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—Just as Americans were beginning to feel a sense of relief that Great Britain and the United States were working together in their policies toward Korea and Red China, the British Foreign Office has thrown a monkey wrench into the machinery.

This comes at a time when almost everybody here was feeling enthusiastic about the success of Prime Minister Churchill's mission and about the splendid impression he made.

For the British Foreign Office has not only disheartened many Americans, but it has also stabbed the Prime Minister in the back and cast doubt on his ability to make good on the pledges he so firmly gave to the American Government.

The British Prime Minister told Congress last week: "Our two countries are agreed that if the truce we seek is reached only to be broken our response will be prompt, resolute, and effective."

WARNING TO REDS

Here was a warning that the Communists could not possibly misunderstand. They had

been counting on the division between Britain and America over Korean policy. They have been successful in the past in driving a wedge between the two countries based on the unwise recognition of the Communist regime in China by Britain in the first place. Now, at the moment when the warning words of Churchill were calculated to show the Communists that Britain and America stood together, the British Foreign Office pulls the rug from under the feet of both Governments. It also weakens the hand of the U. N. negotiators who are trying to work out an armistice that calls for the return of prisoners and also carries the assurance that the flow of blood—largely American—will cease.

If the Communists had agents in the British Foreign Office, they could not have done more than was accomplished in diluting the strength of the Churchill pledge. It revives in Congress impressions that the British are tricky—which impressions Mr. Churchill has done so much to dispel. It was certainly giving aid and comfort to the enemy at a crucial moment.

#### LONDON'S VIEW EXPLAINED

Various dispatches reflected the Foreign Office viewpoint. Thus, the London correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune described the conference of the Foreign Office spokesman with the press as follows:

"It was explained here that Mr. Churchill's statement was not intended as a blanket approval for any action which the United States might like to adopt in retaliation for a Communist violation of a Korean truce. Britain, it was explained, has not finally agreed to any specific action, and adheres to the principle of prior consultation and agreement before any new action is taken.

"At the same time, Mr. Churchill's statement was said to have been intended as a warning to Communist China that Britain will not necessarily withhold approval of any forceful action proposed by the United States, such as direct air attack on China proper, in the event that a truce is violated."

This is the kind of double talk which not only confuses Americans but encourages the Communist negotiators to believe that they can break a truce and there will be a prolonged palaver about it such as has been going on for months in the Korean negotiations. It also misleads. For the implication there is that if a truce is broken, the United States alone would plan to take action and the British in their own time would give it lukewarm consideration. The truth is that all the representatives of the twelve nations which have troops in Korea meet regularly in Washington and when a decision is made it is the agreement of all U. N. nations and not America alone.

#### MORE MEETINGS HELD

There were such meetings last week to explore a future course of action in Korea if the truce were not honored and it is to be presumed the British Prime Minister knew the nature of those agreements. Certainly this is top-secret stuff on the military side and it ill becomes the British Foreign Office to tell the enemy that no agreement has been reached or that the pledge given by the British Prime Minister doesn't really mean what it says and is subject to future debate and revision. This isn't the first time the Foreign Office has disclosed prematurely Allied intentions on military operations in Korea.

Some Americans will doubtless infer now that the British Foreign Office has in it men in sympathy with the attitude of the "left wing" of the British Labor Party which has always wanted the Allies to quit Korea and make a peace at any price. Or it could mean that under pressure of British Labor politics, anticipating a partisan political attack on the Prime Minister when he gets home, the

Foreign Office is trying to throw the partisans off the track and tell them that nothing really has been agreed to and that they will still have a chance to argue about it.

The net effect is to reassure the Communist negotiators in Korea that the solidarity of the Allies is merely a paper proposition and that actually it doesn't mean very much more.

Maybe the Prime Minister will look into all this when he gets home. Meanwhile the blood of American and British and other troops in Korea will continue to be shed as the disunited nations lumber along with an enemy ready to take advantage of such division and dissension instead of impressing them by policies of firmness and unity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there was another thing which gave me great concern in following the press, since the publication of the so-called Yoshida letter which I placed in the RECORD earlier in my remarks. The matter is so well stated by the Alsop brothers, Messrs. Joseph and Stewart, in the Washington Post, January 27, which was last Sunday, that I shall ask unanimous consent to insert this column in the RECORD, after I have read a few very pertinent paragraphs.

I can say that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is here this afternoon, and I were present when these Yoshida conversations were held. We knew before we went to Japan that Mr. Dulles had consulted fully with the British Foreign Minister before we went there at all. We knew, and Mr. Dulles of course knew, that all of this discussion was thoroughly known in Great Britain. The implications to which the Alsop brothers call attention is that there was some underhanded dealing by Mr. Dulles, that there was something unfair, and I want to get my protest in the RECORD against that thought ever having been disseminated by the British newspapers. As I say, I shall read certain paragraphs from the Alsop column, and then ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed as a part of my remarks. I quote the Alsops:

It is being charged publicly in the British press and privately in British official circles that Japanese Prime Minister Yoshida has been forced to recognize the Chinese Nationalists by the Americans, and specifically by State Department Consultant John Foster Dulles.

I may say to my distinguished colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that further on in this column of the Alsops, the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the Senator from New Jersey are mentioned as co-sponsors of this entire business, though we are mentioned but briefly. We were there, and we knew what went on. We share part of the guilt, if Mr. Dulles bears any, certainly.

Quoting the Alsops:

It is being further charged that this pressure has been brought to bear despite a prior American promise that the Japanese would be left free to choose between the Nationalists and the Chinese Communists.

Then, later on the Alsop column:

The fact is—

Say the Alsops—

that before Dulles left for Britain last June to try to negotiate a Japanese treaty with

the British, the Japanese Government had already made up its mind.

And later on:

This fact was perfectly well known to the British Foreign Office.

And then, near the end of the article—and this is very significant, for I think we ought to lay all our cards on the table—appears this:

The basic reason for the continuing Anglo-American tension over Asiatic policy is not any love on the part of the British Government for the Chinese Communists. Rather it is the fear that the Japanese, excluded from China, will enter into disastrous commercial competition with the British in India and southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire Alsop article be printed in my remarks at this point.

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

#### THE ROW OVER CHIANG

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The row which has been kicked up in Britain over Japanese recognition of Chiang Kai-shek is a peculiar parable of international misunderstanding. It is being charged publicly in the British press and privately in British official circles that Japanese Prime Minister Yoshida has been forced to recognize the Chinese Nationalists by the Americans, and specifically by State Department Consultant John Foster Dulles.

It is being further charged that this pressure has been brought to bear despite a prior American promise that the Japanese would be left free to choose between the Nationalists and the Chinese Communists. By implication, Dulles is thus being accused of having acted in bad faith. In fact, this is simply untrue. And because the tensest area of disagreement between Britain and this country is still, despite the Churchill visit, in the Far East, the true story is worth telling.

The fact is that before Dulles left for Britain last June to try to negotiate a Japanese treaty with the British, the Japanese Government had already made up its mind. Premier Yoshida had already signified that Japan would extend at least limited recognition to Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa. This fact was perfectly well known to the British Foreign Office, of course including then British Foreign Minister Herbert Morrison.

Morrison was nevertheless still determined, if possible, to prevent Japanese recognition of the Chinese Nationalists. When Dulles saw him in June, therefore, Morrison proposed that Japanese foreign relations become the responsibility of a commission in a Pacific pact which was to include Australia and New Zealand as well as Japan. By this device, the Japanese Government's hands were to be tied, as far as recognizing Chiang was concerned.

Dulles unhesitatingly rejected this proposal. He said that there was no reason why the Pacific Commonwealth countries should assume the responsibilities of the United States, which had, after all, played by far the greatest part in winning the Pacific war. And he said also that the Japanese had every right to choose to recognize the Chinese Nationalists, if they wished to do so.

Dulles left London without an agreement, and then Morrison in effect gave in. He accepted the Japanese pact. He persuaded the British Cabinet to agree to it on the basis that the Japanese would be free to

choose between the two Chinese governments. But he omitted to point out the essential fact that the Japanese had in effect already chosen.

Thereafter, Dulles made a further effort to reach a clear understanding with the British. He sent State Department Far Eastern Expert Livingston Merchant to London in order to try for a common front on limited Japanese recognition of the Formosa regime. Merchant's negotiations with the Foreign Office officials came to nothing. Thereafter, last December, Dulles went to Japan and tried to reach agreement on the issue with Sir Esler Denning, chief British representative in Japan and a principal architect of British policy in Asia.

These efforts also came to nothing. Meanwhile, Senators John Sparkman and H. Alexander Smith, who had accompanied Dulles, were taking a strong line with Premier Yoshida. They told him that, in order to get the Japanese pact through Congress, there would have to be some assurance that the Japanese Government would recognize the Nationalists.

Accordingly, after Dulles had already left Japan, Yoshida wrote him a letter, promising that the Japanese would extend limited recognition to Chiang Kai-shek's government as the effective government of Formosa. This letter arrived during the Churchill visit, and it was shown to British Foreign Minister Anthony Eden. By bad timing, the letter was published in Japan, on Yoshida's initiative, on the day Eden arrived back in London.

This gave rise to a roar of displeasure in London, and to the implied charge that Eden had been tricked and that Dulles had acted in bad faith. The point is, of course, that the Japanese choice had actually been made before Dulles went to London in the summer.

The basic reason for the continuing Anglo-American tension over Asiatic policy is not any love on the part of the British government for the Chinese Communists. Rather it is the fear that the Japanese, excluded from China, will enter into disastrous commercial competition with the British in India and Southeast Asia. In view of the desperate British economic situation, this fear is not altogether unreasonable. But the above parable of misunderstanding is enough to suggest that it is impossible to reach any sensible Anglo-American agreement on Asiatic policy on the basis of beady-eyed suspicion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, we, of course, unavoidably studied the entire question of the economic situation of Japan and her trade relationships. Our discussions indicated that the Japanese felt that the southeastern Asiatic area was the best for them as an area in which to develop their trade; but, of course, in that area there was competition. The traditional British trade there and the whole question of the sterling area were involved. So we were faced with a sharp difference of opinion, which we tried to consider as fairly as we could. There was the British view of Japan as an undesirable trade rival of the British in southeast Asia, as against our view of Japan as a full partner and as a free-world defense bulwark with the opportunity to develop her trade in competition with other free countries in Asia.

As I have previously stated, we also are embarrassed by the hesitancy of our good friends, the British, to withdraw recognition of Communist China, or even

to consider that they withdraw that recognition in the case of a future outbreak and further aggression. And, of course, the whole problem of trade through Hong Kong is involved, because that is a very important trade center for the British. We are all sympathetic with the importance of trade to the British and their difficult economic position.

Their economic position is certainly very serious, and they are threatened with all sorts of dire things in case their trade is disturbed. Yet I cannot feel that I am doing my duty unless I say right here on the floor of the Senate that the lives of American and British boys in Korea and the jeopardy to our whole security position in the Far East is more important than the continuance of British trade.

The next question I raise involves another one of our good friends, France. The French are very much disturbed, as they should be, over the Indochina situation. They naturally want assistance from us to help in case there is an attack. We are already giving them substantial assistance in the form of arms, aircraft, and equipment. But I was greatly concerned by the implications of an article in the New York Herald Tribune of January 12, 1952, entitled "The West Defense Chiefs Confer on Indochina."

I now read the article:

Paris dispatches said France, weary of the cost of the Indochina fighting in men and money, has reopened with the United States the entire question of recognizing Red China and admitting it to the United Nations as an alternative to stepped-up United States military aid.

French diplomats were represented by informed sources as suggesting some form of a package deal with China as a means of restoring peace both in Korea and Red China.

While the United States is flatly opposed to any such approach these quarters said France may be forced to act on its own unless further United States military commitments are forthcoming.

Here, again, we have a situation where there is obviously a wide difference of opinion between the United States and one of our most important allies. Here we have what amounts almost to a Munich proposal of appeasement as a threat to us if we do not send certain specified aid to that area.

The fundamental question is not simply one of stepped-up military aid that is needed in Indochina; it is the development of an agreement on a far-eastern policy that all support. It must be sufficiently flexible and broad to apply to any spot where an aggression may occur and to offer positive hope for the development of free nations in Asia. If we can agree on a policy of firmness and on a policy based on the development of free and independent nations in Asia we shall be moving toward both the resistance of the aggression which is now threatened and also toward the building up of those nations who are struggling for their freedom.

So, Mr. President, in dealing with the need for more cooperation from our allies, I come to these general conclusions:

First, that the United Nations, and especially the United States, Britain, and France, must prepare to take effective, courageous counter measures to stop the present defiance of the U. N. in Korea and to prevent Communist aggression in the future in Indochina or elsewhere, along the lines I have been suggesting.

Secondly, and this is more important, the United States must use every possible means of persuasion to obtain the cooperation of our allies in a courageous and farsighted far-eastern policy. We are certainly not today satisfied with the degree of cooperation we are receiving, and I submit that we shall have to take determined steps to get full cooperation if we are to move ahead effectively or even approach a solution of the far-eastern situation.

#### OVER-ALL CONCLUSIONS

Mr. President, having reviewed the major problems in the Far East and having presented this program for firm action, I want to close my remarks with some over-all conclusions. They are a summing up, really, of what I have been saying.

First. While, of course, the problem of collective security in Western Europe is of critical importance, the immediate threatening crises are in the Middle East and the Far East.

Second. Basically the restlessness among the people of both the Middle and Far East is due to the yearning for freedom and independence and the deep-seated resistance to any form of imperialism or colonialism.

Third. A free and independent China is absolutely essential to achieve peace in the Far East, and this should therefore be the foundation of our far-eastern policy in keeping with our traditions of the "open door" and the territorial integrity of China.

Fourth. Chinese Communist aggression in Korea can be stopped, and Chinese Communist aggression in other areas of Asia can be prevented only by a close uniting of all the United Nations forces on a courageous, determined policy to apply extreme sanctions, in the event of any further outbreaks or continued Communist stalling in Korean truce talks.

Fifth. The long-range objective of a free and independent China cannot be secured by sanctions against aggression alone. I have been speaking very largely of military sanctions. A free and independent China cannot be brought about by force alone. It requires the prompt development of a constructive, positive program to indicate clearly that a free China would be a full partner in the free world.

Sixth. With a free and independent China the full potentialities of the new independent sovereign Japan would be realized and Japan would become an additional keystone in the arch of free Asia.

Seventh. This program cannot be successfully realized without better cooperation from our allies.

Eighth. The best way to prevent world war III is to make sure that the

Communists know that the desire for world peace will not keep the United States and the United Nations from taking drastic steps to stop aggression.

Ninth. The importance of collective security against future aggression in Asia requires further development of mutual security pacts throughout the Pacific, and especially in southeast Asia. This may well lead ultimately to an over-all Pacific pact similar in general terms to the Rio Pact and it might be characterized as a multilateral Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. President, in this address I have endeavored to contribute to the pending conferences and discussions with regard to the development of a constructive policy in the Far East. No announced policy will be effective without implementing action. We shall need the full cooperation of our Armed Forces and the Armed Forces of the United Nations to establish peace. Let me emphasize the words "to establish peace." But the ultimate long-range permanence of peace will depend not on arms but on the willingness of people from all parts of the world to give themselves to the cause of human freedom. The peoples of Asia must know that a free and independent China, which means a free and independent Asia, is the determined policy of the Western World.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I take it the distinguished Senator has finished with his direct remarks?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes. I was going to yield the floor unless there were some questions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the able Senator from New Jersey some questions, and I hope to lay a predicate for some of my questions by making a brief statement commending the Senator from New Jersey very highly for the very fine presentation he has made. It was my pleasure to accompany him on the trip to the Far East and to be with him in most of the conferences to which he has referred. I think, too, that he has well fortified his own statement by the various insertions in the RECORD which he has made. I do not say, Mr. President, that I agree completely with all the conclusions he has reached, but I am in substantial agreement with what the able Senator from New Jersey has said throughout his presentation.

There is one thing about which I desire to ask a question because I think perhaps some false hopes and some misunderstandings might be created.

The Senator from New Jersey referred to the possibility of some of the Nationalist Chinese moving back to the mainland, and stated that he did not favor at any time the use of any American troops on the mainland of China. Somehow or other I am a little disturbed at the statement, without some qualification, that aid may be given to

the Nationalist Chinese, and that they may be able to go back to the mainland.

I am convinced that the only way we could have saved the China situation, during the turbulent days of the last war and following that war, would have been to send in Americans to supervise the help we were giving the Generalissimo, to supervise it on the economic level, and supervise the use of it in the field of operations.

I was particularly impressed by the report General Wedemeyer made to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, sitting jointly last spring during the so-called MacArthur hearings. If the Senator remembers, General Wedemeyer said something to the effect that the only way by which we could have saved the situation would have been by supervising the use of the help we were giving. He said, "By that I mean that we would have had to do exactly what we did later in Greece, that is, put our men into the field of operations even down to the battalion level." I remember he used that expression. He said, by the way, "I was not willing to recommend that."

I certainly believe that if the time ever comes when this country is supporting the Generalissimo and his Nationalist forces in any kind of a military undertaking, and are again giving them supplies to the extent to which we were during the Second World War, in order to avoid the same thing happening which occurred then we would insist on some close follow-up similar to the plan that was used in Greece; and I think it would be acceptable to the Nationalist Chinese.

I wonder if the Senator from New Jersey agrees that that might be necessary.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator's statement brings out the importance of our working together. What he said is entirely in line with my thinking. I did not mean to imply that we would not use our people for military missions of the type to which the Senator refers. What I was emphasizing was that we did not need to send our boys into China in divisions, as the main source of ground troops. Certainly, if we were working with the Chinese for a free and independent China, we would be glad, as the Senator has said, to do what we did in Greece. No one complained that we sent our forces into Greece in divisions. We did not do that. We would do the same in China that we did in Greece.

I merely desire to highlight the fact that there is nothing in what I have said that would advocate sending American soldiers to the mainland of China, to be put into war, as they have been brought into the Korean situation. I emphasized that by saying I did not believe that Syngman Rhee favored participation by our military except to train and advise the native troops.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought the Senator meant that, and he will recall that I stated that my only reason for bringing out this point was to make it clear that



it was only detached support we were giving.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for making a very important statement, which strengthens my observations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to the so-called Yoshida letter, I was glad the Senator from New Jersey discussed that as he did. I certainly agree with his statement that we did nothing to force out any letter, any statement, or any plan. I know that the Senator from New Jersey never hesitated, nor did I, to say what our own personal views were, and I am sure the Senator will recall that in open press conferences we were asked a question as to that matter from time to time, and we made it very clear that it was not our business to tell Japan what to do, that that was something they could decide for themselves when they obtained their sovereignty. It was only when the question was asked about the effect of it in the Senate of the United States in connection with the ratification of the treaty that we stated our own personal views.

The Senator will recall that even in regard to that I said I was not willing to say that the Senate would decline to ratify the treaty; but I did know that if it appeared that sovereign Japan was going to establish close relationship with Communistic China, it would make our task here much more difficult.

Certainly there was nothing we did that compelled the Japanese to do anything, although we were frank in stating our own personal wishes in the matter.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Again I thank the Senator for confirming my own recollection of the conversations, and what we said in regard to that matter on the occasions to which he refers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There was another point I was glad the Senator brought out. He feels very keenly, as I do, and as both of us have said before, that there is a great need for cooperation between the British and the United States. My own feeling is that, regardless of how irritated we may sometimes feel at some of the things done in Britain, Great Britain stands as our No. 1 ally.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator fully.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe there is no area in the world where the need for cooperation is more apparent than in the Far East. I regretted exceedingly to see the reports coming from—

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor. But let me finish my statement. I have regretted seeing the statements coming from the British Foreign Office, and the apparent misunderstanding on the part of the British people, that there had been any "double-crossing" of the people in these talks. I know, as does the Senator from New Jersey, and as he has stated, that Mr. Dulles kept the British representatives in Tokyo advised of every single turn there, and they knew exactly what we were doing all the time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I may add a word, I understood that the British

representative in Tokyo sent to London a report practically verbatim, of everything that was said, so that there could be no suggestion that anything was concealed. I have talked with Mr. Dulles about this, and he has assured me that he had no indication that London did not know all that was being done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Furthermore, we were informed that London instructed the British representatives not to discuss the matter further, but to refer it to Washington for discussion when Mr. Churchill was here.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That was what I was about to add, that they had cut off discussion with Tokyo, and referred the matter back to Washington. So there was no concealment at all; everything was discussed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had the pleasure of visiting Hong Kong on the trip, and while there I had the privilege of talking with the governor of the colony, and also with the colonial secretary, and with other British officials. I sympathize with the British in many of their problems in Hong Kong and all through that area, and certainly no one has a kindlier feeling toward the British than I have. But I hope I am not subject to condemnation for being too strong in my feeling when I say that I was driven to the inevitable conclusion that the British were pitting, we might say, the peace of the world against trade in southern Asia, and particularly the maintenance of the trade of the Hong Kong Crown Colony.

So I feel that while at all times we should exercise the greatest of care to work out a cooperative program with the British, yet we should be firm and try to get some kind of realism, or recognition on their part as to some of the real problems which exist in the whole Asian area, the upsurge on the part of those people for independence and freedom, new nationalism, and all those things, as the Senator from New Jersey so well brought out in his presentation.

Personally, I believe—and I hope I am not overly optimistic—that we have made considerable headway in that part of the world, in showing to those people, first, that the United States is not interested in any kind of imperialism—political, military, or economic; second, that we are trying to work with friendly nations, the free nations of the world, in building a peaceful world. I believe that if we can work out some kind of better understanding among ourselves, the British, the French, and some of the other great powers, the situation will not be at all hopeless. I believe that we can continue to line up the free nations of the world in a demonstration that certainly Russia and her Communist aggression will not be able to break through.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator from New Jersey agrees with me in that general statement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I not only agree with the distinguished Senator from Alabama, but I wish to thank him for adding his important support in what we tried jointly to do in our trip to the Far East. He has very ably assisted in interpreting what I have tried

to express today. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO CHANGE SYSTEM OF NOMINATING PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the second session of the Eightieth Congress, in 1948, I introduced House Joint Resolution 436, and in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, in 1949, I introduced House Joint Resolution 74, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination and election of the President and Vice President. In view of general interest in the subject of nominating candidates for President by the respective parties, I introduced yesterday Senate Joint Resolution 125 proposing to change the present system of nominating presidential candidates. At a subsequent date I shall introduce again a measure proposing to change the present system of the electoral college dealing with the procedure of electing a President and Vice President of the United States.

This, of course, is not a new subject. In 1913 President Woodrow Wilson, in addressing the Sixty-third Congress, had this to say about the procedure of nominating Presidents:

I turn to a subject which I hope can be handled promptly and without serious controversy of any kind. I mean the method of selecting nominees for the Presidency of the United States. I feel confident that I do not misinterpret the wishes or the expectations of the country when I urge the prompt enactment of legislation which will provide for primary elections throughout the country at which the voters of the several parties may choose their nominees for the Presidency without the intervention of nominating conventions. I venture the suggestion that this legislation should provide for the retention of party conventions, but only for the purpose of declaring and accepting the verdict of the primaries and formulating the platforms of the parties; and I suggest that these conventions should consist not of delegates chosen for this single purpose, but of the nominees for Congress, the nominees for vacant seats in the Senate of the United States, the Senators whose terms have not yet closed, the national committees, and the candidates for the Presidency themselves, in order that platforms may be framed by those responsible to the people for carrying them into effect.

It is my information that the present President of the United States, at a press conference last week, recommended the enactment of legislation changing the present system of nominating candidates for President, and providing for a direct presidential primary.

If democracy is a sound principle of government, and I am sure that we all are wholeheartedly in accord with that premise, and if our Government is to be one of, by, and for, the people, then the time is long overdue for the office of the President of the United States to be occupied by a man both selected and elected by the American people.

The office of President of the United States is the most powerful and influential within the power of people to give. On the President's decisions depend the economic welfare and national security of all the United States and much of the free world. With the American people so vitally concerned and so dependent upon the wisdom and ability of a President, it would seem to be sound and prudent democracy to allow them a direct voice in his selection and election. The present convention system has in past years too often given us party candidates who are not the choice of the vast majority of the party members. Political bosses, party bigwigs, and organized interests have too frequently forced the nomination of not only an unqualified but an unwanted candidate.

A politician of Nation-wide renown recently asserted in a book which he authored that the delegates to a national political convention have little to say about the actual nomination of the President and Vice President. This man whose experience should qualify him to speak on this subject said that fewer than 100 men usually dictate a party's choice as its candidate to the highest office of our land. It may be that those 100 men follow the wishes of the majority of the voters in their party. On the other hand it may be that they do not. For example, when the Republican National Convention met in Chicago on June 8, 1920, the Ohio machine's mastermind, Harry Dougherty, confidently predicted that Warren G. Harding would be chosen by the convention as its Presidential nominee. However, on the initial ballot, Harding received only 65½ votes and thereafter on the next few ballots lost ground. But in the early hours of June 12, 1920, a group of politicians met in George Harvey's room at the Blackstone Hotel and there a handful of men selected the Republican Party's nominee and the man who later became the President of the United States. This is but one of many instances in our history where our nominating system has produced a party candidate who was not the choice of the people. All parties have been equally guilty. None of them have given to the people an opportunity to select as their nominee the man that they actually feel is most qualified to serve the country as President.

In order to remedy the present situation I have introduced Senate Joint Resolution 125, proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to provide a new system for nominating the President and Vice President. The proposed amendment abolishes nominations in conventions and provides instead for a general primary within each party to select the party's nominees for President and Vice President. It provides that each party shall have in each State a nominating vote equal to the total number of Senators and Representatives serving in the United States Congress. Each party candidate would be entitled to receive nominating votes based upon the proportion of his popular vote as compared to the total party vote. For example, the State of Florida has 8 electoral votes. Let us call them nom-

inating votes. If in a Democratic primary Mr. A received 300,000 votes as a Democratic nominee for President and Mr. B received only 100,000 votes, then Mr. A would get 6 nominating votes and Mr. B would get 2. These would be added to the various nominating votes in the other States to determine eventually the nominee of the Democratic Party.

In order to maintain equal geographic as well as popular representation it is necessary to preserve the electoral system although the method of computation is altered in order to bring the electoral system up to date.

I hope the Congress can give to Senate Joint Resolution 125 prompt and serious consideration.

#### REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it was my understanding that perhaps we would vote today on Senate bill 2104, the bill relating to import controls. However, I understand that the vote will not be taken until tomorrow. It is entirely possible that I shall be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow. Therefore, I wish to make certain observations and place myself on record. I thought it might be well briefly to summarize what the controversy is, and how it came before the Senate.

When the Defense Production Act was before the House of Representatives, Representative ANDRESEN of Minnesota offered the amendment which became known as section 104, and which, in a general way, required, under certain circumstances, the imposition of import controls until June 30, 1952. It is not necessary to read that section of the law, but it has for its purpose the imposition of such import controls on fats and oils, peanuts, rice, and certain other items, if it is indicated that domestic production will be impaired, or if our support programs will be burdened and additional expense fall on the Treasury, or if in any way the marketing and storage program will be disturbed.

The argument, as I remember it, having served as a member of the subcommittee which took most of the testimony, is mainly first, that, section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act already confers authority in case there is some menace to production and to the domestic price level. It is authority which has been conferred upon the President, under which he acts after a finding has been made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The other general argument is that section 104 disturbs our trade relations with other countries, and may be conceivably, an impairment of our obligations under the so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The argument on the other side, in behalf of retention of section 104 is that it would disastrously affect the dairy industry, notably that segment of it which

is engaged in the manufacture of cheese and cheese products.

In that connection, Mr. President, I believe the memorandum which was furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture to the subcommittee is about as revealing as anything I know of on this whole subject. It requires no laboring argument on my part to enable anyone to see the light. Among other things in this memorandum, which was submitted and published in the report of the hearings, the Secretary of Agriculture indicates that in September 1951, 378,092 pounds of cheese were purchased under the price-support program. Moreover, while there has been some emphasis on the fact that there is a wide variety of cheeses, and that section 104 does not discriminate between one variety and another, he states that cheese is competitive. The Secretary of Agriculture makes that statement himself.

Mr. President, the cheese bought under the price-support program is Cheddar cheese, and is competitive with every other variety of cheese. What occurred to me in connection with the proposal to repeal section 104 is the question of why we should dip into the Federal Treasury, take out money belonging to the taxpayers, and go into the market whenever the price of Cheddar cheese goes down to 36 cents and buy goodness knows how much of the cheese—in this case 378,000 pounds, but it could have been a million pounds, as a matter of fact—and in the next breath permit any other kind of cheese all of which is competitive, to come into the country.

If we pursue that course we will aggravate the supply problem. It is conceivable and altogether likely that as time goes on it would be necessary to use even larger amounts of public funds with which to buy competitive cheese products, in order to support the price level for our domestic manufacturers.

The second point that appeals to me in the memorandum of the Secretary of Agriculture is that virtually all dairy products are competitive. Anything that is made out of a dairy product is essentially competitive in nature.

In that connection I was rather intrigued to note that the Department of Agriculture, through its appropriate agencies, now holds 35,000,000 pounds of dried milk. Whether it is milk that contains fats or is nonfat dried milk does not in my judgment, make a particle of difference. Dried milk may be an end dairy product, but in proportion as it remains as an overhang on the domestic market it will have some effect on the price of cheese, on the price of butter, and on the price of every other product which is manufactured from milk.

It is necessary, so it is said, under the price-support program to take the surplus supplies from the market from time to time in an orderly fashion, in order to make sure that there is not a further depression of the price level. Under the circumstances, Mr. President, with such a tremendous supply of dried milk on hand, with the Secretary of Agriculture now committed and actually having effected the purchase of cheese in the

open market, in order to support the price level on Cheddar cheese, I can see no good reason whatever for the repeal of section 104.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if I read the language of the section correctly, it will be in effect only until June 30, 1952. Before that time the Committee on Banking and Currency will be giving further consideration to the Defense Production Act. It means that the whole act will be opened for reconsideration and amendment, if that is the desire of the members of the committee and the Members of the Senate.

Therefore, speaking for myself I want to do what I think is consistent. Certainly I do not want in any manner to disrupt foreign trade which this country has with other countries. On the other hand it would look to me as a bit on the stupid side to authorize a program under our Department of Agriculture, at the expense of the American taxpayer, which takes surplus supplies from the market, and in the next breath repeal an interdiction in the law which seeks to ameliorate that condition in part and prevent competitive supplies from coming into this country from foreign nations.

If I were present in the Senate tomorrow I would certainly vote in favor of the Capehart motion to recommit the bill to committee. If that motion shall not prevail I am sure there will be an opportunity afforded for a ye and nay vote on the passage of the bill, in which event, if present, I would vote against the repeal of section 104.

#### DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR SHORT- RIDGE, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a short time ago Samuel Morgan Shortridge, of California, died in California. He was an attorney and a former United States Senator from my State. He was born on the 3d of August 1861 at Mount Pleasant, Henry County, Iowa, and died on January 15, 1952, at his home in Atherton, Calif.

In 1874 the Shortridge family moved to the far West and settled in Salem, Oreg. In Oregon, Samuel had his first real chance to go to school, but the family only remained in the State a year and ultimately located in San Jose, Calif. Samuel was considered old enough to aid the family finances and secured employment in the mines. First he operated the old overshot wheel at the Cold Spring Gravel Mine, in Nevada County, and later he worked at the forge. Always determined to do whatever came to hand in the best possible way, he became eventually a fine blacksmith. As the boy had other ambitions than being a mechanic, however skilled, he moved to San Jose and lived with his brother in order to attend the public schools of the city. Shortridge graduated from high school in 1879, and after doing some post-graduate work he received a first-grade State certificate, which entitled him to teach in the public schools of the State. This was accomplished before he was 18 years of age.

Samuel Shortridge's first position was at Rutherford, Napa County, where he

taught for several years, but he resigned to take the position of principal of the St. Helena public schools. During this time he spent much spare time studying law. In 1883 he gave up his position as principal in order to devote his entire time to study of law at Hastings Law College, San Francisco. In 1884 he was admitted to the Supreme Court of California and began the practice of law in San Francisco.

Mr. Shortridge gained a State-wide reputation as an orator of prominence, as a thinker and fearless exponent of sound social and political science. With his natural gift of oratory, which has been described as "not emotional embroidery of language, but plain, forceful speaking that clears the cobwebs from men's minds and makes them see the straight course of action that should be pursued," he turned to politics. He campaigned throughout the State of California, speaking in behalf of numberless candidates of the Republican Party, of which he had been a working member since he attained a majority.

In the Harrison campaign of 1888 Shortridge was a presidential elector from the Fourth District; in 1900 presidential elector at large for William McKinley; and presidential elector at large for President Taft in 1908. At one time he was seriously considered for the governorship of California.

In 1920 by a large majority Shortridge was elected to the United States Senate where he served the people of California from March 4, 1921, to March 3, 1933; but was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection.

The Senator held membership in the Bohemian, Pacific-Union, Union League, Commonwealth, Press, and Olympic Clubs; the Metropolitan Club of Washington, D. C., and the Masonic, Elk, and Red Man orders.

Senator Shortridge married Laura Gashweiler of San Francisco on August 3, 1899, and they had two sons—Samuel M. Shortridge, Jr., and John G. Shortridge.

During his service in the Sixty-seventh to Seventy-second Congresses, Senator Shortridge served as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, and served on the following other Senate committees: Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, Finance, Irrigation and Reclamation, Judiciary, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Public Buildings and Grounds.

Dr. Robert J. Burdette, editor of the California edition of American Biography and Genealogy, has said of Senator Shortridge:

It is now apparent to all that the country must no longer look solely to the Eastern States for her leaders in social and political matters. The generation that follows the pioneer has always been fruitful of strong, splendid citizenship, and it is this generation that is now the ruling power in the West and is producing the men that are influencing the thought and action of the country at large as well as their own sections. Among these men is Samuel M. Shortridge, of California, one of the best-known attorneys on San Francisco. As a lawyer he is recognized as one of the clearest thinkers and most level-headed members of

the bar of the State and his success has been merited by years of hard work and close application. To the country in general he is perhaps better known as a speaker of force and power and as a loyal fighter in the ranks of the party he believes stands for the truest political faith.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say, on behalf of the State of California, that we noted with great regret the passing of Samuel M. Shortridge, late a United States Senator from the State of California.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MALONE, OF NEVADA

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a special dispatch to the Los Angeles Examiner, dated January 24, 1952, written by George Rothwell Brown, the eminent political writer, dealing with the record and career of the junior Senator from Nevada, GEORGE W. MALONE, and especially his service in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I think it is fitting for me to pay tribute to my neighbor and colleague from the great State of Nevada, Senator MALONE, while he is doing for his country such fine work—work which the people of Nevada, of Idaho, and of the Northwest generally appreciate and admire. As you know, Mr. President, Senator MALONE is the only active practicing engineer ever elected to the Senate; and his practical, fundamental, grass-roots approach to various problems is wholesome and good, indeed. His thinking, Mr. President is, in my opinion, the thinking of most Americans. As I have said, the people of Idaho cherish the representation given to Nevada and the country as a whole by Senator MALONE and, by like token, by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, Senator PAT MCCARRAN. We of Idaho find much to admire in each of them.

Senator MALONE's fundamental knowledge of foreign trade and monetary matters, including the gold standard, is profound and is based on sound government and good economic philosophy. It was my pleasure to be at the conference of the Western States Republican leaders, which was held last October in Seattle, Wash. Senator MALONE had occasion to address that convention. I am sure his remarks at that time will be remembered by all Americans who heard them as being fundamentally sound. I know that members of the Republican Party will seek the knowledge of Senator MALONE and will incorporate that knowledge in the Republican national platform.

I wish Mr. President, we had more Senators of the ability, knowledge, and integrity of Senator MALONE. He has often been at my side. I hope I can always be at his side. Once again may I thank the people of Nevada for giving us Senator MALONE.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by George Rothwell Brown be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of January 24, 1952]

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

LAS VEGAS, Nev., January 23.—The Senate seat held by GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, is typical of those in the western group of States of great importance to Republican control of that body in this year's elections.

The party's national organization is planning to give him all the aid he may need to be reelected, in what promises to be a tough but successful fight.

The Senator belongs to the majority wing of Republicans in the Senate which has made party policy, in Senate speeches and votes, and which will be influential in the resolutions committee which will write the 1952 Republican platform at Chicago next summer.

He has already made his own influence felt in the formulation of western regional policy, adopted at Seattle in October, and amended and approved at San Francisco last week.

The important features of that policy, constituting what may be called a 17-point bill of rights for the West are largely the work of Senator MALONE, especially the foreign trade resolution, on which subject the Nevadan has been one of the leading specialists in the Senate, and the sound money plank.

The Seattle-San Francisco resolutions, in the adoption of which MALONE played a big part, and the added impetus given to the subject of a return to the gold standard by Harold Stassen, in his recent speech in San Francisco before the Republican National Committee, have increased the probability of a determined fight being made at the Chicago national convention for a straight-out plank demanding an American currency convertible into gold as the only adequate method for ending today's ruinous New Deal inflation. Nevada republicanism backs the "honest little dollar."

MALONE's prospects of reelection have improved considerably since this correspondent was last in Nevada, although there are some uncertain factors, and it has not yet been indicated who his Democratic opponent will be.

The only name prominently mentioned thus far in connection with the Democratic nomination is that of Alan Bible, of Carson City, assistant attorney general of Nevada, but no actual decision has been made and won't be until Senator PAT McCARRAN, Democratic boss of the State and its greatest single political power, gives the nod to the man he wants. Bible is a protégé of McCARRAN.

There have been some differences between McCARRAN and MALONE over the distribution of electric power in the State. An uncertain factor is the attitude toward MALONE, not as yet disclosed, of Republican Gov. Charles H. Russell, who was elected for a 4-year term in 1950.

Although there are some rivalries between various Republican groups in Nevada for control of the party, they are not serious and will not be carried into the campaign.

MALONE's popularity has increased with his growing stature as one of the best debaters on the Republican side of the Senate, and he will be renominated as the party's candidate to succeed himself, without opposition, according to all present indications.

Here in Nevada, as in the rest of the western group of States, there is observable a decided slant toward conservative anti-New Deal thinking in the Republican Party, and a strong opinion that the party must break away this year, if it is to have a chance to

elect a Republican President and Congress, from the fatal imitation of State socialism which produced nothing but Republican disaster from 1940 to 1948.

MALONE's record with labor ought to be helpful to him in Nevada, where labor is intrastate rather than interstate as in most parts of the country.

The Senator may need some help from the national organization, and he will get it, as his distinction in the Senate is fully appreciated and his reelection regarded by the top leadership as vitally essential to maintain the Republican solidarity of the western regional States in the next Senate.

PHILLEO NASH

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, before proceeding with the statement I intend to make I should like to join wholeheartedly in endorsing the remarks just made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] about the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Now, Mr. President, what I am about to say today is principally for the ear of President Harry Truman.

All of us have read with a great deal of interest the statements made by General Lowe, after General Lowe returned from Korea and found that while he was there, wisely advising the President, his dispatches were held up and never reached the President.

I have here today material which I am sure has never been called to the President's attention. If it had been, I do not think he would have on his staff the person described in this loyalty report.

Mr. President, I intend to read into the RECORD today some of the proceedings before the Loyalty Board of the White House and the Loyalty Review Board. I may say for the benefit of the Loyalty Review Board that they need not investigate their staff to find out how I got this material, because on December 8, 1950, there was sent to the White House the entire file on the matter I am about to discuss, except for four of the FBI reports, which were sent to Mrs. Lillian D. Pratt, at that time, in the executive office of the President. I mention this so as to save the Loyalty Review Board the difficulty of trying to investigate their own agency in an effort to find out where this material came from.

Mr. President, there is on the President's staff, at a salary of \$17,500 a year, a Philleo Nash, listed as adviser to the President. The White House Loyalty Board cleared Mr. Nash some time ago. Thereafter, the FBI conducted a complete and thorough investigation. Ten separate reports were made by the FBI. All those reports were sent to the White House Loyalty Board and to the Loyalty Review Board.

The White House Loyalty Board cleared Mr. Nash. Subsequently the Loyalty Review Board picked up the case on post audit and asked that a new hearing be held. Shortly thereafter Mr. Dawson asked that the complete files be sent to the White House. All of them were sent to the White House, and never have been returned to the Loyalty Review Board.

As to the matter developed by the FBI, there are nine principal points:

No. 1, that Philleo Nash, the President's adviser, had been in close contact with the Communist underground in Washington,

No. 2, that he has been a close friend and a close associate of one of the convicted Canadian Communists.

No. 3—we shall skip that one; some of these, Mr. President, I think, should not go into the RECORD.

No. 4—also omitted.

No. 5, that he has financially contributed to the support of the Canadian Tribune, the official organ of the Communist Party in Canada.

No. 6, that during the early forties parts of the Communist spy ring in Canada were using his home in Toronto as a point of rendezvous, and some of them were living there.

Nos. 7 and 8—I believe we had better skip also.

No. 9, that Philleo Nash in the early forties was attending Communist meetings and had officially joined the Communist Party.

That in essence, Mr. President, is the picture of the President's adviser, one of his administrative assistants, who is receiving \$17,500 a year.

I assume that this information has never been brought to the President's attention. I would suggest to him that he call upon Mr. Dawson to bring the file of Mr. Nash into his office immediately, and that he promptly read it and then get rid of Mr. Philleo Nash.

PROFITS OF PRIVATE BUSINESS CORPORATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, sometime ago—on March 17, 1947—I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table showing the percentage of profits earned by private business corporations in the United States on sales, total assets, and risk capital, from 1931 to 1946. That was an interesting computation and it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 2, page 2110, of the Eightieth Congress.

At this time I wish to ask that the table be reprinted in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, together with some additional figures covering the years 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948, as prepared by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, because I think the people of the country and the Members of the Senate will be very much interested in these figures. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in this connection a copy of a letter which I received from the United States Treasury Department enclosing these statistics.

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

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, October 30, 1951.  
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to your telephone conversation with Dr. T. C. Atkeson's office on October 22, 1951, there is enclosed a table showing data for 1944 through 1948 which correspond with those appearing in the table inserted by you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 17, 1947. These are the latest statistics available with respect to corporations.

Very truly yours,

JUSTIN F. WINKLE,  
Assistant Commissioner.

TABLE I.—Percent of profit earned by private business corporations in the United States on sales, total assets, and risk capital, 1931–48

[Money figures in millions of dollars]

Year	Number of corporations	Sales (compiled receipts)	Total assets	Shareholders' capital (net worth)	Profit (net income after taxes)	Dividends paid	Percent of profit on—			Percent dividends paid on shareholders' capital
							Sales	Total assets	Shareholders' capital	
5-year average, 1939–43	396,786	184,318	343,454	140,627	9,163	5,871	4.97	2.67	6.52	4.17
10-year average, 1934–43	405,426	151,556	322,829	139,619	6,935	6,059	4.58	2.15	4.97	4.35
13-year average, 1931–43	401,226	137,123	313,313	138,515	4,894	5,566	3.57	1.56	3.53	4.02
1946	366,870	245,886	389,524	154,000	12,800	5,626	4.95	3.13	8.31	3.86
1943	383,534	213,777	360,018	145,665	12,181	5,512	5.21	3.09	7.98	3.95
1941	407,053	186,137	340,452	142,590	9,528	6,556	5.12	2.80	6.68	4.60
1940	413,716	145,427	320,478	138,387	6,947	6,019	4.78	2.17	5.02	4.35
1939	412,759	130,365	306,801	136,865	6,019	5,639	4.62	1.96	4.40	4.12
1938	411,941	117,596	300,022	137,437	3,300	4,834	2.81	1.10	2.40	3.52
1937	416,902	138,907	303,357	141,633	6,531	7,281	4.70	2.15	4.61	5.14
1936	415,654	126,269	303,180	133,468	6,473	7,163	5.13	2.14	4.85	5.37
1935	415,205	112,098	303,150	138,931	4,778	5,896	4.26	1.58	3.44	4.24
1934	410,626	99,095	301,307	141,585	2,456	4,788	2.48	.82	1.73	3.38
1933	388,564	82,148	268,206	127,578	-1,056	3,091	-1.19	-.39	-.83	2.42
1932	392,021	79,701	280,083	133,569	-3,753	3,854	-4.76	-1.35	-2.84	2.89
1931	381,088	105,238	296,497	143,363	-880	6,092	-.84	-.30	-.61	4.25

<sup>1</sup> Estimate.

NOTE.—Figures were taken, without change or adjustment, from the annual volumes of Statistics of Income published by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, U. S. Government.

"Sales (compiled receipts)" comprise (1) taxable income consisting of gross sales (less returns and allowances), gross receipts from operations (where inventories are not an income-determining factor), taxable interest received, rents and royalties received, net capital gain, net gain from sale of property other than capital assets, dividends received from stock of domestic corporations, and other receipts required to be included in gross income, and (2) partially and wholly tax-exempt interest received on Government obligations. They exclude nontaxable income other than wholly tax-exempt interest received on certain Government obligations. The net effect of the broadening of the concept of "sales" to include the above-listed items, some of which are "net" items, is to show the percent of profit on sales in the attached tables to be slightly higher than was actually realized.

Net profit or loss comprises the amount remaining after all expenses of operation and all taxes have been deducted from "Sales (compiled receipts)."

"Shareholders capital" (synonymous with net worth and risk capital) consists of capital stock, common and preferred, surplus reserves, surplus and undivided profits less deficits.

"Dividends paid" comprise cash and all other types of dividends except corporation's own stock.

The corporations covered in these tables include all active private business corporations in the United States filing balance sheets in connection with their Federal income-tax returns. Of a total net profit of \$12,200,869,000 reported for 1943 by all corporations filing Federal income-tax returns for that year, those submitting balance sheets with their income-tax returns accounted for \$12,181,000,000, or 99.84 percent.

The statistics in these tables, in going back to the year 1931, cover all the years for which complete data for each of the categories are available. Less complete records are available for a number of years prior to 1931.

Percent of profit earned by private business corporations in the United States on sales, total assets, and risk capital, 1944–48

[Money figures in millions of dollars]

Year	Number of corporations	Sales (compiled receipts)	Total assets	Shareholders' capital (net worth)	Profit (net income after taxes)	Dividends paid	Percent of profit on—			Percent dividends paid on shareholders' capital
							Sales	Total assets	Shareholders' capital	
1948	536,833	405,430	525,136	197,219	22,477	9,305	5.54	4.28	11.40	4.72
1947	496,821	361,521	494,615	180,567	20,420	8,285	5.05	4.13	11.31	4.59
1946	440,750	283,917	454,705	164,614	16,314	7,378	5.75	3.59	9.91	4.48
1945	374,950	252,636	441,461	154,525	10,518	6,009	4.16	2.38	6.81	3.89
1944	363,056	258,880	418,324	150,459	11,685	5,957	4.51	2.79	7.77	3.96

Source: Statistics of Income, prepared by Bureau of Internal Revenue.

## PERCENTAGES OF VOTERS WHO GO TO THE POLLS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial, under the heading "Americans lead world in avoiding elections," which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of January 12, 1952. The editorial is a fairly short one, but its basic part is included in these paragraphs:

The American public has a great way of studying and judging many things, from stocks to sports, on the basis of statistics. Nowhere else on earth are certain sections of the newspapers so filled with digits and tables, and pored over so intently by so many people.

There is one important box score, however, which does not appear in the newspapers. It is the one that shows where American democracy stands in the international league in terms of people who actually go out and vote. Here are the percentages of eligible voters who went to the polls in recent elections:

The table reads:

	Percent
In Belgium, freed from wartime Nazi totalitarianism	90
In the crucial Italian election which rebuffed communism	89
In the British election which returned Churchill to power	82
In France, after nearly 4 years of Nazi rule	75
In Japan, with its new "made-in-America" democracy	70
In the United States, in the Truman-Dewey election of 1948	51

Mr. President, I was so startled by those figures, it seemed to me that perhaps they were using a different basis upon which to arrive at their percentage of who the eligible voters were, so I requested the Library of Congress to condense the electoral laws in the several countries which had been mentioned in the Saturday Evening Post editorial, so that that information might be available. It has done so, and I ask that the memorandum be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

## ELECTORAL LAWS FOR NATIONAL ELECTIONS IN CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

BELGIUM<sup>1</sup>

Under the current law,<sup>2</sup> all elections are held on the basis of universal suffrage (with a single vote), and the age stipulation has been reduced to 21 years.

FRANCE<sup>3</sup>The constitution of the French Republic<sup>4</sup>

ART. 3. National sovereignty belongs to the French people.

No section of the people or any individual may assume its exercise.

The people shall exercise it in constitutional matters by the vote of their representatives or by the referendum.

In all other matters they shall exercise it through their deputies in the National As-

<sup>1</sup> Constitution of 1831, as amended in 1921 and 1948.

<sup>2</sup> As of December 1950.

<sup>3</sup> As of 1950.

<sup>4</sup> Adopted by the National Constituent Assembly, September 28, 1946.

sembly, elected by universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage.

ART. 4. All French citizens and nationals of both sexes, who are of legal age and enjoy civil and political rights, may vote under conditions determined by the law.

ART. 6. \* \* \* However, the two chambers shall be elected on a territorial basis, the National Assembly by universal, direct suffrage, the Council of the Republic by the communal and departmental bodies by universal, indirect suffrage.

#### GREAT BRITAIN

##### *Representation of the people—Parliamentary and local government franchise*

1. (1) Subject to the provisions of subsection (2) of this section, the persons entitled to vote as electors at a parliamentary election in any constituency shall be those resident there on the qualifying date who, on that date and on the date of the poll, are of full age and not subject to any legal incapacity to vote and either British subjects or citizens of the Republic of Ireland: *Provided*, That a person shall not be entitled to vote as an elector in any constituency unless registered there in the register of parliamentary electors to be used at the election nor, at a general election, to vote as an elector in more than one constituency.<sup>5</sup>

#### NORTHERN IRELAND

##### *Representation of the people—Parliamentary and local government franchise*

1. (2) A person shall not be entitled to vote as an elector at a parliamentary election in any constituency in Northern Ireland unless he was resident in Northern Ireland during the whole of the period of 3 months ending on the qualifying date for that election.<sup>6</sup>

#### ITALY<sup>7</sup>

##### *Constitution of the Italian Republic<sup>8</sup>*

"ART. 48. All citizens of both sexes having attained the age of majority have the right to suffrage.

"The vote is personal and equal, free and secret. Exercise thereof is a civic duty.

"No limitation on the right to vote may be established except for civil incapacity or as a consequence of an irrevocable penal sentence or in cases of moral turpitude as determined by law.

"ART. 56. The Chamber of Deputies is elected by universal and direct suffrage on the basis of one deputy for every 80,000 inhabitants or for a fraction greater than 40,000.

"All voters who have attained 25 years of age on the day of the elections are eligible to become deputies.

"ART. 58. Senators are elected by universal and direct ballot by voters over 25 years of age."

By an Italian law of January 20, 1948,<sup>9</sup> for a period of 5 years stringent restrictions upon the right to vote were put upon Fascists, former Fascists, and those having held high, national, or provincial, civil, or high military office upon the Fascist regime, and the authors of Fascist propaganda books and school texts. Among those excluded from the restrictions were those employed in religious, sanitary, or charitable services of Il Duce, and those who had held high office or been members of the legislature prior to 1925.

<sup>5</sup> Representation of the People Act, 1949, 12 and 13 Geo. 6, 1949, ch. 68. (Law in force, 1951.)

<sup>6</sup> Representation of the People Act, 1949, 12 and 13 Geo. 6, 1949, c. 68. (Law in force, 1951.)

<sup>7</sup> As of 1950.

<sup>8</sup> Approved by the Constituent Assembly on December 22, 1947, and effective January 1, 1942.

<sup>9</sup> Standards for the election of the Chamber of Deputies (No. 6 of 1948, arts. 4-7, 9).

#### JAPAN

The Japanese Constitution<sup>10</sup> provides: "The qualifications of members of both Houses and their electors shall be fixed by law. However, there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, sex, social status, family origin, education, property, or income."

Under the law for the election of members to the House of Representatives (Law No. 43, December 17, 1945, as amended by Law No. 43 of 1947), the qualifications for an elector are listed as over 20 years of age and 6 months' residence in his locality. A person is restricted from voting if he is declared quasi-incompetent or is serving a sentence of penal servitude or confinement. The same qualifications and restrictions with respect to the election of members to the House of Representatives also applies to the election of the House of Councillors. (See Law No. 11, February 28, 1947.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion temporarily?

Mr. LONG. I will withhold the motion, if the Senator from New Hampshire or some other Senator desires to speak.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understood that the distinguished Senator from Washington wanted to speak when one name on the Executive Calendar was reached.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington wishes to be heard when the name of Jack Gorrie is called for consideration by the Senate; and the Senator from Washington obviously would have no objection to the Executive Calendar's being called, except for one fact. The Senator from Washington desires to speak for about 10 minutes before the Senate goes into executive session, if he may get the floor.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator so desires, I will withhold my motion.

#### INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL BOXING CLUB

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate the Senator's indulgence.

Mr. President, on August 13, 1951, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and myself submitted for appropriate reference Senate Resolution 191. The resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, had as its purpose a study and investigation of the International Boxing Club, to determine whether that organization was a monopoly which was preventing legitimate challengers from competing in the several boxing classes for weight championships.

Both the Senator from Idaho and I were, and are, interested in seeing that every deserving boxing aspirant is provided with a reasonable opportunity to fight for the championship in his class. We are likewise, and have long been, interested in the career of a light-heavyweight boxer, Harry Matthews, who was

born in Idaho, and who has lived for years in Seattle, Wash. Harry Matthews possesses an unusual record. He has participated in almost a hundred professional bouts. Of these Harry Matthews has won almost 60 bouts by knockouts. Six of his bouts have ended in draws. In only 3 bouts has Harry Matthews been defeated. He has not suffered a defeat in more than 60 consecutive bouts. I know of no other American prizefighter who is presently fighting who has a record of boxing achievement to compare with that possessed by Harry Matthews.

Harry Matthews has been recognized for several years as being an outstanding challenger for the light-heavyweight title. Prior to the time when Senate Resolution 191 was offered in the Senate, the International Boxing Club had evidenced no interest of any kind in signing Harry Matthews for a title bout. Scores of interested persons in the State of Washington and throughout the Nation were constantly insisting that Harry Matthews ought to be given his earned right to fight for the championship. Most of those persons, including myself, became convinced that the International Boxing Club was pursuing restrictive procedures which would continue to prevent Harry Matthews and other legitimate challengers from fighting for title recognition. The attorney general of the State of Washington wrote officially to the Attorney General of the United States to ask for an investigation of the monopolistic practices of the International Boxing Club. My colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] offered a Senate resolution to pursue the same course of inquiry.

To make a long story as short as possible, I feel constrained to reflect briefly on the Harry Matthews question as it appears to be today. The Senator from Idaho joins me in this statement because of our desire to keep faith with our Senate colleagues, whom we had asked to take an interest in Harry Matthews.

In recent weeks, the International Boxing Club has offered to match the challenger Harry Matthews with the light-heavyweight champion, Joey Maxim. The first offer carried 15 percent of the gate for the challenger. This is the usual percentage offered in title bouts. This offer was turned down by Mr. Jack Hurley, the extremely able and astute manager of Harry Matthews. The International Boxing Club then made a second offer and raised the challenger's end of the purse to 20 percent. This offer has been outstanding for several weeks. Had the first offer or the second offer been promptly accepted, the International Boxing Club intended to have the championship match on Washington's Birthday.

Under date of January 23, the Senator from Washington received a telegram from Mr. Jack Kearns, the manager of the light-heavyweight champion. In this wire Mr. Kearns stated that the champion was willing to meet the challenger and hoped that a fight between Joey Maxim and Harry Matthews could

<sup>10</sup> Constitution of Japan, November 3, 1946.

be arranged in the near future. Any follower of sports will be interested in all of what Jack Kearns said in his telegram.

As a result of the Kearns telegram and because the Senator from Idaho and I had talked to the Senate about Harry Matthews some months ago, we thought it proper to encourage Mr. Jack Hurley to accept the title opportunity. The means by which this encouragement was given was a telegram from the junior Senator from Washington to Mr. Royal Brougham, the noted sports editor of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and a close friend and supporter of Harry Matthews and his manager, Mr. Hurley.

In order to keep the Judiciary Committee, which has before it Senate Resolution 191, completely informed, I think it proper to read the telegram which I wrote to Mr. Brougham and a copy of my letter to Mr. Jack Kearns which was written in response to his revealing telegram to me.

The telegram was dated January 23, 1952, addressed to Mr. Royal Brougham, sports editor, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Seattle, Wash., and reads as follows:

JANUARY 23, 1952.

MR. ROYAL BROUGHAM,  
Sports Editor,  
Seattle Post-Intelligencer,  
Seattle, Wash.:

The Jack Kearns telegram which I received this morning is being sent across the Nation for release in all daily papers tomorrow morning. As a personal favor, I want you to make the Kearns telegram available to Jack Hurley. I want you also to advise Hurley and Harry Matthews of what Senator WELKER and I think about the Kearns offer. Last August WELKER and I and others urged the Senate to investigate the International Boxing Club as being a monopoly and for refusing legitimate challengers an opportunity to fight for the light-heavyweight crown. We were serious in believing that Kid Matthews was being discriminated against. We sought to establish this contention as being fact. Our intention became effective and the International Boxing Club through Al Well, its matchmaker, offered recently to have Matthews fight the champion on Washington's Birthday. The IBC offered 20 percent or a higher figure than challengers usually get. This offer was turned down by Jack Hurley but I have never read his stated reasons for rejection. Jack Kearns has now stated that the champion is begging the challenger to enter the ring with him. If such an offer has ever been made by a champion before, WELKER and I are not aware of it. In a word, WELKER and I sought a title fight and opportunity for Harry Matthews.

I want to state, Mr. President, as being simply a fact, that my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), was as interested and helpful in endeavoring to bring that result about as were my colleague from Idaho and myself.

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

Mr. CAIN. I gladly yield to my colleague.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was much interested in what my colleague had to say, and it is quite apropos at this time. It so happens that the two

gentlemen about whom the Senator has been speaking are both friends of mine of long standing, and they are coming to the city of Washington today. I mentioned that to my distinguished friend from Idaho (Mr. WELKER), and I am hoping because of our joint interest in this matter, that they will stay over—they are here on some other business—and I may invite them to lunch tomorrow and we can show not only other Senators a man we think is one of the finest fighters in the world but one who might answer some of the questions privately or publicly raised by my colleague from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I am grateful for the Senator's comments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will yield further, I should like at this time to suggest that if those men do stay over, the three of us will have lunch with them and talk with them tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, although personal business is seldom transacted on the floor of the Senate, if I can join with my colleague from Washington and my colleague from Idaho in having lunch tomorrow with Mr. Hurley and Kid Matthews, we might take whatever step may be necessary actually to get the challenger into the ring with the champion, for the three of us have always felt strongly that once that bout actually takes place the new light-heavyweight champion of the world will be Kid Matthews, of Seattle, Wash.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude the reading of the telegram:

Unless he agrees to terms, WELKER and I must withdraw our resolution which has already served one of its major purposes and advise the Senate publicly that the IBC has offered a title bout which Jack Hurley has turned down. If Hurley wants Matthews to fight Walcott or anyone else rather than the light-heavyweight champion, I think that Hurley ought to publicly say so. We ought to bear in mind that opportunity is something a challenger doesn't get every day. If Matthews does not take advantage of his present chance to become the titleholder, there may be nothing that WELKER and I can do to help him in the future. We are devoted to Harry Matthews and convinced of his ability but there is no way to long support a challenger who overlooks any chance to become the champion. The Kearns wire follows: "Respecting your earnest interest in assuring a championship opportunity to boxer Harry Matthews, I have agreed in behalf of world's champion Joey Maxim to provide for such a title opportunity and I respectfully submit to you that the champion is prepared to defend his crown at the earliest moment. It is rare in boxing for the champion to appear in the role of a virtual challenger, and I go back to the days of the incomparable Jack Dempsey whom I had the delightful pleasure to manage. Please feel free to accept this message as authorization for public announcement that Champion Maxim is ready at once to defend his title against Matthews and I shall be grateful for your kind intercession to make this match possible and be assured of my appreciation for your interest.

"Cordially yours,

"JACK KEARNS."

Mr. President, I merely signed my telegram "Very sincerely, HARRY P. CAIN, United States Senator."

Mr. President, in response to that telegram, and under date of January 26, 1952, I wrote Mr. Jack Kearns as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1952.

MR. JACK KEARNS,  
Manager of Joey Maxim, Light-Heavyweight Champion of the World,  
Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR MR. KEARNS: I have done all I can think to do, as the attached telegram indicates, to encourage Jack Hurley to do that business with you which will get your champion and Hurley's challenger into the same ring at the same time.

The Maxim-Matthews question is both unusual and confusing to me. I have never known a champion to beg for trouble against an outstanding challenger and I have never known of Senators in the past who pled the case of a particular fighter on the floor of the Senate. For several reasons I can only hope that the fight comes off. One relatively unimportant reason is that such a fight would permit me to remove myself from a business about which I obviously know nothing.

The attached wire was released to the press of the Nation and was used in whole or in part in many communities. When convenience permits, I hope to read the telegram to the Senate so that my colleagues will know that Senator WELKER and I are endeavoring to support and recognize fair play. We were serious in endeavoring to get Matthews a title opportunity. We are as anxious now to see that he takes advantage of it.

I did appreciate and welcome your wire and hope that good fortune will soon permit me to meet you personally. I have known and liked you by reputation for many years.

Most cordially,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Mr. President, these several documents, which include the Kearns telegram, cover every bit of information which is available to the Senator from Idaho and to me.

Mr. CAIN subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the remarks made earlier by myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, about Harry Matthews and Joey Maxim, it had been my intention to ask permission to have printed in the body of the RECORD an interesting and provocative article on those matters, which appeared in the Times-Herald this morning, and was written by Dick O'Brien, who is acknowledged to be a thoughtful student of sports. Because the substance of this article may provide the Senate Committee on the Judiciary with additional information to consider, I now ask that it become a part of my remarks previously offered.

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

SPORTS SLANTS

(By Dick O'Brien)

Senators HARRY CAIN and HERMAN WELKER, who withdrew their support of Harry Matthews last week in the latter's continuing squabble with the International Boxing Club, may find in the end that their action was premature.

Matthews may soon be knocking at their doors again, pleading for their help in breaking down the barriers in his announced aim of seeking a crack at the heavyweight championship.

Harry Matthews has as much right at this time to a heavyweight title shot as Rocky Marciano or anybody else, because there are

precedents galore in boxing wherein light heavyweights have deserted the 175-pound ranks to go after bigger game.

Of course, as we pointed out previously, we can understand the Senators not wanting to go along with Matthews further after they had set up an opportunity for him to fight Joe Maximum, the light-heavyweight ruler, which was the thing they originally planned to accomplish. It was a matter of principle with them.

Along with their decision to withdraw their support from Matthews, however, their announcement that they plan to drop their resolution calling for an investigation of the International Boxing Club as a giant sports monopoly, was accepted by the boxing public with a great deal of regret.

To say that the International Boxing Club is no longer a monopoly, merely because it offered Harry Matthews a chance to box for the light-heavyweight crown, is a premise that won't hold water. In fact it's a fallacy.

The circumstances which surround the Matthews-IBC case today, now that Matthews has announced his intentions of seeking the heavyweight title, are no different than they were last April, when Harry was hot for a crack at the light-heavyweight title, just after beating Bob Murphy in the Garden. The set-up is the same. You are either "in" or "out" with the IBC crowd and Matthews is definitely not "in." From where we sit it will be a cold day in July when Al Weill opens the door to the clever and hard-hitting west coast operator.

The time element being a most important factor in boxing, the time for the IBC to have matched Matthews with Maxim for the light-heavyweight crown was last summer or in the early fall, instead of waiting almost a year to start negotiations for the match. Meanwhile, the IBC exploited Maxim to the hilt, giving him lucrative engagements, including one with former heavyweight champion, Ezzard Charles, in which he made a very poor showing.

Matthews has outgrown the light-heavyweight division in stature. In support of this position we offer the recent Cleveland show promoted by Ed Bang, which drew nearly \$100,000, with Matthews pitted against Danny Nardico, a pretty fair heavyweight, not far from a challenging position in the heavyweight ranks himself.

It was off that fight, that Jack Hurley, Matthew's pilot, decided to go after Walcott and why not? What could he gain fighting the deflated Maxim?

Now turning to precedents for such a decision, we single out Bob Fitzsimmons, Battling Levinsky, Georges Carpentier, Gene Tunney, Tommy Loughran, Harry Greb, Mickey Walker, and Gus Lesnevich as examples of men who deserted the middleweight and light-heavyweight ranks from time to time to defy the heavyweight rulers.

The latest and best example in this premise, of course, was Billy Conn, who deserted the light heavyweights at the height of his career and came within an eyelash of beating Joe Louis in their first outing. Conn, and the others aforementioned, had the support of the leading promoters of the day. Not so with Matthews. He still stands alone while the favorite sons are called upon in the same old heavyweight merry-go-round.

If it were left to Joe Walcott himself to decide, Matthews probably would be his next opponent, or at least Joe so stated in a recent news dispatch.

But Bob Christenberry and his associates on the New York State Athletic Commission soon took care of that by announcing that unless Joe signed to defend his title against either Charles or Marciano, it would strip him of the title. This also was a break for the International Boxing Club.

So today we find the situation in boxing quite different than it was only a few months ago. The International Boxing Club has covered its tracks well, escaping a possible investigation in Congress and at the same time watching with glee while the athletic commission in its own State usurps its powers by acting as a matchmaking instrument.

Oh, well. You can't win them all, but we would like to see Harry Matthews win one argument on the political front even while piling up victory after victory in the boxing ring.

#### BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY TO SENATOR GEORGE AND SENATOR MCKELLAR

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, information has come to me that today is the birthday anniversary of our distinguished colleague, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia. I know I speak for every Member of the Senate in wishing him a happy birthday and many happy returns of the day. One of the high honors which I have received is that of being associated with that great American and distinguished leader from the State of Georgia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, while I do not have authority to speak for my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I am sure the Senator from Idaho has expressed the sentiments of every Member of the United States Senate, regardless of the side of the aisle on which he sits. I, too, wish to extend my hearty congratulations to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle, representing a far Western State, I too wish to join in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, who for so long has rendered outstanding service to his Nation as chairman of the very important and powerful Senate Finance Committee. He is generally recognized on both sides of the aisle as being one of the ablest attorneys in this body, and one of the leading tax experts of the Nation.

I believe Republicans as well as Democrats have recognized that throughout his long career the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, who represents a great and important State of the Union, has constantly placed his Nation above his party whenever he felt that his Nation was in trouble and needed the viewpoint of an American citizen regardless of partisan affiliation. I know that Senators on this side of the aisle will join with his many friends on the other side in hoping that the senior Senator from Georgia will have many more years to devote to the service of his country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been informed that another very distinguished American, a Member of this body, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], is also celebrating his birthday today. It is a coincidence that in point of service these two distinguished Senators are among the oldest Members of the Senate.

I know that I express the sentiments of all his colleagues in extending to him, as we have to the Senator from Georgia, heartiest congratulations, and the hope that he may enjoy many more years of service.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to join with the senior Senator from Washington in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee. I am certain that I speak for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the minority leader, and all other Senators on this side of the aisle when I say I join wholeheartedly in the tribute paid to this great statesman and great American.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to join most sincerely and heartily in the sentiments which have been expressed by my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], on this the birthday anniversary of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

It is needless for me to say that I regard both these men as outstanding Senators, which is a very high compliment in itself, but it must be added that they are and have been always men of conviction, who vote constantly for what they think is right. This is an even greater compliment. It is a rare American privilege to have the opportunity, on an occasion like this, publicly to express one's affection and admiration for distinguished Americans.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to take a moment to associate myself with the very fine sentiments which have been expressed about the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. Last fall, while I was traveling throughout my State, I told the various people I could get to listen to me what a great privilege it was to be able to sit in the same body with men of the caliber of the Senator from Georgia, and in each of those instances the audiences who were listening would break out into spontaneous applause, because they recognized, as we all do, the great contributions which the distinguished Senator from Georgia has made toward the welfare of our country—and of course the same can be said of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who have any business to propose, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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



## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Dean Rusk, resigned; and

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles A. Coolidge to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin V. Huggins to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

## JACK GORRIE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jack Gorrie to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, before action is taken on this nomination, I should like to make a brief statement.

The junior Senator from Washington was the only Senator who did not vote among the seven or eight members of the Committee on Armed Services who were present last Friday when a vote was taken on the nomination of Mr. Jack Gorrie to be the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. At this time I wish to offer a brief explanation to indicate my attitude toward the nomination of Mr. Gorrie, and his fitness for the office in question.

After the vote had been taken I wrote and offered to the press the following brief statement:

It was not possible for me to vote to confirm Mr. Jack Gorrie as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board because by law that appointment automatically carries with it membership on the National Security Council.

I spent 2 days in examining Mr. Gorrie's fitness for the NSRB and NSC assignments. In my opinion, Mr. Gorrie is deserving of his appointment as Chairman of the NSRB. He is competent, conscientious, and informed in his duties and responsibilities on that Board.

I am likewise of the considered opinion that Mr. Gorrie does not possess the breadth of knowledge, experience, or travel which ought to be required of members of our Nation's highest policy council. In having no desire to injure Mr. Gorrie, but because of the high standard which must be maintained in the National Security Council, I refrained from voting.

The Armed Services Committee believes that the National Security Act of 1947, which established the National Security Resources Board and the National Security Council, should be thoroughly reexamined. Every member of the committee is convinced that improvements can be recommended and made. The chairman, Senator RUSSELL, has appointed a subcommittee to promptly and closely examine the question. I am privileged to be a member of that subcommittee. The members will seek only a greater degree of security for our precious Nation. In my view, the hearing on the nomination of Mr. Gorrie will lead to organizational and personnel changes which will increase the security posture of the United States.

Mr. President, for a moment I wish to draw to the attention of citizens generally and of Members of the Senate the activities and the mission of the National Security Council. That Council was created by the National Security Act of 1947. On it there sit but six members, namely, the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and the Director of the Mutual Security Agency. The mission imposed upon this Board is as follows:

The duties of the National Security Council are to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, in the interest of national security, for the purpose of making recommendations to the President.

Mr. President, as I have stated, Mr. Jack Gorrie is an exceedingly well-informed and conscientious younger American, within the range of activities with which he is familiar. But Mr. Jack Gorrie, who is to become one of six men in whose hands is likely to lie the destiny and the future of the United States, has never been outside continental United States. The Senator from Washington firmly believes that no man is so inherently intelligent that he can adequately concern himself with policy questions involving the integration and coordination of our foreign and domestic commitments if he has never been abroad. I know that Mr. Gorrie will travel widely at his first opportunity. Now that he is about to be confirmed for this vitally important post, for which I hold him to be miscast, I wish him well, in all sincerity.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks concerning the nomination of Mr. Jack Gorrie to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. I am not so familiar as is my colleague from Washington with the administration and workings of the Board and of the Security Council. As a matter of fact, I have had very little to do directly with the National Security Resources Board since I have been a Member of the United States Senate. However, I do know Mr.

Gorrie. I have known him for many years. I know him to be a very industrious, energetic, and quite capable and intelligent young man.

So far as his ability to perform the job as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board is concerned, I suspect that the best proof of that pudding is the fact that he has been the acting chairman of that very important Board. I agree with my colleague that it is an important Board. He has been the acting chairman for several months.

Because I have had very little personal contact with Mr. Gorrie or the Board since he has been Acting Chairman, I made it a point, after I learned that his name was to be sent to the Senate, to inquire of those who had dealings with the Board, and who were familiar with the administration and workings of the Board, regarding the services of Mr. Gorrie as Acting Chairman. Without exception I learned from those of whom I asked regarding Mr. Gorrie's ability and administration of this very important post, from Cabinet members on down, not only that he was doing a good job, but that he was very highly recommended.

At this time I wish to add my recommendation of his nomination, not only because I have known him personally, but because apparently those who have dealt with him during the many months he has been Acting Chairman of the Board have found his services to be of a very high order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jack Gorrie to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

## EDWARD T. DICKINSON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward T. Dickinson to be Vice Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

## PROTOCOL TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ON THE ACCESSION OF GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol (Executive E, 82d Cong., 2d sess.) a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey, opened for signature at London on October 17, 1951, and signed on behalf of the United States of America and the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, which was read the second time, as follows:

## PROTOCOL TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ON THE ACCESSION OF GREECE AND TURKEY

The Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington on 4th April, 1949.

Being satisfied that the security of the North Atlantic area will be enhanced by the

accession of the Kingdom of Greece and the Republic of Turkey to that Treaty, Agree as follows:—

## ARTICLE I

Upon the entry into force of this Protocol, the Government of the United States of America shall, on behalf of all the Parties, communicate to the Government of the Kingdom of Greece and the Government of the Republic of Turkey an invitation to accede to the North Atlantic Treaty, as it may be modified by Article II of the present Protocol. Thereafter the Kingdom of Greece and the Republic of Turkey shall each become a Party on the date when it deposits its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America in accordance with Article 10 of the Treaty.

## ARTICLE II

If the Republic of Turkey becomes a party to the North Atlantic Treaty, Article 6 of the Treaty shall, as from the date of the deposit by the Government of the Republic of Turkey of its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America, be modified to read as follows:—

"For the purpose of Article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack—

"(1) on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian Departments of France, on the territory of Turkey or on the islands under the jurisdiction of any of the Parties in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer;

"(2) on the forces, vessels or aircraft of any of the Parties, when in or over these territories of any other area in Europe in which occupation forces of any of the Parties were stationed on the date when the Treaty entered into force or the Mediterranean Sea or the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer."

## ARTICLE III

The present Protocol shall enter into force when each of the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty has notified the Government of the United States of America of its acceptance thereof. The Government of the United States of America shall inform all the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty of the date of the receipt of each such notification and of the date of the entry into force of the present Protocol.

## ARTICLE IV

The present Protocol, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the Archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of all the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

In witness whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Protocol.

Opened for signature at London the 17th day of October, 1951.

For the Kingdom of Belgium:

A. DE STAERCKE,

17 octobre 1951.

For Canada:

L. D. WILGESS,

17th October, 1951.

For the Kingdom of Denmark:

STEENSEN-LETH,

22nd October, 1951.

For France:

HERVÉ ALPHAND,

22nd October, 1951.

For Iceland:

GUNNLAUGER PÉTURSSON,

17th October, 1951.

For Italy:

A. ROSSI-LONGHI,

22nd October, 1951.

For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg:

A. CLASEN,

22nd October, 1951.

For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:

A. W. L. TJARDA VAN STARCKENBORGH-STACHOUWER,

17th October, 1951.

For the Kingdom of Norway:

DAG BRYN,

17th October, 1951.

For Portugal:

R. ENNES ULRICH,

17th October, 1951.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

F. R. HOYER MILLAR,

17th October, 1951.

For the United States of America:

CHARLES M. SPOFFORD,

17th October, 1951.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the Accession of Greece and Turkey which was opened for signature at London on October 17, 1951, in the English and French languages, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

In testimony whereof, I, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the authentication officer of the said Department, at the City of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this twenty-fourth day of October, 1951.

[SEAL]

DEAN ACHESON

Secretary of State.

By M. P. CHAUVIN

Authentication Officer, Department of State.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this treaty came before the Foreign Relations Committee, and I was requested by the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. CONNALLY] to report it. The committee unanimously approved the treaty and recommended that the Senate ratify it.

It will be recalled that under the North Atlantic compact, no new members can be admitted without the consent of all the parties signatory to that treaty. For reasons which are obvious, and because of the magnificent contribution which they have made in the near-eastern area toward the peace and security of the world, Greece and Turkey have been unanimously agreed upon, and this treaty is to express our consent that Greece and Turkey become parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, so far as I know, there is no objection to the treaty. However, there was no agreement between the minority and the majority with respect to calling up the treaty. I understand that certain members of the minority would like to obtain certain information briefly at this moment before the vote on the treaty. Therefore I shall not press for action at this moment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington recognizes the importance of affirmative action admitting Greece and Turkey to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization at the earliest moment. I deeply regret, however, that so few Members of the Senate are present. The Senator from Washington has a great concern over the future of the world in which we live, and the preservation of freedom. I believe that a colossal blow is about to be struck in the name of furthering the legitimate aims and ambitions of collective security.

Entirely aside from that fact, we ought to pause for a moment and pay a warranted word of tribute for the contributions to the war in Korea which are being made at this moment by our friends in Greece and our friends in Turkey.

I am reminded that Turkey was among the first nations to recognize that the fire of aggression must be stamped out in Korea, if at all possible, as rapidly as possible. Turkey has made a contribution to the war in Korea out of all proportion to her resources and population, as related to contributions being made to the Korean conflict by a great many other friendly nations which there is no present reason to name. The contribution being made in Korea by the Greeks is smaller but no less good and valiant.

Because of what both Greece and Turkey are doing today in the name of freedom and because of what those two countries intend to do in concert with and as equal partners of the other free nations in the North Atlantic area, this is a memorable moment in history and gives us reason to believe that, despite all the hazards which could be enumerated, we stand today, for our friends are now much closer to us, in a position of having a greater chance to live collectively in the future than is the case this afternoon. I hope that the protocol is ratified with enthusiasm.

I again wish that all of my colleagues could be present to raise their individual voices in approval. They would be as thrilled as I am over a promising chapter of history which is being written at this moment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am highly gratified that the Senate is about to ratify the protocol admitting Turkey and Greece into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As we all know, these countries occupy a highly strategic position in the Mediterranean. They have resisted aggression by a great power in that area. Turkey is a country of brave men and fine soldiers. Greece, with all her socialistic and communistic infiltration, finally, with our aid, resisted and drove out those elements. I am highly gratified. I believe that their entry into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will be of great value to the countries who are already members of it and will give strength and prestige and power to Greece and Turkey to continue their resistance through the years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive E. Eighty-second Congress, second session, a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey, which was opened for signature at London on October 17, 1951, and has been signed

on behalf of the United States of America and the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the protocol is ratified.

#### RECESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 30, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 10), 1952:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lincoln MacVeagh, of Connecticut, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain, vice Stanton Griffis, resigned.

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

##### To be captains, USAF (medical)

James H. Corey, Jr., AO2239990.  
Robert A. Flaherty, AO976573.

##### To be captain, USAF (dental)

Bob K. Merrill, AO1786767.

##### To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Robert F. Cavitt, AO2239820.  
William V. Relyea, AO2213168.  
Hal E. Snedden, O2051339.

##### To be first lieutenant, USAF (dental)

Philip F. M. Gilley, Jr., AO1907518.

The following-named distinguished officer candidates who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

##### To be second lieutenants

Jack L. Barnes, AO1910823.  
Richard O. Barwin, AO1910825.  
Charles D. Bosstick, AO1910832.  
Edward F. Call, AO1910838.  
Curtis R. Hutchison, AO1910891.  
Robert M. Landon, AO1910904.

Carl J. Lauderdale, Jr., AO1910906.  
Ralph H. Myers, AO1910923.  
William P. Olsen, AO1910926.  
James V. Powell, AO1910935.  
Henry R. Rieder, AO1910938.  
Henry C. Wurthmann, Jr., AO1910970.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-second Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

##### To be second lieutenants

John H. Bennett Joe A. Logan  
Edward J. Buck, Francis C. Van Gorder  
O1341397 Robert D. Peacock,  
David L. Gray O1341287  
George A. Gustafson Earl E. Yanecek  
Robert E. Henry

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of colonel, with date of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force under the provisions of Private Law 368, Eighty-second Congress:

Joseph F. Carroll, AO948277.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

##### To be captain, USAF (medical)

James L. Eavey, AO1725822.

##### To be captains, USAF (dental)

John H. Bonbright, Jr., AO2213522.  
Robert R. Hase, AO1697684.  
Vernon C. Maggard, AO1906926.

##### To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Walter J. Berger, Jr., AO1906214.  
Edward Bradford, AO2212261.  
James S. Cheatham, AO977698.  
Jerald P. Hough, AO1906319.  
Bruce C. Newsom, AO1906799.  
Fred E. Stull, Jr., AO975550.  
Robert P. Sturr, Jr., AO1906717.  
Charles W. Upp, AO2238724.  
Stanley C. White, AO2214056.

##### To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental)

Alexander A. Calomeni.  
George F. Coons, AO2087405.  
Sidney A. Hagen, AO726775.  
Daniel J. McAtee, AO1055663.  
John P. Shelton, Jr., O889670.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, Eighty-second Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of judge advocate duties:

##### To be captain

Walter I. Horlick, AO563344.

##### To be first lieutenants

Charles R. Burton, AO439217.  
William G. Catts, AO677980.  
Michael R. Donovan, AO1647402.  
John R. Frazier, AO411252.  
William J. Kelly, AO1852064.

Thomas J. Krauska, AO691644.  
Albert T. Nice, AO873954.  
Charles F. O'Connor, AO664803.  
David D. Webber, AO717928.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

##### To be second lieutenants

Warren G. Berger James E. LaRue, Jr.  
Stuart L. Brown, Jr. James F. Low  
William E. Brown, Jr. Alfred M. Miller, Jr.  
Jules B. Gerard Thomas L. Moore  
Billie B. Hunt Roland W. Parks  
Benjamin F. Ingram, George Wray, Jr.  
Jr.

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduate, the following-named distinguished military student of the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Jere D. Guin

##### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### CALIFORNIA

Michael J. O'Rourke, Jr., Beverly Hills, Calif., in place of M. J. O'Rourke, retired.

##### HAWAII

Teruhisa Nishiyama, Haleiwa, Hawaii. Office established December 1, 1949.

Katsue I. Nishiyama, Kunia, Hawaii, in place of Toshihiro Nakagawa, resigned.

##### IDAHO

James F. Hughes, Boise, Idaho, in place of H. L. Yost, retired.

Wilburn J. Adams, Rockland, Idaho, in place of A. L. Ralphs, resigned.

##### KANSAS

Claude O. Leonard, Richland, Kans., in place of C. J. Montfort, transferred.

##### MAINE

Conrad J. Lausier, Danforth, Maine, in place of J. G. Russell, retired.

Alice I. M. Ewing, West Enfield, Maine, in place of J. R. Blanch, resigned.

##### MARYLAND

Edward L. Best, White Hall, Md., in place of H. H. Wiley, resigned.

##### MICHIGAN

Harold F. Clark, Morenci, Mich., in place of Martha Swaney, resigned.

##### MINNESOTA

Lester E. Sullivan, Madelia, Minn., in place of Henry Hillesheim, retired.

##### MISSISSIPPI

Alonzo A. Vance, Chunky, Miss., in place of Bessie Puckette, retired.

Ira L. Moore, West Enterprise, Miss., in place of C. L. Wright, retired.

##### MISSOURI

Arthur M. Sames, Centralia, Mo., in place of W. S. Drace, retired.

##### NEBRASKA

John P. Sherlock, Emerson, Nebr., in place of D. F. Sheehan, retired.

Allen O. Wasenius, Oxford, Nebr., in place of J. T. Haffey, transferred.

##### NEW JERSEY

Frances B. Engelsen, Barnegat Light, N. J., in place of Bertha Applegate, retired.

Ettore T. Minervino, Denville, N. J., in place of S. V. Dickerson, deceased.  
Joseph P. LaPorta, Williamstown, N. J., in place of L. A. Martinelli, deceased.

## NEW YORK

Glenn O. Robinson, Adams N. Y., in place of J. W. Cain, retired.  
Harold C. Shannon, Alexandria Bay, N. Y., in place of F. F. Cornwall, retired.  
Louis C. Nielsen, Amagansett, N. Y., in place of B. C. Hadel, retired.  
James W. Maloney, Aurora, N. Y., in place of J. L. Purcell, retired.  
Theodore J. Marden, Baldwinsville, N. Y., in place of W. H. O'Brien, Jr., removed.  
Marjorie A. Dibble, Bloomville, N. Y., in place of M. L. Cleveland, retired.  
Arthur L. Rennie, Cornwallville, N. Y. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1947.  
Rene J. Panuska, East Islip, N. Y., in place of A. B. Melton, resigned.  
Charles E. Stata, Granville, N. Y., in place of D. J. McHenry, retired.  
Carl N. Cooper, Greenport, N. Y., in place of G. A. Rackett, deceased.  
Charles F. Fitzgerald, Hague, N. Y., in place of S. B. Keenan, retired.  
Arnold D. Case, Hinsdale, N. Y., in place of D. B. Allen, retired.  
Paul A. Lane, Larchmont, N. Y., in place of F. L. Egger, retired.  
John H. Chase, Milford, N. Y., in place of W. C. McRorie, retired.  
Hewlett H. Davis, Miller Place, N. Y., in place of K. W. Davis, retired.  
Jack J. Powers, Montgomery, N. Y., in place of C. W. Schmitt, transferred.  
Leland F. Griswold, North Chatham, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Frank J. Daly, Norwich, N. Y., in place of H. N. Bulger, deceased.  
Victor Rowe, Ontario Center, N. Y., in place of M. C. Foley, retired.  
Walter G. Kluge, Orient, N. Y., in place of J. H. Douglass, retired.  
Henry E. Holley, Otisville, N. Y., in place of Benjamin Zimmerman, deceased.  
John A. McGarr, Oyster Bay, N. Y., in place of B. H. Powers, retired.  
Bernard F. O'Malley, Potsdam, N. Y., in place of R. E. Perrin, retired.  
James J. Sullivan, Quogue, N. Y., in place of E. H. Stevens, resigned.  
Jeannette L. Moran, Rexford, N. Y., in place of A. R. Knowlton, retired.  
Peter J. Clark, Richland, N. Y., in place of A. D. Widrig, resigned.  
Mary B. Bunnell, Scio, N. Y., in place of B. F. Palmer, retired.  
Howard C. Green, Sinclairville, N. Y., in place of Devillo Cobb, retired.  
Karl F. W. Mowitz, Tonawanda, N. Y., in place of W. F. Baltes, deceased.  
Catherine V. Paczkowski, Turin, N. Y., in place of D. B. Kentner, retired.  
Gerald W. Churchill, Walden, N. Y., in place of Fred Burns, retired.  
Irene E. Siebert, West Copake, N. Y., in place of A. E. Finkle, deceased.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Oscar K. Sovig, Arnegard, N. Dak., in place of C. E. Fleck, retired.  
LeRoy A. Anderson, Binford, N. Dak., in place of J. A. Knapp, retired.  
Oscar G. Tang, Cooperstown, N. Dak., in place of T. A. Marquardt, retired.  
Mattie J. Clapper, Glenburn, N. Dak., in place of N. V. Simmons, transferred.  
Malvern E. Thorson, McGregor, N. Dak., in place of E. L. Stahl, retired.  
Walter Kessler, Martin, N. Dak., in place of V. C. Magnuson, resigned.  
Charles W. McNeill, Mott, N. Dak., in place of W. T. Wakefield, retired.  
Donald Smith, Souris, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Sletten, transferred.  
Elizabeth N. Fischer, Streeter, N. Dak., in place of Paul Kietzke, deceased.  
Herbert W. Booth, Towner, N. Dak., in place of C. J. Haman, removed.

## OHIO

Gerald D. Keller, Oberlin, Ohio, in place of M. A. Houghton, retired.

## OREGON

Arthur B. Scarseth, Camp White, Oreg. Office established June 16, 1949.  
Charles W. Garlick, Gladstone, Oreg., in place of G. M. Ely, retired.  
Vella A. Harlan, McNary, Oreg. Office established September 1, 1949.  
Russell F. Cooper, Sutherlin, Oreg., in place of H. W. Chenoweth, resigned.

## PENNSYLVANIA

John Albert Vail, Chester Springs, Pa., in place of K. H. Vail, deceased.  
Joseph J. Habeeb, Chinchilla, Pa., in place of J. F. Moran, declined.  
Richard Downing, Jr., Conneaut Lake Park, Pa., in place of H. W. McArthur, deceased.  
Mildred G. Spencer, East Springfield, Pa., in place of E. E. Taft, resigned.  
Clyde M. Buzard, Ellwood City, Pa., in place of T. A. Wilson, retired.  
Martin H. Liggins, Florin, Pa., in place of J. B. Eschbach, resigned.  
Lawrence W. Nees, Geistown, Pa., in place of L. C. Nees, deceased.  
Beatrice M. Fitzstephens, Genesee, Pa., in place of D. M. Sullivan, retired.  
Dorina B. Torris, Green Ridge, Pa., in place of A. C. Musante, deceased.  
Vivian C. Geuther, Gwynedd Valley, Pa., in place of W. S. Cressman, retired.  
Natalie G. Landenberger, Holmes, Pa., in place of F. H. Filbert, removed.  
Thomas J. Cavanaugh, Nanty Glo, Pa., in place of M. A. Mash, retired.  
Marie G. Hastings, Pennel, Pa., in place of C. S. Doyle, retired.  
Frederick G. McGee, Roslyn, Pa., in place of J. A. Kelly, removed.  
Olga T. Graham, Russellton, Pa., in place of D. D. Salomon, resigned.  
Guy V. Kingree, Jr., Smoketown, Pa., in place of G. L. Brookmyer, resigned.  
Dean L. Musick, Youngstown, Pa., in place of G. V. Shawley, deceased.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Vernon A. Sjerven, Bristol, S. Dak., in place of J. E. Jiran, resigned.  
Walter V. Wiedenman, Madison, S. Dak., in place of J. H. Ryan, resigned.  
Bernard A. O'Reilly, Stephan, S. Dak., in place of K. H. Holtzman, declined.

## TENNESSEE

Robert H. McCrary, Waverly, Tenn., in place of C. M. Haygood, retired.

## WASHINGTON

William K. Wuesthoff, Davenport, Wash., in place of J. J. Peak, retired.  
Donald J. Auvil, Entiat, Wash., in place of Robert Kinzel, retired.  
Vincent B. White, Okanogan, Wash., in place of M. S. Brinkerhoff, retired.  
Troy T. Dean, Otis Orchards, Wash., in place of John Dean, retired.  
John P. McMonagle, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.

## WEST VIRGINIA

James G. McAvoy, Fayetteville, W. Va., in place of A. J. Duncan, retired.

## WISCONSIN

William Schaller, Jr., Barronett, Wis., in place of M. B. Arnes, resigned.  
Donald E. Chape, Bayfield, Wis., in place of Marie Freeman, retired.  
John B. Hoffman, Brantwood, Wis., in place of Fred Martin, deceased.  
Joseph C. Dinegan, Briggsville, Wis., in place of C. H. Barlow, retired.  
Clayton B. Hesselink, Cedar Grove, Wis., in place of J. K. Hesselink, transferred.  
Joseph D. Robertson, De Soto, Wis., in place of C. K. Hammond, transferred.  
Jennie A. Lane, Fall River, Wis., in place of M. I. Dunn, resigned.

Earl H. Coder, Franksville, Wis., in place of I. C. Kuchenbecker, resigned.  
Fred W. Thoms, Hawthorne, Wis., in place of D. A. Johnson, resigned.  
Arthur E. Carstens, Hilbert, Wis., in place of C. H. Eldridge, transferred.  
James R. Morgan, Ladysmith, Wis., in place of F. M. Doyle, retired.  
Leonard T. Goetz, Manawa, Wis., in place of John Lindow, retired.  
George F. Rasmussen, Neenah, Wis., in place of C. G. Schultz, deceased.  
Erwin J. Hendrikse, Oostburg, Wis., in place of Willard Dirkse, resigned.  
Edwin R. Barden, Platteville, Wis., in place of H. M. Harms, transferred.  
Herbert W. Johnson, Port Wing, Wis., in place of J. T. Helsing, retired.  
Jack J. Morgenthaler, Springbrook, Wis., in place of M. E. Odekirk, retired.  
Bertha C. Schippers, Twin Lakes, Wis., in place of John Schippers, deceased.

## WYOMING

Daniel Gerrard, Evanston, Wyo., in place of F. P. Nelson, resigned.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 10), 1952:

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Charles A. Coolidge, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Edwin V. Huggins, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

## NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Jack Gorrie, of Washington, to be Chairman, National Security Resources Board.  
Edward T. Dickinson, of New York, to be Vice Chairman, National Security Resources Board.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art able and willing to enrich and endow us abundantly with the needed blessings of knowledge and understanding, of insight and interpretation, we are again looking unto Thee for guidance.

Grant that the Members of the Congress may have that confidence, favor, and influence with their constituents and all the citizens of our Republic which come from faithfully following Thy leading and from diligently discharging the duties of their high calling.

May we daily seek to have a larger share in building a world order in which Thou shalt be worshiped more worthily and struggling humanity shall be served more effectually.

Inspire us with a fearless attitude and an open-minded welcome for every plan and proposal that may help to solve our difficult domestic and foreign problems. In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 266):

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM T. BYRNE, late a Representative from the State of New York.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the above resolution, the Senators from New York [Mr. IVES and Mr. LEHMAN] were appointed members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

## WILLIAM MCKINLEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Republican Members from Ohio, we thank the Speaker for his kindness in allowing us this time today.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that practically every Member of the House is wearing a red carnation indicates that this is McKinley Day here again in the Congress. I am glad that I had a large part in establishing this custom here in Congress. We did this the first time about 15 years ago and we have kept it up every year since. I am proud that practically every Member of the House is wearing a carnation because it shows that there is no partisanship involved. Our purpose in the beginning was that this custom would not be in any way political. Ohio has McKinley Day observances all over the State today. There will be meetings of various kinds and most of them will not be political in any way. The red carnation, which was McKinley's favorite flower, will be in evidence at all the meetings.

Mr. Speaker, it is generally conceded that Ohio is the mother of Presidents. This honor lies between Virginia and Ohio. We in Ohio claim eight Presidents, all of whom were a credit to the State and to the Nation. These Presidents are as follows: William Henry Harrison, General Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, James A. Garfield, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, William Howard Taft, and Warren G. Harding. Only three of these eight Presidents served in the House of Representatives. These were William Henry Harrison, Rutherford B. Hayes, and William McKinley. The most outstanding work of General Harrison was his work as a soldier and as a Territorial Governor. The most outstanding work of President Hayes was his record as a major general in the Civil War. The most outstanding work of President McKinley was done in this Chamber in which we are assembled and as a Representative to Congress.

His service in Congress was rendered in the days when the United States was striving to become one of the greatest nations of the world. His great natural abilities, together with his high character and his unquestioned patriotism, were recognized by all who knew him and established him as one of America's great statesmen.

Because of his great work as a Member of Congress, he was elected Governor of Ohio without much trouble, and his promotion to the Presidency was accomplished without much opposition in his party.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are proud to take these few minutes to recount the accomplishments of a truly great man who was great in spirit and great as a Member of Congress.

Mr. McKinley was a man when he was yet a boy. At the early age of 18 he left his position as a school teacher and enlisted in the Union Army. There his ability attracted the attention of Col. Rutherford B. Hayes. By the time he was 21 years of age he was a major in Gen. Phil Sheridan's army. General Sheridan in his memoirs praises Major McKinley for his outstanding service when Sheridan's army was badly disorganized at the Battle of Cedar Creek.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, Mr. McKinley was a young man of purpose and good impulses. He was a valiant soldier. His work in Congress made him a great statesman. And the people promoted him to the governorship of Ohio and to the Presidency. And when he was yet only 58 years of age the merciless hand of a mad anarchist struck him down. This was a great tragedy and a great loss to the Nation. The people respected Mr. McKinley. Those who knew him intimately loved him. He had the warm affection of his neighbors; and when the news of his assassination was spread in his home city it was said that the children cried in the streets.

Mr. Speaker, with the Chair's permission, I should like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] at this time.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this, the 29th day of January, is the birthday of William McKinley, native son of Ohio, long a distinguished Member of this House, and finally President of the United States.

Many gracious gestures have been made down the years by the leadership in this House. None has been more appreciated than the uniform courtesy—granted by the Speaker to the Ohio delegation through our distinguished dean, the Honorable TOM JENKINS, of Iron-ton—to say a few words about this great American. Thank you, TOM JENKINS, for giving me the privilege this year.

One of my early memories is the excitement of the campaign that made Mr. McKinley President. I remember being on the stone porch of my grandfather Payne's house on old Euclid Avenue, where elms met overhead, and listening to talk of "sound money," "sixteen to one," "full dinner pails." Then suddenly there was music and I flew down the lawn to the iron fence at the sidewalk and clung to the bars while the parade went by.

Grandfather was a gold Democrat who had seen brilliant service as Senator of the United States here in Washington, and was bitterly opposed to the free silver program of the silver-tongued orator who opposed Mr. McKinley. That same black iron fence, may I say, was the first such iron to go to the scrap drive from Cleveland at the beginning of World War II. Senator Payne's grandchildren could not have done less.

Ohio has given eight of her sons to the Presidency, probably none more beloved and certainly none more illustrious than William McKinley. Calm and self-contained, he possessed a quiet strength beyond the average.

Lest there be some amongst you who know little of this man from Ohio, let me give you a bare outline—for many have been led to personal attainment by the example of his seemingly commonplace life.

Born in the little town of Niles, in northeastern Ohio, living most of his life in Stark County so ably represented in this House by our distinguished colleague FRANK BOW, he was schooled in the nearby township of Poland until he entered Allegheny College in Meadville, Pa. Forced to leave college because of illness, he served as assistant postmaster until his enlistment as a private in the Union Army in 1861.

Then, as now, our soldiers voted. William McKinley cast his first ballot for President for Abraham Lincoln, while he was on the march. Mustered out in 1865 with the rank of major, McKinley took himself to the Albany School of Law and was admitted to the bar in Warren in 1867. He was prosecuting attorney of Stark County in 1869, and ran for Congress for the first time in 1876, serving here in Washington until 1890. Twice Governor of Ohio he was elected to the Presidency first in 1896 and again in 1900. His death at the hand of an anarchist in 1901 marked him our third assassinated President.

Such is the bare outline. But let us look more closely for a moment, that we may know more of what it was that has made him revered and beloved by all Americans regardless of political faith. To this end let me quote from the words of Dr. Casper Wistar Hiatt, given on the occasion of the celebration of Mr. McKinley's birthday by the Tippecanoe Club of Cleveland, January 29, 1906:

In the first instance he was elected in 1896 with the country in the throes of financial and economic desperation. The National Treasury was running low, revenue had fallen behind expenses \$140,000,000 in 3 years. Whispers of anarchy were heard on every side and the fear of all good people swung between thoughts of revolution on one hand and dictatorship on the other. He called Congress in special session and bade them to put a stop in the leak, in the National Treasury. He demanded that the dollar of America should be of such a quality that its ring would be acknowledged genuine in every market of the world.

The second achievement which he wrought was the redemption of the flag and the restoration of its honor throughout the world. The world had said that the militarism of the United States had declined under the burden of its civilization. The explosion of the battleship *Maine* made everybody restless and eager for conflict, but President

McKinley said we must wait until we discover whether we have a right to go to war. We must wait until men perceive the justice of our movements. We must wait until we are able to properly equip and train our forces for the front. And not until every step of diplomacy and equity had been taken, not until all was ready was the signal given. Then suddenly in the doorway of the White House there appeared the Civil War major, sword uplifted with the tricolor of our liberty streaming in the wind. The ensign of the Republic found a home in both the hemispheres, a flag on which the sun no longer sets.

The third achievement of McKinley was the solidarity which he accomplished in the Western Hemisphere. He closed the chasm between the North and the South. He instituted friendships and neighborly relationships with Mexico and the Republics of South America. He sowed the seed which ripened into present-day respect for United States leadership in the Western World.

No doubt there were many who opposed his methods and his views—great as these were—but there was no difference of opinion about the man.

Let me quote from a short editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of September 15, 1901:

As a citizen aside from political matters and as a man there was no difference of opinion concerning William McKinley. His strictest political opponents—it would be a misuse of language to say his bitterest political foes, because he was not the man to inspire bitterness in anyone and his opponents could hardly be designated foes—esteemed him as a citizen and were among his warmest personal friends. His kindness of disposition, sincerity of manner and unflinching courtesy made it impossible to be on ill terms with him, however strong the disagreement on political grounds.

From the humble position in life in which he started to the highest possible rank to which he attained and in which his life closed, he was ever the same modest unassuming, plain American citizen, doing his duty to his country and his neighbors as he understood it and claiming no special credit for doing that duty.

His private life was without reproach, his domestic life one that endeared him to the people who hold domestic virtues in strong regard. His religion was sincere but unostentatious and was expressed in his dying words, "It is God's way. His will be done."

The editorial continues:

To sum it all up William McKinley was an honest, patriotic, clean-lived, God-fearing plain American citizen. His example as such is an inspiration. Such as he made this country what it is. The hope of the country's future lies in the knowledge that the late President was a representative of the qualities and the virtues of American citizenship.

But there was one further side of William McKinley that I bring to you lest I omit the greatest factor of all: his spiritual life—the anchor to which he held firm, one from which we today seem to have drifted far. We find him saying in Youngstown on September 6, 1892:

No man gets on so well in this world as he whose daily walk and conversation are clean and consistent, whose heart is pure and whose life is honorable. A religious spirit helps every man. It is at once a comfort and an inspiration, and makes him stronger, wiser, and better in every relation of life. There is no substitute for it. It may be assailed by its enemies, as it has

been, but they offer nothing in its place. It has stood the test of centuries and has never failed to help and bless mankind.

In another place he said:

The men who established this Government had faith in God and sublimely trusted Him. They besought counsel and advice in every step of their progress. And so it has been ever since; American history abounds in instances of this trait of piety, this sincere reliance on a higher power in all great trials of our national affairs.

And at another time:

No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the invisible hand which conducts the affairs of man more than the people of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency.

It is noteworthy that Cardinal Gibbons, speaking at Baltimore at the time of his death, said:

He would have adorned any court in Christendom by his civil virtues. No court in Europe or in the world was more conspicuous for moral rectitude and purity or more free from the breath of scandal than the official home of President McKinley.

And Rabbi Joseph Silverman, speaking at the time of his funeral in New York City, said:

The supremely religious life made him an ideal President of the Nation, on a plane with Washington and Lincoln. Speaking epigrammatically we might say that Washington created the Union, Lincoln preserved the Union, and McKinley expanded the Union. He wisely brought harmony out of political chaos, shattered the financial heresies of his opponents, and conserved the stability of the Nation's credit. He always felt that he was doing God's work, that he was a humble servant of the Lord in His vineyard on earth.

Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of the birth of Ohio's William McKinley, I would commend to you the strength, the gentleness, the integrity, and the wisdom that characterized him. I urge upon you the example of his consecrated service to his country and to all mankind. And may the Infinite find such service now, as always, acceptable in His sight.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable William McKinley has always been one of my ideals. He was a man of character; he was a man of deep convictions. A little incident that occurred on this floor when he was a Member of Congress will illustrate his line of thinking so far as his public duty was concerned.

When Maj. William McKinley was returned to Congress by a reduced majority a colleague in the opposition party chided him with these words: "Your constituents do not seem to support you."

Major McKinley's reply is worthy of remembering: "My fidelity to my constituents is not measured by the support they give me. I have convictions which I would not surrender if 10,000 majority had been entered against me." He exercised a great moral influence on the

whole Nation. I have always believed that every man was some boy's ideal. Many times a man does not know it, but some boy in the neighborhood watches him; he likes the way he talks, the way he walks, and he says to himself, "When I grow up I am going to be like Mr. So and So." That is a great responsibility that rests on every person. When a man gets into public life that means a greater responsibility as the ideal of young Americans, because he is in evidence to the boys of the entire country. I think the character and the convictions of the Honorable William McKinley in public office have exercised a great influence not only on his own generation but also on succeeding generations. If I had time I could prove that the influence of men lives and inspires others not only for generations but for thousands of years. I think that McKinley's influence as a man of deep conviction and of great moral character will travel down the ages.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as an admirer from behind the Confederate lines, I desire to join in these tributes to William McKinley, a great American.

I have often said that the two Republican Presidents for whom I have the highest regard were Rutherford B. Hayes and William McKinley, both of whom were from Ohio. Rutherford B. Hayes deserves the undying gratitude of the American people for the action he took in removing the Federal troops from the South and restoring peace to this Nation by putting an end to the dark days of "reconstruction."

William McKinley was a great American. His assassination was a horrible calamity the results of which are felt to this day.

While I did not agree with Mr. McKinley on the tariff issue, and on many other issues, I always regarded him as a great American who put the welfare of his country first.

To give you an idea of how he stood personally with his colleagues here from the Southern States, I call attention to the fact that he is said to have joined the Masonic lodge at Winchester, Va. I am a Mason. I have been master of a lodge, and I have been deputy grand master of my State. I know there is one place where a man's character is scrutinized, and when McKinley was made a Mason in Winchester, Va., I am told that every single officer in the lodge was a Confederate soldier. That is one of the greatest tributes that could have been paid him; and his daily life showed that he richly deserved it.

I gladly join in these tributes to this great American. I wish we had more men like him today.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], who represents Mr. McKinley's old district.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, we are today paying tribute to an American who is considered by many historians as the outstanding graduate of this Chamber—William McKinley.

Perhaps, in accordance with the inscrutable ways which are God's, there is today being molded in this same Chamber some other great American of tomorrow.

If our imaginary leader of the future would assure his success, he could follow no better course than to emulate the actions of William McKinley in this House.

What obligations would this impose?

It would require, first of all, a paramount sense of duty to his country. This, William McKinley possessed in abundance.

It would entail the maintenance of a calm and analytic mind which would function well even in the heat of battle.

It would mean that our friend must conduct himself at all times and in all places as a Christian gentleman who truly loves his fellow men, and is in turn loved and respected by them.

Biographies, letters, speeches, and his own remarks on this very floor show these to be the characteristics which played a great part in the ultimate ascension of McKinley to the Presidency.

We are told that no one, not even his most dedicated opponents, ever doubted McKinley's honesty, sincerity, and patriotism—all thought highly of him.

There is also evidence that McKinley possessed a quiet sense of humor which often stood him in good stead.

This is best exemplified, I believe, by the colloquy which he carried on with the Democratic chairman of the Ways and Means Committee during a session in the late 1880's when the tariff question was the great issue of the day.

The conversation went something like this:

The chairman, evidently somewhat disgruntled, said, "Mr. Speaker, we have been working for 6 months, and have yet to get a bill out onto the floor."

Mr. McKinley quickly rose, and amidst great laughter, as reported by the RECORD, stated, "You brought out the tariff bill."

"Yes," retorted the chairman, "and you were instrumental in butchering it mercilessly."

Never, McKinley replied, had he been so delighted with the results of his efforts. Again the RECORD reports laughter by the Members.

A few years later, it was McKinley, as chairman of the same committee, who brought through the House the highly protective McKinley Tariff Act on which rests much of his fame as a Member of this House.

Largely because of the great prosperity which the country enjoyed following the passage of this act, McKinley was elected to two terms as Governor of Ohio. His efforts in that office met with widespread commendation, and, as is well known, won the Republican Presidential nomination in the summer of 1896 and the election that fall.

As President, McKinley continued to practice those attributes of kindness, consideration, and devotion to duty which had previously won him widespread respect.

When the Spanish-American War broke out, William McKinley did much to heal the still sore relations between North and South by naming Joe Wheeler and Fitzhugh Lee, nephew of Robert E. Lee, as major generals in the Army of the United States.

After the war was concluded and the question remained as to what disposition should be made of the Philippine Islands, McKinley was greatly troubled. He asked the Lord's guidance, and thereafter announced that we must attempt to educate, civilize, and Christianize the inhabitants of the islands, in order that they might ultimately enjoy that freedom which is theirs today.

William McKinley's death at the hands of the anarchist, Leon Czolgosz, in 1901, marked the close of a magnificent chapter in the history of our Nation—a chapter in which many of the greatest scenes were laid in this very Chamber in which we meet today.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member wishing to add his remarks to these tributes to Mr. McKinley be permitted to do so at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Thursday, following any special orders heretofore granted.

#### AMERICA'S RETREAT FROM VICTORY

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1951, the Senator from Wisconsin made a speech in the other body on the subject of Gen. George Marshall. The Senator in that speech cited chapter and verse of a well-nigh unbroken succession of acts by General Marshall that favored the cause of Soviet Russia. According to one of the best legal minds in the House today, Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, Michigan, that speech of the Senator from Wisconsin was the most completely and thoroughly documented speech given in the other body during the last 20 years.

In a book just published by Senator McCARTHY, entitled "America's Retreat From Victory," he summarizes that speech and comments upon it. Any doubting Thomas who reads that book carefully will become an out-and-out convert to McCarthyism. The facts stated and the documents cited are proof positive that the Senator from Wisconsin has been, and still is, absolutely right in his charge that in the administration there have been, and still are, many subversives in important positions.

In reading the book, however, one should always keep in mind that practically every act and every move of General Marshall during the entire period covered by the book was done under orders from, or without the protest of, either Commander in Chief Franklin D. Roosevelt or President Truman. General Marshall was a good soldier; he carried out the orders of his Commander in Chief.

No figure opposing the administration has been attacked more bitterly than Senator McCARTHY. His enemies have, cunningly as they thought, coined a special epithet—"McCarthyism." If this country is to be saved from the Communists and Communist-sympathizers that have guided its policy—and under whose guidance it has been headed toward destruction—the term "McCarthyism" must come to stand for the acts of a courageous patriot who is willing to stand up in the face of bitter attacks and tell his story. We need more McCarthys in Washington.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing a bill which would provide for the joint study of the St. Lawrence seaway project by the Corps of Engineers and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I believe that the results of this joint study will provide the Congress and the Nation with essential information which should be at hand when and if the measure is ever reported out of committee.

My people are vigorously opposed to the construction of the project. Our reasons have been frequently stated and will again be brought to the attention of the committee and the Congress. It is our belief that for an intelligent consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway and of its kindred ramifications there should be more information than is presently available.

I trust that my bill will receive early and favorable consideration in committee and in the House.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, to anyone who has been, and is, concerned with the economic interests and the security of our Nation, the President's message to Congress urging the enactment of legislation to carry out the 1941 agreement with Canada for joint completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and

power project contained very few facts which are not already known. This particular subject has been examined and discussed thoroughly, and over a period of a good many years, by Members and committees of this body, by various ranking Government officials and agencies, and by the American public and press. The advantages of our participation in the construction, management, and control of the St. Lawrence project have been pointed out time and time again, and were never refuted simply because they are not any figments of imagination but valid conclusions derived from a careful and impartial analysis of concrete facts. For that reason, it is difficult to understand why Congress, having these facts before it, has so far refused to act on this legislation, thereby going along with what boils down to be the selfish dictates of eastern railroad interests and a few coastal port and shipping groups which oppose the seaway.

The President's message emphasizes and brings to fore the pressing need for speedy and favorable action on the seaway legislation. It appears to me that Congress has been dilly-dallying with this matter too long, and that the time has come when we must decide whether the interests of our entire Nation will be given preference over the interests of a few special groups.

The Government and the people of Canada, who have been waiting patiently for years to have us make up our mind, have decided to proceed with the construction of the seaway on their own. As the President stated:

The question before the Congress, therefore, no longer is whether the St. Lawrence seaway should be built. The question before the Congress now is whether the United States shall participate in its construction, and thus maintain joint operation and control over this development which is so important to our security and our economic progress.

I know that it is not within my power to present to the Members of this body the valid and unrefutable arguments favoring our participation in this project in any more clear, or more eloquent, fashion than they have been presented on so many occasions in the past. I wish that I could do that, only because such an accomplishment on my part could serve to further this worthy and essential cause. But even though I must acknowledge my shortcomings in this respect, I want to again add my voice to those that have been, and are, urging the approval of the St. Lawrence seaway legislation, mentioning at least a few reasons for my stand.

First of all, the projected seaway is important to our national security. Various military and civilian experts, as well as special commissions, have attested to that fact, backing their claims with facts which cannot be ignored. One of them concerns the availability of high-grade iron ore, essential to our present defense preparations and to our civilian industrial production. The deposits of the Mesabi ore on which we have been depending are diminishing rapidly.

They can be supplemented by Labrador ore which, however, can only be brought economically to our great steel mills in the Midwest by water transportation. The railroads cannot convey that ore to our steel mills at anywhere near the low rates of water traffic. In addition, railroad routes are channeled in most part through New York City, which turns into a terrible bottleneck in times of peacetime tie-ups, and which, in the event of war, could become a real and dangerous menace.

Secondly, the seaway will be of great significance to the commerce and industry of our Nation. Not only steel but agricultural and other products would move through it. The low rates which this water route could afford would serve to expand our commerce and industrial activity.

There is one more point I would like to make. The seaway will be self-liquidating through the collection of tolls. Unless we participate in its construction, Canada will determine the levels of these tolls. And since it is evident that, whether or not we shall participate in the construction of the seaway, we will make greater use of it than will Canada, we will be paying the major portion of toll rates without having anything to say about their levels.

These, and the many other reasons advanced in connection with this matter, compel me to urge the Members of this body to give their prompt and favorable consideration to the seaway legislation which is now pending before the appropriate congressional committees.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday on the subject of Presidential primaries, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 29, 1952.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

Yours very truly,

VERA BUCHANAN,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.  
There was no objection.

#### ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 508), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, That VERA BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, be, and she is hereby, elected a*

member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GOVERNOR GENERAL VINCENT MASSEY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know those in Washington who knew the Vincent Masseys will rejoice that he has been made Governor General of Canada. Instead of having a British Governor General they now have a Canadian Governor General. Vincent Massey was a very fine Minister to the United States and did much to increase neighborly good will between our countries. I believe it will add greatly to the bond of friendship between the United States and Canada. There is every reason why Canada and the United States should be joined together more and more in ties of friendship, as good neighbors, and also as a matter of national security, for both Canada and the United States.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

#### MANUFACTURE OF INFLAMMABLE CLOTHING

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, back home in Endicott, one of the triple cities, I was recently approached by a friend and constituent who demanded that I bring a direct request of his to the floor of the House of Representatives. He said, "I demand a prohibition of the manufacture of this ignitable clothing that is being sold and purveyed by unscrupulous manufacturers. I think it is time that the population of the United States was made secure from these dishonest and unscrupulous manufacturers who put ignitable



chemicals upon these sweaters, so that just a lighted match or a cigarette touching the cloth or the material will cause them to go up in smoke within a minute after they have been ignited."

For that reason I am introducing a bill today prohibiting the manufacture of the combustible sweater and the inflammable material which goes to make up clothing of this kind, as a safeguard to the American people.

The following is the text of the bill I am introducing today:

A bill to prohibit the manufacture of combustible sweaters and other inflammable clothing

Whereas the public press has carried numerous stories of widespread evidence of severe accidents to citizens caused by wearing certain articles of inflammable clothing; and

Whereas the manufacture of combustible sweaters is proving injurious to our people; and

Whereas further distribution of such merchandise will jeopardize the health and well-being of many Americans: Therefore

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

(1) That the manufacture of clothing which is highly inflammable, combustible, and ignitable shall be completely prohibited.

(2) Further distribution of such clothing shall be punishable by a fine not to exceed \$10,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION IN AMERICA IS ESSENTIAL IF WE PRESERVE OUR GREATEST NATIONAL ASSETS AND IF WE PREVENT THIS LAND OF OURS FROM BECOMING AN IMPOVERISHED DESERT

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech by J. Matt Hensley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, in these times of international stress we are prone to overlook the supreme importance of certain domestic problems.

There are only a few basic resources of wealth, broadly speaking. These are the topsoil of our land and mineral deposits in the earth and the products grown and derived from these original sources when the work and labor and intelligence of man is applied to growing, recovering, and manufacturing the necessities of life that we obtain from the topsoil and the mineral deposits of the earth.

The life and happiness, and the very existence of every citizen in the United States, those who dwell in the cities as well as those who live in small towns and on farms, depend absolutely upon these being conserved and being protected from waste and erosion, the rich topsoil of the lands which we collectively possess here in the United States.

Practically all of our food and most of our clothing and shelter are derived from the topsoil. If this is further depleted, wasted, and eroded away, it will not be long until poverty and famine begin to get a death grip upon America just as

it has on many lands of the earth in the past.

History is replete with many examples of rich nations, such as China, India, Egypt, and the Holy Land, that formerly had abundant production of food and the necessities of life, being wasted away and large parts of them becoming sands and deserts and rocky hills, through the everlasting process of erosion and of wasting away of the topsoil to such an extent that millions of people have starved to death, that great nations have been weakened and impoverished and their opportunities and happiness in life turned into a miserable existence for the lack of food and shelter, is an ever-present shadow that haunts their people from the cradle to the grave.

The earth and the fruits thereof were given to man to cultivate, nourish, and preserve. If this is not done scientifically, under past methods of denuding the soil by stripping it of its timber and vegetation and by improper methods of farming, we have turned loose on our land all of the destructive forces of nature.

The earth can protect itself from erosion and the washing away of the rich topsoil if its natural coverings are left intact. However, when it becomes necessary to remove the natural cloak of protection which nature gives her topsoil in order that we may recover and use the timber and crops grown on the land, unless we do this and at the same time protect the soil by scientific soil-conservation methods, we hasten and accelerate the process of erosion and wasting of the topsoil to such an extent that here in the United States we are already on the precipice of destruction, and unless we turn back the forces of nature that lash our land and wash the topsoil down the thousands of rivers, creeks, and branches into the sea, we will soon have such a small amount of topsoil left that this country of ours cannot feed and nurture its people.

Our citizens who live in our great cities depend altogether upon the products of our topsoil produced by the farmers and food growers of America; in fact, the city dwellers only receive the surplus after the farmers and their families have retained all the food they need for their own homes and tables. It is just as important, or more so, to our people who live in the cities to promote and support scientific soil conservation all over the United States as it is to the farmers themselves.

It is calculated by our best agricultural authorities that it takes approximately 3 acres of good topsoil to support each individual throughout the life of that individual. In the comparatively short history of the United States, since the soil of this continent was first broken by man and its natural covering and protection taken from the land, we have had more than 100,000,000 acres of fine topsoil washed and eroded away. There is left in the United States only a small margin of protection and cushion of topsoil over and above the absolutely neces-

sary amount for the sustenance of our people.

The process of waste and erosion is ever-present in the United States and much of our topsoil is lost and washed away every year; at the same time our population is increasing rapidly, and before we reach and cross the danger line, all the people of America should wake up to the realization that our first concern should be directed toward conservation of the topsoil of the United States in every State and county and upon every farm in America.

Fortunately, we have men who know how to do this, men who have acquired the knowledge and training of how to combat the forces of nature and to preserve for us these invaluable assets that concern us all.

Another fortunate thing is, under the present set-up of the soil conservation program in the United States, we have a system of home rule, where the citizens of each county select their own leaders and plan their own program, adopt their own rules and regulations and carry out the methods which they know to be essential to protect the top soil on the lands and farms of their own communities.

There are furnished under the soil conservation program to these local officers and directors of the soil conservation program, men who are scientifically trained in soil conservation. These trained experts, with vast knowledge from experience and training, give to the local soil conservation authorities the full benefit of their knowledge and leadership on the ground and this program has been in effect long enough in this country of ours to demonstrate its great value and effectiveness.

There is nothing socialistic about it: it is a combination of free American men pooling their strength and knowledge to conserve everywhere this essential wealth for the benefit of the present and future generations of citizens of this great country of ours. The trouble at present is the failure of the people generally, and the Members of Congress and our Federal officials, to grasp the vital importance of this question and to make sufficient appropriations to bear the conservative and legitimate expense of these highly trained and expert men who know how to teach our citizens the basic principles of soil conservation. While we give many billions of dollars to other nations, the appropriations of the Federal Government to the vital program of soil conservation has been but a drop in the bucket.

To prevent the erosion and wasting away of billions of dollars worth of our topsoil every year, in the past, although we have been generous with everybody else, there was appropriated but a very small sum last year—\$50,000,000—for this program, to be spread over the entire United States. Sometimes in the course of human events a little money can be spent to protect great values and to increase the wealth and prosperity of our people. We have countless examples of this. If a family owns a fine, large,

comfortable home, well furnished, and if the roof of that home gets full of holes, and the rains and storms, snow, and ice are allowed to invade that home, tremendous damage and destruction will take place; while, on the other hand, the timely expenditure of a little money and a little work to stop the leaks in the roof will save from waste and destruction the house and all its contents. Just such a situation confronts our people in the conservation of our topsoil. We could well expend 10 times the amount that we have been expending on this vital program. We could take the money that is wasted and squandered in many nonessential governmental activities and apply it to this universal need, with great profit to all our people.

The creation of additional wealth by the labor of our people upon rich and productive soil would soon increase the national income to such an extent that our Federal Government would derive in additional taxes and revenue more than enough to replace the original initial outlay of money for soil conservation.

Soil conservation is a national problem. The States can, and do, help in this program, but soil conservation is needed and required across the face of all the land in every State in the Union, and our Federal Government is concerned and should be concerned. The problem which confronts the Members of Congress is to see to it that this soil-conservation program is expanded and sufficiently financed to meet the great need that exists all around us throughout the United States, and to stop as quickly as possible the wasting and washing away of hundreds of thousands of fertile acres, and to reverse this trend so as to build up and enrich the land in every State and county and on every farm in our Nation.

Since coming to Congress I have voted for and assisted in passing reductions in the amount of money requested by the present administration of over \$75,000,000,000. I belong to what is referred to as the economy bloc in Congress. I am against waste and extravagance, but I do believe in spending money where a small expenditure will enrich and strengthen the country and pay many-fold on the investment.

A very modest request will be placed before the Appropriations Committee of the Congress for soil conservation at the present session. Only \$53,474,991 is being requested for soil conservation. This is not enough; it is only a very slight increase over last year. The needs in my home district require about twice the amount of money that we received for this very vital program last year and I feel sure other congressional districts are in about the same shape. I think we could well afford to trim some appropriations and increase the appropriation for soil conservation, and I shall endeavor to sponsor and support such a program in the present session of Congress.

Soil conservation not only saves and holds in place topsoil, but it works hand in hand with the reforestation program

to conserve our natural resources in the forest and timberlands of our Nation, and at the same time soil conservation also makes a very notable contribution to our efforts to check the devastating effects of floods that frequently ravish our lands.

There was delivered in my congressional district a speech by Mr. J. Matt Hensley, director of soil conservation, on September 15, 1951, at Somerset, Ky., which speech of Mr. Hensley is so full of vital information that I feel that the people of America should have an opportunity to know what Mr. Hensley said. This speech not only conveys to our people some of the basic facts on soil conservation, but it sets forth in clear and understandable terms the program of soil conservation and shows clearly that it is based upon home rule and is in complete accord with our American traditions of free government by the people, and, under unanimous consent of my colleagues in Congress, I incorporate this speech of Mr. Hensley in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and make it a part of my remarks:

Gentlemen, the things I'm going to say may be entirely out of place in this meeting. Some of you know some of the things I shall say. Some of you don't know some of the things I'm going to say and none of you know all of the things I'm going to say.

It seems to me that we are moving to the time when all the agricultural agencies will be put under one management.

Then the question arises in my mind, will the Soil Conservation Service or the Production and Marketing Administration be the predominating one and the other one subservient to it?

Let me say I have nothing against the P&MA. I'm for it. In fact I was a member of the first AAA committee formed in our county and remained its chairman until I resigned. I have drawn compliance money every year since it was set up. I have drawn money for hogs I raised. I have drawn money for hogs I didn't raise. I have drawn money for seeds I sowed in compliance, and I have sowed seeds and performed other practices for which I didn't draw money.

And now this year I'm hoping to draw for the following: 5 acres balbo rye, turned under; 2 tons mascot lime spread; 500 pounds 2-12-6 fertilizer spread; 500 pounds superphosphate; 400 pounds crimson clover, 27 pounds of certified ladino clover seeded; 307 pounds fescue seed sowed; 1 bag barley; 1 bag balbo rye; 477 linear feet of tile ditching; over 4,000 feet of open drain ditching; and 200 pounds of broadleaf hairy peas sowed.

This runs to more than \$250. So you can see I'm for the Production and Marketing Administration. I wish they had more money with which to pay us for compliance. Secretary Brannan stated that the farmers' profits had recently decreased 12 percent while the businessman's profits had increased 35 percent, thereby making a difference of 47 percent. So it looks to me like we need help.

But when I think that the Soil Conservation Service activities working through locally owned and operated soil conservation districts might be curtailed, I'm forced to take a longer view than the present. I think of the time when I can no longer say this field or these acres are mine. I think of the time when, if a spot of ground some 5 by 7 feet could talk, it could say, "I contain, I possess the body of J. Matt Hensley."

When I think of it in terms of times to come I become soil conservation district minded.

Go with me if you will to Northern Africa and back on the table lands we will find the barren, hard, dry, and dusty soil; a great man-made desert.

Go on over to the land of Mesopotamia where Adam and Eve are supposed to have lived in the Garden of Eden—where perhaps Noah lived and even the gourd vines could make a shade for a man to rest under. What do you find there? You will find there ancient cities standing on bare rocks above the top of the ground, while in many other places the soil is more than 30 feet deep.

Go on around to the land where Moses sent his spies and they came back carrying a cluster of grapes and reported, "This is a fine land; truly it is a land that flows with milk and honey." But what do you find there today? You will find a sparse population of Arabs moving their flocks from one place to another; grazing them on the scanty vegetation that is left.

Go on around to Phoenicia, where the great cedars that went into the temple grew. They are not there anymore.

And so it has gone and continues to go. Kingdoms have risen and fallen. What is the story back of this? What is the history of the people? What happened to these cradles of civilization? If you would know go and investigate the story of their productive soils. Get the history of their different agricultures.

Move on across the Aegean Sea into Greece. Athens was once considered the seat of learning. Not too long ago I heard a man who was just back from Greece say, "Those hills on which the Greeks used to pasture their sheep are now denuded of all forms of vegetation. The people live in villages in the lower parts. They do not make a pretense of eating three square meals each day. The only real meal they get is at evening. Then they cook the meal on an open fire built from the twigs and sticks which they gather, and they eat that one meal more or less in common in front of their shabby homes. Their standards of living are very low."

Come back to our own land.

When our forefathers began to settle America, they found a land far richer in basic wealth than their wildest fancies or dreams even pictured. By basic wealth I mean the soil—dirt, and those things that go with it, such as vegetation, coal, oil. Instead of us conserving that basic wealth we have been busy trying to accumulate man-made wealth.

Yes, God did a wonderful job in giving America so much basic wealth and we have done and are continuing to do a wonderful job of destroying that gift.

We have already lost 50,000,000 acres of our productive soil; another 50,000,000 acres are on the verge of being destroyed; and another 100,000,000 acres have lost between 25 and 75 percent of its top soil, leaving us approximately 350,000,000 acres to feed 150,000,000 people—to say nothing of the rest of the world.

If you will divide 350,000,000 acres by 150,000,000 you will see that we have about two and one-third acres per person. It is estimated that it takes 2 acres for each human being. So you can see that we still have one-third of an acre to play on.

But that margin is fast decreasing, for erosion takes place at an accelerated rate. Likewise our population is increasing at an accelerated rate. Why, it is estimated that we lost the equivalent of 12,500 40-acre farms each year. Multiply 40 acres by 12,500 and you get 500,000 acres. Now we can't stand that. We must wake up. I wonder if we as a Nation might not be compared to a man floating down the Niagara in a boat toward

the falls. At first no one pays any attention to him. Then someone from the shore calls a warning, but placidly the man floats on. Someone begins to holler, "Ahoy! The falls are below you." All of a sudden he realizes his boat has been caught in the rushing current. He rows for dear life and calls for help, but to no avail. He is swept over the falls into eternity and this world knows him no more.

Now what has become of this topsoil? Where is it going?

You can certainly say, "Most of it at least is going where it is not wanted." It is filling reservoirs, lakes, harbors, and streambeds. And it is costing quite a lot to take care of it. You may be surprised to know that it is costing different agencies yearly two-thirds as much as it cost to build the entire Panama Canal. You say, "Oh, let them pay it." But listen, it is estimated that each of us with a wife and one child is paying \$20 yearly on this bill. We pay our part of taxes, higher prices on the articles we buy, and in different ways.

Now of course when I talk of soil erosion and soil conservation I think of water. Oh, I would like to hear some man preach a good sermon on water. When I think of water I see two pictures. First I see the thirsty, dusty, dry traveler on the desert who has lost his way. He begins to chase one mirage after another and before he loses all of his power to reason he cries, "Water! Water! Oh, Lord, I would give all I possess for one glass of cool clear water."

We are beginning to realize that our ground water is no longer constant.

When I was a boy my father dug a well in our yard. That well seemed to be the choice well in our community for some 25 years. Then it failed. They drilled deeper in the same well and had ample water for some 20 years more and that one failed. Then I had one dug and it lasted some 10 years and began going dry. Two years ago I had another one drilled. Think of it. Four wells sunk in the same yard and each of them lasting for years and then failing. All in the same yard and that in the lifetime of one person. Perhaps others of you have had a like experience. No; our ground water is no longer constant.

Then I get another picture of water. I see the man when he realizes the flood is rushing down upon his home, and I can hear him call to his neighbor, "To the hills! To the hills! The waters are out."

Some of us in this room very vividly remember the flash flood of June 1947. We know partly what happened when the waters were from 10 to 15 feet fuller than any living resident had ever heard of.

What has been happening in Kansas and Missouri recently in the way of floods may happen to us at any time. Flood control is a big problem. President Truman is asking Congress for \$400,000,000 with which to fight floods.

Now what is the answer? What is the solution to soil conservation and water control?

To my mind the best answer, so far, is the technical aid of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture working through locally owned and operated soil-conservation districts.

The first soil-conservation district was formed in North Carolina in 1937. By December 31, 1949, each State in our Union had passed laws making it possible to organize soil-conservation districts.

We supervisors of soil-conservation districts hold an increasingly important job because we represent the efforts of local people to solve their soil- and water-conservation problems locally and under State law.

We stand as the only defense of the free-enterprise system in soil and water conserva-

tion over against the yoke of controls. We represent the American way of doing things. Let us each one continue and increase our efforts for soil-conservation districts.

This movement is young, but it has wonderful possibilities and is working toward a goal that must be reached. Oh, we have only begun. We are making a little dent. You soil-conservation district supervisors are a very important part of that work. You have laid your hands to the plow. Are you willing to stick?

After all this land we claim is not ours. "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." "Yea the cattle of a thousand hills." We are only stewards for a very fleeting moment of time. I'm grateful to Him who made it possible and permitted me to be the steward of His acres, and when I release my stewardship to the next steward, I hope he finds these acres in as good shape as they were when I first claimed them.

#### WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there is a room in the Old House Office Building opposite the quarters of the Committee on the Armed Services that is being called the Chamber of Horrors. I did not name it; it was so named by probers of the Armed Services Committee. If you have time to go into that room you will find therein documented a story of military waste that will shock you.

When I voted for unification I thought the first thing that would be unified in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps was procurement, but apparently there is no such thing; for instance, you will find in this room overseas boots now being purchased by the Army at \$24 per pair. The same identical boots are now being purchased by the Marine Corps at \$16 per pair. There also you will find scores and scores of items showing similar discrepancies. I asked one of the probers working on this job how much he thought might be saved by honestly unified procurement. He said: "Eight to ten billion dollars."

Who says that President Truman's military budget cannot be reduced?

Who says that we have a proper budget? Who says we have a proper watchdog operation on these billions of expenditures?

When President Truman was a Senator and chairman of the Senate Committee Investigating War Expenditures, he castigated the military for their wastefulness. History proves they have always been imprudent spenders.

Now is the time to stop this business, to prevent scandal after scandal, and to protect a tax-weary and scandal-shocked American public.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM T. BYRNE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was detained in Pittsburgh yesterday when eulogies were expressed concerning the demise of our late lamented colleague, William Byrne, of New York. It is with the deepest sense of shock and personal loss that I learned of the passing of our friend and colleague. He was a man to lean on, to trust and to love. His never failing kindness, his humanity, together with his sense of equity and fairness, now withdrawn from our midst, will impoverish the Congress and the country. I personally will miss him sorely. I know the extent of the bereavement of his family, and I know that there are very, very many who share with them their grief.

Well might we say, as did the psalmist:

Better is the fragrance of a good name than the perfume of precious oils.

William Byrne does indeed leave behind him a good name.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### MANGANESE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when I no longer feel it advisable to refrain from speaking plainly and bluntly with respect to the matter of domestic manganese production.

We are inviting a national disaster through a possible shortage of manganese. Manganese is essential in the manufacture of steel. There is no substitute. Without manganese our steel mills would close.

We now consume approximately 2,000,000 short tons of manganese ore or the equivalent a year. In 1951 our production was approximately 120,000 short tons or 6 percent of our consumption. Imports during the year, which were not sufficient to build up a reserve stockpile, came mainly from India, Africa, and Brazil.

The steel industry is operating on a hand-to-mouth basis in manganese. Our stockpiles are limited. In 1949 it was estimated that we had little more than a year's supply of manganese ore in stockpile. The stockpile has been increased by dribbles, but due to increased consumption it is estimated that we still have little more than a year's supply—just enough to fill our lines leading to the steel mills. A year without imports or domestic production and we will scrape the bottom of the barrel. Should

an all-out war come before the condition is corrected, we would face a desperate situation. It could be fatal.

Domestic mines cannot well be developed and put into production after an emergency starts. It takes time to carry forward underground developments and build plants for concentrating the ores.

An official of the United States Bureau of Mines has testified before a congressional committee to the effect that in case of war and our foreign supplies of manganese are cut off and we have no vigorous start on accelerated domestic production "we might as well acknowledge that the war is over."

The United States has no vigorous start on domestic production. In 1944, 131 domestic mines shipped 247,000 tons of manganese ore. By 1946 the number of mines shipping was reduced to 10. The production of 120,000 tons during 1951 was the lowest for any year since 1944. This was due to changes in specifications and cutbacks following the war.

If only the mines shipping in 1944 had been kept in operation we would now have an additional 700,000 tons of manganese ore in stockpile. The 1944 production of 247,000 tons per year could easily have been doubled or tripled. But instead of continuing production following the end of the war and passage of the Stockpile Act of 1946, most mines were forced to closed and little has been done to get them back into production.

Five years after the passage of the Stockpile Act we are producing less than before. It is a shameful exhibition of Government planning.

I am informed that a few special contracts have been let that promise to increase domestic production, but the total over-all proposed production is alarmingly small.

I refer particularly to the release of the GSA on July 21, 1951, wherein they state that—

Two regulations under which the General Services Administration will carry out a 5-year domestic manganese purchasing program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese in the United States were issued today.

Jess Larson, Administrator of General Services, said the Government will purchase manganese ore from miners at three depots being set up by GSA at Butte and Philipsburg, Mont., and Deming, N. Mex.

I am informed that this new 5-year program, even if completed to the maximum, will supply at the most only about 2 percent of our annual consumption. The mining publications in the West report that this program is a flop. They are not getting the ores expected.

The reasons are plain. At Butte and Philipsburg, Mont., they buy only carbonate ores. Most small mines in Montana ship only oxide ores. At Deming, N. Mex., they do not specify either oxide or carbonate ores but offer only \$6.10 per long ton for ores containing 15-percent manganese, with higher prices for higher grades. Processing charges levied against ores further reduce the price. Few, if any, miners can mine and transport 15-percent manganese ores at \$6.10 per ton.

The total over-all tonnage authorized to be bought at Deming, N. Mex., during the 5-year period is only 6,000,000 long-ton units; which means an estimated recoverable tonnage of 90,000 long tons of ore concentrates containing 50-percent metallic manganese, or approximately 18,000 tons per year. This is not sufficient tonnage to justify investment on the part of each operator to install individual upgrading plants to raise the manganese content of his ore. Miners remember too well the experiences with the Government following World War II. Most producers had the markets withdrawn without warning, and were left holding the bag. Many lost their shirts and have never been paid even their cash expenditures. On account of unfavorable Government policies they are afraid to again stick their necks out.

The situation is well summarized in a short statement published in the September 1951 issue of *New Mexico Miner and Prospector*, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.:

**MANGANESE ASSOCIATION CHIEF CITES ESTIMATES ON ANNUAL CONSUMPTION**

"The Government's new manganese program, as announced by the General Services Administration, to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese in the United States, through purchase of ores at Butte and Philipsburg, Mont., and Deming, N. Mex., will supply at the most only about 2 percent of our annual consumption," J. Carson Adkerson, president of the American Manganese Producers Association, said recently.

"We consume approximately 2,000,000 tons of manganese ore or equivalent per year. The new program as announced provides for a maximum of around 38,000 tons per year of similar grade ore. But even this may not be obtained.

"Under the program few mines will be able to produce. The prices and specifications are so drawn as to rule out rather than include most manganese mines even within the areas. In Montana only carbonate ores will be accepted. Oxide ores are out.

"In New Mexico the price proposed for low-grade ores is too low to enable production without upgrading facilities and the over-all tonnage to be purchased is too small to enable each individual mine operator to install such facilities. The schedule further provides that only the recoverable manganese content of the ores will be paid for. This will further eliminate most potential producers.

"The word 'manganese' comes from a Greek word meaning mystification or delusion. To most manganese miners the new program and specifications will serve only to emphasize the meaning of the word.

"There are 2,000 or more known idle manganese deposits in the United States, scattered through 27 States from Maine to California, for which there is no Government program to bring forth production."

An editorial from the December 1951 issue of *New Mexico Miner*, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., expresses the views of the miners in the vicinity of the New Mexico stockpile depot:

The Deming depot is officially open and receiving low-grade manganese ores under provisions of the highly controversial program announced in July by the General Services Administration and amended November 29 by that agency.

As of December 7 it was not definitely known whether the schedule of treatment charges to shippers' accounts, as announced

in amended regulations of November 29, could or would be adhered to by GSA.

The New Mexico Mining Association and the Arizona Small Mine Operators Association both violently opposed this supplemental regulation on the grounds that it constituted breach of contract by the Government inasmuch as no mention was made in the July regulation of treatment charges to be assessed against the shipper.

It was pointed out in various press releases that several operators had spent considerable money on development and preparation of mines in anticipation of shipping to the depot on terms as originally announced in July; and that some of these operators would not be able to ship under the new regulation and would doubtless have to close down their mines. Likewise, the question has arisen as to whether these mine owners might not be entitled to recover some or all of the expenses involved in getting their properties ready to produce.

A visit with the principals in charge of the Deming depot revealed that they have a much better understanding of operators' problems than has been exhibited by the authors of the Federal manganese program. The Deming officials realize that very little ore containing less than 30-percent manganese will be received at the depot if shippers are going to be charged for beneficiation.

It is highly probable that if the economics of the program are such that only ores running 30 percent manganese or better can be shipped, the amount of manganese which the Government can expect to receive at Deming will be negligible.

Operators are advised that initial lots of less than 200 tons can be shipped with a reasonable assurance that payment will be made on the basis of the original purchase regulation. But there is no definite knowledge as to whether the treatment charges may be removed from subsequent shipments. Meetings are currently being held in Washington to determine whether the treatment charge should be reduced or eliminated.

When one considers the vast amounts of money which the United States is spending on foreign economic aid, most of which expenditures return practically nothing to this country, it seems inconceivable that the administrators of a domestic purchase program involving a commodity as critical as manganese would suddenly abrogate the announced terms of that program in an attempt to effect a saving at the expense of the producer.

When are we going to get some common sense in our mineral planning?

Why can't miners in the West be allowed sufficient profit incentives to permit them to carry on more extensive development and exploration?

If there is that incentive to get some of our manganese mines, long idle, into production, we may bring in some new ore bodies that will appreciably enhance our supplies of that vital metal.

It is hoped that the manganese mess will be straightened out, and fast. Industry needs the metal.

Most domestic manganese deposits have been worked on small scale and by crude methods only. The areas have hardly been scratched.

The widespread distribution and availability of manganese in the United States is evidenced by the record of shipments of a total of 2,767,237 tons of high-grade manganese ore from 26 States, up to and including 1944. The

shipments from each State are shown in a table from the chapter on Manganese, United States Bureau of Mines Mineral Year Book, 1944.

The following historical table presents a complete production record for the important producing States. As the Bureau of Mines has presented the data for the man-

ganese chapter in short tons (2,000 pounds) since 1942 and in long tons before 1942, the following table is given in short tons to place all years on a comparable basis:

Manganese ore (35 percent or more Mn) produced and shipped in the United States, 1838-1944, by States, in short tons

Year	Ala-bama	Arizona	Arkan-sas	Cali-fornia	Colo-rado	Georgia	Idaho	Montana	Nevada	New Mexico	Ten-nessee	Utah	Virginia	Wash-ington	Other States <sup>1</sup>	Total
1838-79			459	6,100		22,344							20,160			49,123
1880						2,016							4,100		336	6,452
1881			112			1,344							3,690		336	5,482
1882			196			1,120							3,340		420	5,076
1883			448										5,998		448	6,894
1884			896										10,058		448	11,402
1885			1,661	224		2,880			224				20,994		56	26,049
1886	84		3,714	112		6,765			84			56	23,035		16	33,816
1887			6,329			10,107							22,215		16	38,667
1888			4,829	1,680		6,236							19,764		193	32,702
1889			2,831	59		5,833				17		34	16,370		1,957	27,101
1890			5,980	432		839			112				14,223		16	21,602
1891			1,848	790		4,064							18,197		307	25,146
1892			7,513			925							6,808			15,246
1893			2,262	448		811						540	4,883			8,644
1894			2,166	311		1,430						1,033	2,013		112	7,065
1895			3,350	588		4,319							1,921		515	10,683
1896			3,832	318		4,575							2,260		314	11,299
1897			3,629	542		3,732						12	4,088		438	12,441
1898	25		2,981	606		7,492						427	6,341			17,872
1899			399	129		3,460						21	6,975		143	11,127
1900			162	147		3,861		153				34	8,827			13,184
1901	19		102	683		4,563						448	4,788		31	13,434
1902			92	948		3,920							3,406		9	8,375
1903				18		560							2,017		28	3,164
1904				67								36	3,420			3,523
1905				1		168						22	4,421			4,612
1906			69	1								34	6,751			7,751
1907				112								112	5,156		896	6,276
1908													6,881			6,881
1909													1,729			1,729
1910			560										1,969			2,529
1911				2									2,750			2,752
1912				21									1,721		121	1,863
1913													4,534			4,534
1914				561									1,931		459	2,951
1915	224	380	1,443	2,870	168	3,548					168	34	1,814		56	10,705
1916	30	3,427	7,076	6,872	123	1,761		7,188	346	567	480	1,436	4,947	101	896	35,250
1917	296	16,578	11,357	15,900	67	4,048		68,442	3,864	2,915	2,236	4,698	13,843		629	144,873
1918	794	19,725	8,659	26,955	5,400	7,480		223,924	22,257	3,501	4,661	5,712	12,239		1,266	342,573
1919	45	592	2,865	12,644	12,506	54		27,992	87		368		4,399			61,552
1920	64	2,690	3,858	1,941	4,080	382		85,614	1,389	2,299	562		2,826		45	105,750
1921		367	815		549			12,465			156		803			15,155
1922		227	2,536	286				10,921	20		127		896			15,013
1923	27	274	4,220	398	2,551	1,682		24,546		200	239		1,105		38	35,280
1924	1,391	47	3,808	952	5,979	1,224		39,698	1,467	868	510		1,753	5,600		63,297
1925	1,051	329	3,939	973	832	1,847		85,331	952	1,779	394	56	3,496	9,087	58	110,124
1926	1,004	3,006	2,744	440		3,641	630	26,451	1,800	2,202	1,742		4,247	3,541	62	51,810
1927	769	4,374	2,918		94	548	3,563	29,687	1,520	2,453	558	30	3,596			50,110
1928	472	3,928	4,058			5,294	1,506	29,941		2,942	62		4,269		11	82,483
1929		2,974	4,825	637		2,824	1,485	47,406		3,325	586	99	3,417		47	67,625
1930		408	3,669	181		21,165		39,878	1,668	2,883	569		4,315		344	75,080
1931		45	4,511	45		7,270		28,969		1,201	78		1,686		206	43,951
1932	299		1,463			224		17,336					588			19,910
1933	903		2,117			1,753		10,438			659		5,468		106	21,444
1934			6,543	177		7,035		12,934			1,219		1,789			29,697
1935	207		4,266	343		7,795		12,122			2,120		2,746			29,599
1936	641		5,104			4,280		18,451			3,964	1,831	1,524		199	35,974
1937	324		4,403			4,280		20,983		983	4,004	36	2,537		2,059	45,071
1938	226		3,345			3,425		13,368	48	628	4,626		2,511		183	28,360
1939	209		6,009	7		2,964		12,476		380	8,775	56	1,860		77	32,824
1940	272	413	6,808	177	251	4,001		21,665	235	50	8,308	31	2,482		245	44,938
1941	185	1,012	5,015	4,096	190	4,976	34	54,565	2,937		4,426	43	6,091	1,588		87,795
1942	26	2,946	4,132	12,908	513	4,917		130,086	6,112	1,267	2,247	970	11,246	10,660		150,748
1943		5,779	5,319	23,229	707	2,489	36	138,115	10,451	469	2,605	91	7,040	7,731	1,112	205,173
1944	49	8,519	7,109	21,540		1,135		159,889	21,799	273	418	30	20,172	5,199	1,484	247,616
Total	9,636	78,040	191,354	148,591	34,010	211,848	7,554	1,419,924	77,339	31,185	59,640	19,426	413,139	43,518	22,033	2,767,237

<sup>1</sup> Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

In 1944 the Metals Reserve Company announced a change in specifications. They were warned by the industry in advance that the new specifications would close most mines. The result was that of the 131 wartime mines developed by 1944, only 10 were in operation in 1946. The same specifications, in effect, continue today.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of Analysis of Metals Reserve Company Manganese Ore Schedule dated September 21, 1944:

ANALYSIS OF METALS RESERVE COMPANY MANGANESE ORE SCHEDULE

(By J. Carson Adkerson, president, American Manganese Producers Association, Washington, D. C., September 21, 1944)

The new manganese ore specifications recommended by War Production Board and an-

nounced by Metals Reserve Company to become effective January 1, 1945, will close a considerable number of domestic mines, many of which are just starting into production.

It is simply another chapter in the history of the Government war agencies failure to bring forth more American production of manganese after adequate warning from producers and the expenditure of many millions of dollars by the agencies themselves.

The war is not yet over. The cost to the Nation, in lives, ships, and dollars, through failure to develop our own manganese production is a story yet to be told.

In the war-year 1918, without preparation and without Government aid, domestic producers shipped 305,000 tons of manganese ore. In 1943, with processes known, and with so-called Government aid, the production was only 175,000 tons.

The only redeeming feature in the present emergency is the grade of domestic ore.

In 1941, the last year in which full records are available for release, ores from domestic mines averaged 50.6 percent manganese (United States Bureau of Mines Mineral Year Book 1941, manganese chapter, p. 13). This included ores containing 35 percent and more manganese. Even this raise in grade was brought about by private industry and not by the Government war agencies.

Most small mines do not have beneficiation plants and ship crude ore running below 42 percent. The new specifications will rule them out. Not only them, but the specifications are so drawn to rule out many other ores containing more than 42 percent manganese. Certain Arkansas ores for instance will run more than 0.3 percent phosphorus. They will be out. On the other hand, certain ores from New Mexico and Montana will contain practically no phosphorus but may contain more than 1 percent combined copper, lead, and zinc, or more than 15 percent combined silica and alumina. They, like-

wise, will be out, regardless of the manganese content of the ore.

If domestic ores are mixed or blended, as they most surely will be, before they are fed to a furnace, the average grade will likely be superior to foreign ores, just the same as the records show for the year 1941. But under the new specifications many of these ores will be denied a market.

The Metals Reserve Company schedule carries a penalty on alumina added to the silica. Alumina penalty was not added to silica in specifications published by industry in peacetime. Alumina was not even mentioned in the Government-approved manganese-ore specifications for the war-year 1918. Why is it now included and added to silica?

Even the original, stringent specifications of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department in the purchase of manganese ores under the Strategic Minerals Act of 1939 allowed 10 percent silica and 6 percent alumina in ores containing a minimum of 48 percent manganese (grade B).

The 1 percent combined copper, lead, and zinc limit is a new and drastic penalty unknown in peacetime published specifications for ferro-grade manganese ore.

In former years the ferromanganese industry paid a premium of 5 cents per unit for iron content in ores containing 40 percent or more manganese (see United States Geological Survey Bulletin 427, p. 278). Now the Metals Reserve Company applies a penalty for iron above 6 percent and offers no premium for low silica or alumina content.

It is obvious that these penalties, restrictions, and discriminations are designed to rule out as many small domestic manganese ore producers as possible.

For employment and national income, as well as national security, it is the duty of the Government in the reconversion and postwar periods to see that a market for domestic ores is maintained through blending of these ores to meet any specifications desired.

If any domestic ores now being shipped are claimed not suitable for blending, then beneficiation plants to concentrate such ores to the desired grade should be made possible and available to the producers of these particular ores.

On December 12, 1951, the GSA issued a release saying that the Industry Advisory Committee for Manganese to the Defense Materials Procurement Agency had just been called in and invited to offer suggestions for plans for increasing manganese production, principally abroad.

These are the same suggestions that have come from time to time since the passage of the Stockpile Act in 1946. We still have little increase in our stockpile and most domestic mines remain idle.

I am particularly impressed by the fact that, outside of Anaconda which converts most of its own ore to ferromanganese, there is no representation of domestic miners on the committee. The committee is composed largely of consumers of manganese ore in the United States who draw their ore supplies from abroad. Some of these consumers are interested in foreign mines; have their plants located favorable to imported ores and are not interested in the development of inland deposits in the United States. Will someone tell us why there are no members of this committee representing the owners of manganese ore here in the United States?

The big consumers of manganese ore seem more interested in getting low cost manganese produced by unskilled labor in so-called backward countries, than in helping develop a domestic manganese mining industry to serve the Nation in time of peril.

Congress, through legislation, has repeatedly expressed its will and intent to develop and maintain a healthy nucleus of a domestic manganese mining industry ready to expand in case of emergency. The will of Congress has been frustrated by deliberate acts of suppression and obstruction on the part of the administrative agencies of the Government. Congress must see that action to stimulate the development and production of domestic manganese ores is taken by these agencies or none of importance will occur.

The mere fact that no representative of small miners is included on the Manganese Advisory Committee is stark evidence that the DMPA is working hand-in-hand with the big consumers to carry out the expressed intent of the DMPA in continuing efforts for the development of manganese principally abroad. This is in spite of the expressed will of Congress and in spite of the threat to our national safety, and in spite of full knowledge that foreign sources of supply may be cut off by enemy submarines at any time and without warning.

#### DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT AGENCY,

Washington, D. C., December 12, 1951.

Methods of stimulating the production of manganese to keep pace with rapidly expanding defense needs for the metal were discussed at the first meeting of the Industry Advisory Committee for Manganese to the Defense Materials Procurement Agency.

Meeting in Washington at the invitation of Jess Larson, DMPA Administrator, the committee advised the Government on its program to increase manganese production, both domestic and abroad. Tom Lyon, Director of DMPA's Program Development Division, is chairman of the committee which is comprised of representatives of importers and ferromanganese producers from all over the United States.

Industry officials were advised of projected requirements through the currently scheduled mobilization program and invited to offer suggestions for plans which will lead to expanding present mining facilities and opening of new sources of supply, principally abroad.

Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator of DMPA, told the meeting that it is essential to keep the Nation's stockpile of manganese at a high level while seeing to it that every segment of industry is kept going at capacity. If this is to be accomplished, he said, every possible source of economically feasible manganese ore, both in this country and abroad, must be developed to its fullest extent.

The committee agreed that a major problem facing the output of manganese ore in foreign countries is the transportation difficulties of getting the ore from mines in the interior to ports where it can be shipped to the United States. Suggestions were made to alleviate this situation.

Other matters on the agenda concerned the relation between present price of ore and prices of ferro-alloys. The situation has been aggravated by the general downward trend of the manganese content of the ores received. On lower grade ores the unit

cost of freight and manufacture are increased.

Committee members attending the meeting were: P. G. Spillsbury, consulting engineer for the Anaconda Copper Mining Co.; Paul S. Killian, vice president, and I. D. Sims of the Bethlehem Steel Co.; Robert H. Cromwell, vice president of the Electro Manganese Corp.; Andrew Leith, vice president, and Russell N. Ward of the E. J. Lavino & Co., Philadelphia; J. J. Grady, Pacific Northwest Alloys, Inc., Spokane, Wash.; Fred S. Haggerson, Union Carbide & Carbon Corp., New York; and Robert M. Lloyd, vice president of the United States Steel Co.

I have no quarrel with the administrative agencies of Government when they say, as did DMPA on December 12, 1951, through its Deputy Administrator "it is essential to keep the Nation's stockpile of manganese at a high level while seeing to it that every segment of industry is kept going to capacity. If this is to be accomplished," he said, "every possible source of economically feasible manganese ore, both in this country and abroad, must be developed to its fullest extent."

I would like to know, however, what is meant by the phrase, "economically feasible" and what is actually being done to give those fine words translation into effective action.

Sam Williston, a prominent mining man, a member of the mining committee of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, and who lately occupied an executive position with the DMPA here in Washington, and could see first-hand how things operated from the inside, has this to say, according to the California Mining Journal of January 1952:

"Another failure of the Federal Government," he said, "was in its strategic metal stockpiling program, whose administrators showed complete lack of understanding of basic features.

"If Joseph Stalin had been sitting in Washington for the 5 years from 1945 to 1950 he could hardly have engineered a plan which would have robbed us of the raw materials on which we must base any war effort more effectively than the Washington planners were able to do," he added.

Raw Materials in War and Peace, prepared and published in 1947 by the Department of Social Sciences, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., is a textbook giving special reference to manganese as well as a few other strategic minerals, and, I understand, is used by representatives in the administrative agencies of the Government concerned with stockpiling and sources of supply. The explanation in preface of who prepared it contains the names of a number of men reported in high advisory positions in the executive agencies of the Government. The trend of the book emphasizes conservation and Government control of our natural resources; this is to say, limited domestic production and major reliance on foreign production.

Page 43 contains the following:

Nationalization of the production of certain raw materials can be used to conserve supplies or to build up domestic production. The movement of capital can be controlled so as to channel it into the production of desired materials. The performance of Soviet

Russia testifies as to the possible effectiveness of such measures when used to improve the state's raw-materials position.

On February 9, 1942, Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, issued a release announcing:

[For release in morning papers of Monday, February 9, 1942]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR INFORMATION SERVICE

BUREAU OF MINES

A domestic manganese war program of sufficient scope to free American steel and alloy production from its present reliance on foreign sources with accompanying dependence on ocean shipping or naval convoy, where necessary, has been developed by the United States Bureau of Mines, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today.

The program, designed to provide sufficient manganese to produce 87 million tons of steel annually, covers utilization of low-grade domestic manganese. It was made possible through the development of several processes which have been tested by the United States Bureau of Mines during years of study, in laboratories, and in pilot plants in the West, provided by Congress for that particular purpose.

Manganese has been classified as a first priority strategic mineral considered indispensable to the manufacture of steel with some 12 pounds usually required for each ton of steel. Manganese is an essential ingredient of steel used for tools, armor plate, ships, and machinery. Over 90 percent of the manganese normally is imported, chiefly from southeast Asia, Brazilian, and Cuban ports, and there is a considerable supply of such imported manganese in the United States for immediate but not future needs.

The Bureau of Mines reported that in order to secure rapid use of the program, it was prepared:

First, to make available its knowledge, experience, technical personnel, and processes to industry so that industry can benefit from the work the Bureau has done, and to supervise operations if industry so requests.

Second, only in the event industry is unable to undertake the production rapidly, the Bureau of Mines is prepared to assume responsibility for the necessary production itself at the request of the War Production Board.

The specific program provides for the establishment of eight mills, three hydrometallurgical plants including one electrolytic unit, and one matte smelting plant. The proposal is to establish these 12 plants in 10 locations in 8 States. The States are Arizona, Arkansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Utah. All these plants can be in operation at the end of 1 year, and many at the end of 9 months. It is believed that even with an increase of imports from Cuba and Mexico a reduction of shipping from other foreign sources may result in a deficiency in manganese in 1943 without additional processing of domestic ores. Supplies sufficient for the present year and part of 1943 are now on hand.

The work of the engineers of the Bureau of Mines has continued for a number of years and has been intensive over a 2-year period. Congress authorized and financed this work in manganese by a \$2,000,000 appropriation made available to the Bureau through the War Department. During the period of testing and experimentation an industry committee representing the larger manganese and steel producers, which is attached to the National Academy of Science, was kept advised of the progress of the work.

The engineers of the Bureau of Mines report that they do not hesitate to stake their professional reputations on the feasibility and workability of the processes they have

tested. They state that relatively little high priority material is needed for the construction of new plants for production.

Careful calculations indicate that a capital investment of less than \$38,000,000 in mining operations and processing plants will be required to produce the amount of manganese specified. At prices only slightly above the present price of \$75 per ton for pure metallic manganese in nodulized concentrates at Butte, Mont., the whole capital cost can be amortized in 3 years. After amortization, the price is expected to be 20 percent below the present price. A minimum of 526,000 tons of metal annually is provided for in the program with a maximum of approximately 560,000 tons. This includes 12,000 tons of electrolytic manganese which is of special value in low carbon steels, for shells, and in certain types of stainless steels. Approximately 11,500,000 tons of domestic ores can be processed annually.

The program proposed by the Bureau of Mines is divided into two steps. Six custom mills and one hydrometallurgical plant can be established first, using the higher grade ores. After careful consideration of the larger resources available and the methods of treatment suitable to each ore, the following locations were proposed: Customs concentrators at Deming, N. Mex.; Batesville, Ark.; Parker Dam, Ariz.; Phillipburg, Mont.; Delta, Utah; Garfield, Utah; and Las Vegas, Nev., where a leaching plant and electrolytic plant can be established. These plants could produce a minimum of 213,620 tons of manganese metal equivalent annually, and would require an investment of \$14,100,000.

The second step in the program includes plants at Artillery Peak, Ariz., on the Cuyuna Range, Minn., and at Chamberlain, S. Dak. These plants could produce a minimum of 312,175 tons of manganese metal equivalent annually, and would require an investment of \$24,000,000.

Fifty different ore bodies could be used in the program, including properties in the Batesville-Cushman district in Arkansas, the Aquila, Parker Dam, and Wickenburg areas in Arizona, the Paymaster district in California, Granite County, West Butte and Wickes areas in Montana, Drum Mountain, Simpson Mountains, Kanab, Maryville and Tinctic districts of Utah, the Caliente, Ely, Pioche, Battle Mountain, Valmy areas of Nevada; Three Kids, Annex, and Las Vegas-Wash areas of Nevada, the Cleveland area of Idaho, the Cuyuna Range area of Minnesota, and the South Dakota area near Chamberlain.

Several of these ore beds could be exhausted, during the war period, but others could with the new processes, be used to supply the Nation's steel needs for many years. The largest deposit, although of very low-grade ore, is at Chamberlain, S. Dak.

The program proposed by the Bureau of Mines included the advance purchase of ores during the period of construction of the mills and hydrometallurgical plants so that full operation could be obtained rapidly.

Dr. R. R. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, stated that the research and experimentation work which made the Bureau confident that it could help support the Nation's war-steel program for many years was in charge of Dr. R. S. Dean, Chief, Metallurgical Division, and that in addition to the Bureau's experts, professors of several universities had been employed by the Bureau for the work. Most of the experimentation work was concentrated at the Boulder City, Rolla, and Salt Lake City laboratories.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the gentleman from Arkansas is

speaking on manganese today. As the gentleman knows, I am very much interested in this particular question because of the fact that we produce in this country about 10 percent of our needs, or something on that order. Of that 10 percent, 90 percent is produced in the State of Montana.

Mr. MILLS. By the Anaconda Copper Co.

Mr. MANSFIELD. By the Anaconda Copper Co. in Butte and also by a lot of independent producers in the Philipsburg area. Now I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to this fact. For about a year and a half the Montana delegation has been trying to get some assistance for these small manganese miners in the Philipsburg area. We have been getting the run-around from the Bureau of Mines and the Defense Minerals Administration. Is there anything we can do to get these people really interested in the extraction of this manganese so that it can be made available for our own security, and thereby cut down the need for importing so much from outside?

Mr. MILLS. I will say to my friend from Montana that that is my purpose today. I am trying to outline a plan that I think will bring about an increase in the production of manganese domestically.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. The gentleman is making a very wonderful statement, on a matter on which I believe is long overdue. I believe the mines of this country should be developed and operated as fully as possible. May I call attention to the fact that besides manganese there are in the West great deposits of chrome ore, in Del Norte County in my district are located chrome mines containing some of the best high grade chrome developed anywhere, which is vital to the defense effort. I believe those types of mines should be encouraged and that governmental aid should be developed in order to stockpile these metals properly so that we will have our own supplies in this country. There should be made available stockpiling at Crescent City Harbor which is close to these mines and where this supply could be shipped by water to points of use.

Mr. MILLS. Rather than "aid," I think the gentleman would prefer to see Government leadership.

Mr. SCUDDER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to associate myself with what my colleague from California has just said. The gentleman from Arkansas is making a very timely and significant speech on a very scarce and very necessary metal.

I am glad the gentleman from California also brought in chrome, which is in somewhat the same category as manganese.

What I want to ask the gentleman is this: Why is it the Bureau of Mines, the

General Services Administration, and the Defense Minerals Administration have seen fit to set up a rate schedule for the purchase of manganese which varies to such a great extent that new low-grade deposits in the Southwest are being offered more for the manganese produced there than in the Philipsburg area, outside of Butte, which to my knowledge is the greatest and most consistent manganese area in the entire country? Why do we have this differentiation? Why can we not get an established policy laid down by these Government agencies to help these mines?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly that is needed. I cannot answer why there is a differentiation in price. There is no differentiation in the price of other commodities so far as I know, and there should not be a differentiation in the price of manganese ore based on the same percentage of metallic content.

The gentleman has put his finger on one of the factors that I think is contributing now to the failure of this program throughout the country.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. What the gentleman is saying is of very great interest to the members of the Maine delegation, because Maine has in Aroostook County one of the most extensive deposits of low-grade manganese ore in the country, which we are seeking to have developed and which I hope will be developed.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman does have, according to information I have, a tremendous deposit of ore in Maine. That has been, I know, within the last few months seriously considered by those in the General Services Administration. Nothing has yet been done with respect to the stockpiling of those ores. I am hopeful something will be worked out in behalf of those ores through the development of beneficiation processes.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The State of Virginia during World War I was the fourth producing State in manganese and in World War II was the fifth producing area. The Government agencies are perfectly willing to buy from us. Now all we have to do is to ship into Deming, N. Mex., and sell it to them at one-fourth the cost of production, and the Government will buy all that we can ship out there.

Mr. MILLS. I understand anyone who desires to ship 15 percent manganese ore from Virginia and North Carolina to Deming at a price of \$6.10 a ton may do so. The only catch, so far as I can see as to it being a workable program, is that the freight from North Carolina to Deming, N. Mex., or from Virginia to Deming, N. Mex., amounts, I understand, to better than \$29 a ton, and the producer of the ore would have to absorb the freight.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Can the gentleman tell us this: If the Government buys Virginia or North Carolina or Georgia manganese in Deming, N. Mex., and then ships it back to Pittsburgh or some other steel center in the East, who

pays the freight on bringing it back there?

Mr. MILLS. The Government would have to pay the freight from Deming back to Pittsburgh.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Does the gentleman know of any depot in the eastern area?

Mr. MILLS. There is no depot anywhere in the United States outside of Philipsburg, Butte, and Deming.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I have a table which indicates that in New Mexico the total production since 1938 of manganese has been 31,000 tons, whereas in Virginia it has been 413,000 tons, Georgia 211,000 tons, and in Arkansas and other States substantially high. Is there any reason why the gentleman can suggest why there should be a depot in New Mexico and none at all in the eastern area?

Mr. MILLS. I think that the gentleman means, and I am certainly in accord with his thought, that if it is advisable to have a depot at Deming, N. Mex., and at Philipsburg, and at Butte, and I certainly think it is advisable, then it is likewise advisable that there be other depots conveniently located in manganese-ore areas in the East and other sections of the United States, including Virginia and North Carolina, and my own State of Arkansas.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina who contributed so much in the preparation and passage of the original Stockpile Act of 1946.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the point the gentleman has mentioned is very important in this discussion. In my opinion it is highly important and probably should have been made earlier in this House. As the gentleman has already said, we have not gained anything in the stockpiling of manganese since 1946. It is tragic, in my estimation, that in America where we have plenty of manganese, there is not provided some domestic program for stockpiling this manganese. As to the gentleman's suggestion as to what to do under present conditions which exist today, I have come to this conclusion after very much patience with the Department in initiating some kind of domestic program for these strategic and critical materials. This is not the only one that is involved. I do not know what we will be faced with on the commitments made a few days ago with England. I do not think anyone can say today what those commitments are, but it concerns me greatly as to where those commitments are coming from. I do not know where they are coming from, because the ore is not above ground in this country. If these commitments are met we have got to initiate some domestic program to get these low-grade ores, which the gentleman is speaking of today. It should be done. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has introduced legislation time after time, and it is time this Congress was taking some action, in my opinion, because in 1946, when the Congress laid down the policy of what

should be done for the national security of this country, we took the recommendation of the National Security Board in regard to the stockpiling of these items in this country. We met them on many, many occasions, as the gentleman knows, and went far above them in the stockpiling of these items. But where conditions have brought about an uplifting of these sights, which have been placed with the Congress, they could not be met, and now we have gone out and assumed another one. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the time is overdue for action by this Congress.

Mr. MILLS. Long overdue.

Permit me to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question, if I may, since I have such high regard for the gentleman's view and know of the tremendous amount of information the gentleman has on this question of stockpiling of strategic and critical minerals. Is it not a fact that where workable plans have been devised for domestic production of some of these strategic and critical minerals that there has been a tremendous increase in the production of those minerals when it was not known theretofore that we had any reserves of them at all, and that in addition to supplying the heavy demands of industry for those minerals at the present time we have been able to build up additional stockpiles?

Mr. DURHAM. What did we do in regard to uranium? I think that is the most typical example of what can be done in America. When we come to the point of action we can always do it if we try, and we did it with this program. It was in the hands of Congress. What did we do? We told these people to go in and get this stuff out. What has happened? Today we are predominately ready for a long time to come.

This manganese is just as important. The gentleman knows that we need approximately 2,000,000 short tons of manganese ore or the equivalent a year—I believe that is the correct figure on consumption; and that is not being produced, as far as I know today, by all the contracts that exist. If I am incorrect on this I want to be corrected by the Defense Metal Production people, by the Bureau of Mines, or by anybody else who knows—but today we are not producing enough manganese to meet that by any means; and we are not getting any in our stockpile.

We know that the upping of production of steel from 90,000,000 to 120,000,000 tons will require the use of additional manganese. It takes 14 pounds of manganese for every ton of steel. As I say, that increased production is going to call for more manganese. If we do not do something about it immediately we are going to have to dig into our reserves, into the stockpile which as I have said and as the gentleman has said has not grown in any substantial way since 1946. That is foolishness. We should get down to business. Congress should work out some definite program and get it going immediately.

Mr. MILLS. Permit me to ask the gentleman a further question and see if he is in accord with my thinking. At



the present time we are trying to bring into the United States all of the manganese we can.

Mr. DURHAM. And that is all right.

Mr. MILLS. That is fine; I am in perfect agreement with that program of bringing in every pound that is available anywhere in the world. At the present time the GSA and the DMPA are endeavoring to enter into 5-year and longer-term contracts for the procurement of this high-grade manganese of 40 percent metallic content or higher.

Mr. DURHAM. That is all right, too.

Mr. MILLS. We want that done to the maximum extent possible. But even if those two things are continued and the maximum is received by the United States from those two programs there will still be no appreciable increase in the stockpiling of manganese under the stockpiling program initiated in 1946. In order to have any material increase in the stockpile which we must build up and have on hand for that possible day in the future when we may be deprived of these imports of manganese, in order to do that, it is necessary that we go farther and that is to get the DMPA to announce immediately a program of purchasing low-grade ores that exist in such abundance in the United States, purchase them at the same price for every section of the United States; purchase all of these low-grade ores that can be purchased and which can be concentrated or beneficiated under processes that are known in the Bureau of Mines. It is failure to have this latter program that is disturbing me. It is this latter program that is not receiving the support and cooperation of the agencies of the Government; rather, we see the gentleman's subcommittee and other committees frustrated by tactics of obstruction every time they attempt to work out a program that would accomplish this result.

Mr. DURHAM. We have been continually asking since 1946: What do you need? What do you desire?

Congress has laid down a 5-year program. That is what we want for security. What have they done? They still have the 1-year program and that has been going on for about 7 years now.

Now, getting to the domestic program, when we adopted the Defense Production Act we gave them the money for processing plants. How many have they put up here? Can the gentleman answer that?

Mr. MILLS. They have one plant that was put up in World War II out in Butte, Mont., operated by the Domestic Manganese & Development Co. A pilot plant was built in Nevada some time before World War II. Outside of that there have been no Government plants at all that now are available. During the period 1950 through 1951 some contracts have been made with individuals that would result in some type of plants being constructed in order to carry out the contracts. But we have done nothing along the line of what the Department of Interior, when Secretary Ickes was head of it in 1942, recommended should be done. He said then that the Bureau of Mines was in

a position to stake its professional reputation on processes being available for the concentration of this low-grade ore and went so far as to say that if the program of the Bureau of Mines was placed in effect in a short period of time we would free ourselves entirely of dependence on manganese from abroad and could produce the then desired amount of steel, 87,000,000 tons, without foreign ores other than from Cuba.

Mr. DURHAM. Will not the gentleman agree with me that if we will adopt a domestic program in line with the present program at the present time on long-term contracts in connection with helping and aiding in the construction of processing plants we will secure manganese in this country?

Mr. MILLS. No. Just that alone will not do it.

Mr. DURHAM. I do not mean entirely.

Mr. MILLS. I will tell the gentleman why. Because some high-grade ore that contains as much as 48 or 50 percent metallic content cannot be produced and delivered to the stockpile and meet all requirements of existing specifications. In my own State, for instance, we have as much as three-tenths of 1 percent phosphorus in certain ores. That is immediately ruled out, and it would not make any difference how many contracts Government entered into with that operator because in my State as long as he cannot ship such ore containing three-tenths of 1 percent phosphorus he will not be able to sell any of that ore for stockpiling. We have the same situation with respect to silica and alumina ore in the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and others. Those specifications will have to be changed in order to accomplish this job through the establishment of plants by individuals and through this contract method.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Colorado). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the next special order. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes, the 5 minutes to be taken out of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said about manganese. I know that in the production of steel there is required about 14 pounds of manganese to produce a ton of steel. We need manganese, we must have it. We have processes now to beneficiate this low-grade manganese which, as Secretary Ickes said, are good and they have been proven satisfactory and are highly successful. I am disappointed to learn that we do not have any domestic member on the committee having to do with the acquisition of manganese for the stockpile. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MILLS. I am referring, when I make that statement, to a release from DMPA dated December 12, 1951. At the conclusion of the announcement it is said:

Committee members attending the meeting were: P. G. Spillsbury, consulting engineer for the Anaconda Copper Mining Co.; Paul S. Killian, vice president, and I. D. Sims, of the Bethlehem Steel Co.; Robert H. Cromwell, vice president of the Electro Manganese Corp.; Andrew Leith, vice president, and Russell N. Ward, of the E. J. Lavino & Co., Philadelphia; J. J. Grady, Pacific Northwest Alloys, Inc., Spokane, Wash.; Fred S. Haggerson, Union Carbide & Carbon Corp., New York; and Robert M. Lloyd, vice president of the United States Steel Co.

There is not included in that list an individual representing the so-called independent American manganese producers. Anaconda produces about 120,000 tons of manganese ore a year, but Anaconda produces that manganese largely as a byproduct, along with other minerals, of other operations. They have continued to produce and to sell during all this period without regard to Government programs, specifications or anything else. You could not, in my opinion lay the entire blame on Mr. Larson and Mr. Young. I am not aiming my criticism at them. If I knew as little about a subject, as DMPA has indicated by its action so far that it does about manganese production in the United States, I could not expect to be informed on the best methods of obtaining American production by surrounding myself with a group of people who own foreign deposits of manganese, who have depended always on the importation of foreign manganese and who, I say, today are more interested in maintaining a profit margin in the production of ferro manganese by buying cheap ores from abroad than they are in developing any domestic program here. If DMPA will change this committee by calling to this committee such outstanding men in the United States as I know personally, who are capable of producing manganese, who will produce manganese under a workable program and ask what it is that must be done in order to bring about production, such action will solve much of the problem. We had started on the road to greater production domestically until these specifications were changed January 1, 1945. At least, DMPA can get back to that point. By calling in these domestic producers upon whom they are relying for production, they can get a better answer, in my opinion, than by continuing to call on those people who historically have never had any interest in domestic production but instead have done everything they could to defeat domestic production.

Mr. PATMAN. I am very much interested in getting something done, and I join in any effort in that direction. There seems to be considerable sentiment expressed here on the floor today, and I wish the gentleman would just outline exactly what he believes should be done in order to get results.

Mr. MILLS. All right.

Mr. PATMAN. We want domestic manganese developed, and we want a huge stockpile.

Mr. MILLS. That is right. The first thing that must be done in my opinion in connection with these contracts that are now being entered into is the restoration of specifications that were in existence prior to January 1, 1945.

Mr. PATMAN. Who does that?

Mr. MILLS. That would be done by DMPA. The gentleman would be interested in knowing that those earlier specifications were worked out by a former Texan with those under him in Metals Reserve Company, Mr. Jesse Jones. When that program of specifications was placed into effect, the production of manganese materially mushroomed within a 2-year period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Permit me to answer the gentleman from Texas further. The second point, and that is the thing that has not yet been done or attempted in connection with this over-all program, the price for this ore from 15 percent up to 40 percent must be increased by the announcement of a Nation-wide price that will enable miners to produce ore, to further develop and to explore. That has to be done. Evidence of the fact that the \$6.10 is too low is that DMPA is not receiving into the stockpile at Deming anticipated amounts of this low-grade ore. I would not have the Government through any agency buy any of this low-grade ore for which there are not known processes of beneficiation and concentration, but there are such processes. It takes time to build those concentrating plants either by industry or by Government, and preferably by industry. But while that is being undertaken, we could immediately begin to stockpile manganese through the mining of low-grade ores by the small miners, these little independent fellows who are the ones that are going to have to produce the bulk of the ore. That was the program outlined in a bill which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and I first introduced in 1949. The significant thing about it today is that the DMPA has found at Butte, Mont., in connection with the plant it operates there, that the prices set forth in these bills in payment for this manganese ore are not excessive. They have established beyond any doubt that it actually costs the Government \$2.30 per unit to process and obtain the ore at Butte, Mont. All I am suggesting is that we start a program with a minimum price on the 15-percent ore of \$15 a ton or more based on Bureau of Labor Index of Prices instead of \$6.10 a ton and let the price go up as the metallic content of the ore goes up.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I want to commend the gentleman on his able discus-

sion. We have struggled long and hard together to get something under way in the way of domestic production. The gentleman knows as I do that each time we came before the committee or advocated the adoption of his bill or mine, and they are identical bills, we were told that they already have those powers now and do not need the legislation.

Mr. MILLS. They do have the powers but have not used them.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I have come to believe that we now more than ever need that legislation to make it a mandatory program, because they have demonstrated long ago that there is no real intent to carry out the provisions of this particular bill.

Mr. MILLS. I fear the gentleman is eminently correct, that they have no present intention of carrying out any such program.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Let me add one point with regard to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. He has struggled long and hard and is entitled to tremendous credit in the House of Representatives for his work in regard to this stockpile legislation. I was struck by your colloquy a moment ago in regard to that particular legislation. I think it might be enlightening to the House to look behind the scenes and find out, if we can, why that bill, which turned into Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1946, has been so inadequate in carrying out domestic-mine production. Here is a direct quotation from the President's statement in approving the bill S. 752, which was Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. It is a direct quotation from the President's statement when he signed that into law:

Furthermore, to insure that the necessary stockpiles are accumulated as rapidly as deemed advisable and with a minimum cost to the public, this act should not be used as a device to give domestic interests an advantage over foreign producers of strategic materials greater than that provided by the tariff laws.

There is the key to the whole situation. I think we had the answer back there in 1946. That might explain to the House of Representatives why all our struggle was unproductive of results.

Mr. MILLS. My purpose in calling the attention of the Members to the situation today, and I certainly appreciate the questions that have been asked and the statements that have been made here during this time, is to suggest that the appropriate committees of Congress immediately look into the situation further to determine whether or not in their opinion it is necessary for us to legislate on this question, even though existing authority now is on the statute books for such action being taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is probably the most interesting speech on the mining industry that I have heard since I have been a Member of the House. I want to again compliment the gentleman from Arkansas who is especially interested in this particular field, and who is certainly one of the best-informed Members of the House. It seems to me I heard the gentleman say, in referring to some of these Government agencies, perhaps we should not be too critical of them. I would like to disagree with the gentleman and say that we should be very critical of them because, as the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from North Carolina both have pointed out, the Congress has laid down the policy and the Congress has appropriated the funds, yet these people downtown have done nothing to augment the program which needs to be emphasized if the security of this country is to be maintained. I hope it will not be necessary for any more delegations to come back from Montana, at their own expense, and at the invitation of the Bureau of Mines and the Defense Minerals Administration, and then get the run-around. I have had delegations coming back for a year and a half, and as yet nothing has been done to take care of the manganese situation in Montana, which is the biggest operation outside of Butte, and it is right next door to Butte.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. In regard to the point about being critical of these people, of course, most of them are trying to do a good, honest job.

Mr. MILLS. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. DURHAM. I have the highest respect for Jess Larson. I think he is one of the finest men I have come across in the Government. Jess Larson is really trying to do something to get this stockpile program going. But here is where I want to be critical. The committee that has had charge of critical materials since 1942 so far as the security of this country is concerned, has been asked by us consistently, time after time, after time, What can we do? Do you need any legislation? Do you need any money? You will find it all in the Record. We have given them everything they want. Now the stockpile has not accumulated in the way we expected it to. We have done pretty well I would say, but not as good as we should have done. This question of getting manganese is not the only problem which is involved in this program. Of course, we are talking about manganese here today, but we have to think seriously about some of these other things, because most of us today are being faced with this situation of having to beg these people down here for steel. I do not know whether some stand-by steel production should not be initiated in this country. That has never been done. What did we do in regard to rubber? We said to these people, "You

are not going to sell these plants. You are going to keep them in stand-by." Where are we today? We can roll on rubber without any trouble. Who did that? Who solved that problem? That was solved right up here on Capitol Hill because we said "No" to those people. We said, "You are not going to sell these plants. We are going to keep them in stand-by." Therefore, the people today do not have to worry about it. This manganese is just as important to steel production as rubber is to the rolling of the wheels.

Mr. MILLS. Or the iron ore itself?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes, or the iron ore itself. I want to compliment the gentleman again for bringing the attention of the House to this matter.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it has been the argument of some people in the Government that it is not advisable to do what has here been suggested as the Government would lose money on it. Let us ask you whether or not it is considered that the Government has lost money in developing the supply of uranium? Has the Government lost money in developing a supply of tungsten? Has the Government lost money in developing crude rubber stand-by plants, mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]? There is no question in my mind about the answer. It has been said that we could not get any manganese in the United States if we undertook this program, when the Bureau of Mines, testifying through its officials before committees of this Congress, has said that it is estimated there is a reserve sufficient to last the people of the United States 100 to 500 years. These same persons argue about processes, but they completely overlook the statement made by the Bureau of Mines in 1942, to the effect that they will stake their reputation upon these processes being available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. It was said in one of the committees that this bill, which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and I introduced, would cost a whole lot of money. Well, it would cost a whole lot of money if the bill did actually establish a policy or a program for the development of domestic manganese that was successful, as it will. It would cost at that time the money necessary to buy and stockpile that manganese. I have asked some producers of manganese to give me some idea of what would happen domestically if we undertook this program of buying these low-grade ores capable of concentration and if we put them over into the stockpile program established in 1946 after beneficiation. If we undertake a 5-year program, the very minimum that any one of them has suggested might be available—and they stake their reputations on this—would be

some 1,800,000 tons of metallic manganese in a 5-year period. Even though Secretary Ickes said in 1942 that it would not take that long to obtain this production it probably will take that long to get enough of these mines into operation, and beneficiation plants actually constructed to get this comparative amount of high-grade ore. I think the figures are far too conservative. I think we would get a lot more high-grade ore than that, but those people are willing to stake their reputations as producers themselves upon this being the bare minimum figure of what we would have in the United States then that we will not have without this workable program. Agencies should plan in terms of a maximum program, not this minimum.

Think again in terms of the demands that are being made for the production of steel; think in terms again of the demands upon us by the rest of the world to supply materials which are necessary to place road blocks to the spread of communism. We are thinking about doing this and that and something else to provide additional iron ore, and yet not one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the time or attention is being paid to this one particular element that is so essential—absolutely essential—to the production of this steel.

The Germans themselves attributed the loss of World War I in part to the fact that they ran out of manganese and could not find any substitute for it in the manufacture of steel. I fear that we are not giving enough attention to those things that should occupy high priority in our own thinking in the Congress, as well as in the departments.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. On that point, when we were faced with that situation in 1941 and 1942, what did the Congress do? We opened up an extra set of locks which permitted the iron ore to flow into the steel mills. If they need anything like that, come to us and tell us what they want. If they need it in the production of steel, we will give it. In my opinion, we will come out of this thing and have a demand for steel for many years to come. So this is still a local program that we have at the present time. We are going to have demands for steel in my opinion at around 120,000,000 tons a year for a long time to come. I heard the other night one of the finest statements I ever heard, made by a man connected with United States Steel along that line and I think they are pretty well of the opinion that they are going to be in this high-production era for a long time to come.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman mentioned vast increased production of steel; so did the gentleman from North Carolina. Where does the gentleman think the United States is going to get the ore to make that steel?

Mr. MILLS. I am talking about where we are going to get manganese ore in the event our foreign sources are no longer

available, manganese with which to produce the steel. The gentleman, of course, is concerned about the iron ore; but the gentleman will admit, I think, that a great deal of progress has been made by the executive departments and the Congress in that connection. My whole thought is that it is equally important to give the same kind of attention to this question of domestic manganese ore production.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly glad that my distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has directed the attention of the House to the bureaucratic apathy which has deprived the Nation of the full value of its manganese resources in a period of supply crisis.

This disinclination to take a realistic view of the value of undeveloped deposits in the East is an old story to us in Virginia. Despite a record of appreciable manganese production in the past, and in the face of substantial expert testimony that large quantities of workable ore remain untouched in the ground, Virginia manganese men have met only rebuffs.

Although the manganese shortage is recognized as most serious, with every available ton of ore needed, the Defense Materials Procurement Agency tells Virginia producers it will consent to buy their ore—if they deliver it at Deming, N. Mex.

The absurdity of such an invitation is clear, when it is realized that freight charges on such shipment would amount to several times the amount the Virginia producer would receive for his ore at the Government depot in Deming. In addition, he would be charged for processing his ore, and would find himself in debt to the Government on every ton delivered.

In a letter to me, Mr. Jess Larson, Administrator of the DMPA, states that it is not true his agency does not want Virginia manganese. Why, he says, we have even contracted for some ore at \$1.50 a long-ton unit. That is \$1.50 a unit for Virginia ore, whereas the established cost to the Government at Butte-Phillipsburg, Mont., is \$2.30 per unit.

I should like to emphasize that we have no quarrel with the price being paid our western friends. The Butte-Phillipsburg figure appears to have been arrived at on the basis of actual costs in a plant established by the Government. We believe, however, that the Virginia producer is entitled to equity, and we think it fair to ask: "Why \$2.30 cost per unit at Butte-Phillipsburg and \$1.50 per unit for Virginia ore?"

Another question seems apropos: "Who pays the freight when ore received at Butte-Phillipsburg is shipped to steel-production centers in the East?"

The existing inequity is obvious. The Government is willing to pay an established cost of \$2.30 per unit for ore accepted in Montana, which still must be shipped to steel centers for use. On the other hand, the Government is contracting for Virginia ore at \$1.50 and is refusing to establish an ore-receiving depot within reach of Virginia producers.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from a prophetic address delivered on November 10, 1930, by Mr. J. Carson Adkerson, president of the American Manganese Producers Association. Mr. Adkerson said this:

As far back as 1927, I publicly called attention to the fact that the treacherous hand of the Russian Bolshevik would delight in lulling us to sleep with the ease in which manganese is flowing to our shores, filling Red coffers with American gold and then, suddenly, close in on the source of supply, while the United States struggled to develop her own manganese resources after the days of opportunity have gone.

Mr. Adkerson is from Woodstock, Va., in my congressional district. He is a practical mining engineer who has clambered many underground miles along manganese ore bodies in Virginia. With the closing out of manganese receipts from Soviet Russia, we have seen his words come true.

We are told that our steel industry needs every ton of manganese that can be found, at home and abroad. Virginia manganese producers are ready to help meet the crisis, as they did during two world wars. They ask only equity in the price paid and ore depots within reach of their mines.

#### MINERALS PRODUCTION LAGS

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, this discussion today of our stockpiling program and our effort to provide strategic and critical minerals for industry and the stockpile is, in my opinion, very much worth while. Our Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN], has held a number of hearings in an effort to get production of these minerals started domestically. We have had representatives of the various executive agencies before our committee and questioned them at length as to why purchases have not been made, why contracts for the production of strategic and critical minerals have not been concluded, and as to why more encouragement has not been given our domestic producers of these items so necessary to our security. Frankly, our Mines and Mining Subcommittee has been very much disappointed as to the progress made.

In hearings our subcommittee has held in various parts of the country, so that local miners would have an opportunity to express their views as to just how we could be of help, protests invariably have been presented that they were not receiving cooperation from the Federal agencies, as was intended by Congress when it wrote the provisions of law designed to encourage domestic production.

The Defense Production Act gives the President practically unlimited authority to stimulate exploration, development, and production of minerals by private mines owners. The President signed this act on September 8, 1950. It took the Executive Department 6 months to formulate plans so that even a limited domestic exploration program was announced. Nearly a year passed before the issuance of a manganese program, and then it was only for the purchase of

relatively small amounts of low-grade manganese at purchase depots to be established at Butte and Philipsburg in Montana and at Deming, N. Mex. Another period of several months went by before these depots actually were in operation.

Montana has the largest chromite deposits in the United States. Chrome is a mineral necessary to the making of tough steel such as is required for war machines. It was a year before the executive agencies were ready to issue the simple orders necessary for the purchase of a small amount of chrome at Grants Pass, Oreg. The Montana properties have not been put in production to this date.

The situation is similar with respect to other ores that are in short supply and the production of which might be stimulated domestically. In short, we have done a lot of talking, have passed sufficient laws, provided the money and set up the agencies, but the net result in domestic production of strategic and critical metals and minerals has been most disappointing.

The situation is just as discouraging with respect to exploration. I am advised that up until the first of this year over 1,100 applications for exploration assistance had been received by the Department of the Interior. Of this number, less than 200 have been approved.

In the case of manganese, I have indicated that purchase depots were opened at Butte and Philipsburg, Mont., last November, and at Deming, N. Mex. I am advised that up to January 11 the depot at Deming had received 1,436 tons of manganese ore, 54 tons had been delivered at Butte, and 202 tons at Philipsburg. In our committee hearings on this program we were informed that neither the quantity limitations nor the price were satisfactory. Both are inadequate to justify the opening of the properties near Deming. DMPA representatives admitted that the price was determined without consulting with the producers in the area. In the case of the Butte and Philipsburg depots, the price and quantities and regulations for delivery were based on the needs of four or five of the largest operators in the two areas. Only manganese carbonate can be accepted under present regulations. Manganese oxide ores that are found in both areas will not be accepted at the purchase depots.

Only one domestic-production contract for manganese has been concluded to date, that of the Three Kids Mine at Henderson, Nevada.

The failure of the manganese program has made necessary the diversion of manganese from the stockpile to industry, so that instead of building our reserves, we are depleting them.

I have only touched on a situation that is most disappointing to those of us who serve mining States. It is doubly disappointing to those concerned with our national security. Mr. Speaker, surely something can be done to speed up the production of these materials at home.

Part of our difficulty may be found in the disposition of high officials to rely almost exclusively, and certainly to a

dangerous extent, upon foreign sources. A newspaper article quotes Mr. Jess Larson, Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency, as having said that as the "temperature of the international situation goes up" and as America's material requirements increase, foreign sources of domestically scarce items "loom larger than ever in our thinking."

We from the mining States of the Nation would like to call his attention to the opportunities for mineral exploration and development within our own country.

We need better coordination of the various agencies concerned with determining the strategic and critical material requirements of this country and those charged with domestic procurement. An all-out effort should be made to increase domestic production of minerals found to be in short supply. If the mineral is really strategic and critical, then regulations and prices should be so determined as to encourage the greatest possible domestic production. There are a lot of mines in this country that could produce vital materials if they had a slight price increase. Certainly this would be in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, our subcommittee on Mines and Mining has made an extensive study of this situation and has reported several times the slowness of action by the executive agencies. We have tried to encourage exploration of our resources and domestic production wherever possible. If our discussion today helps to encourage action in this field, our able chairman the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN] and every member of the subcommittee will be very much gratified, and the country will be well served.

#### HON. EDWARD W. BARRETT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I note the resignation of the Assistant Secretary of State, Edward W. Barrett, and the nomination by the President of Howland H. Sargeant to that position. It is with regret that I watch Mr. Barrett leave the Government service. I have known him personally during his term and have dealt with him officially many times. His energy and capacity for work is legendary in Washington. I know personally that whenever I called him I usually found him at this office whether it was 8 in the morning or 8 at night. His position as head of our overseas information program was a difficult one. There is probably no field in American government where the average newspaper man considers himself more at home than in the field of propaganda, so Mr. Barrett has had plenty of advice and critiques. On the other hand his greatest successes were usually hidden under the necessary cloak of security regulations. I can only commend him for a job well done and wish him good luck on his new venture.

HON. HOWLAND H. SARGEANT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Howland H. Sargeant as Mr. Barrett's successor is a worthy one. For the past 2 years he has served as Mr. Barrett's deputy and during this service he was awarded a State Department commendation for superior service. In a previous position as chairman of the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, he was awarded by the Army a certificate of appreciation. Mr. Sargeant is a capable administrator and because of this ability and his previous experience in the Department of State I can sincerely welcome his nomination.

CHARLES W. DAVIS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the President nominated Charles W. Davis, of Vandalia, Ill., to be general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

It is not often that I agree with either President Truman or his appointments. However, I find this one to be justified on several counts.

Future events have a peculiar way of casting their shadow. Charlie Davis' shadow was cast early in life when he was graduated as valedictorian of his class at Vandalia High School. He later came to the University of Illinois and in the undergraduate school made an outstanding record in scholarship. He continued this same course of industry while taking his legal training at the University of Illinois Law School and became one of the board of student editors of the Illinois Bar Journal.

During the time he was in law school, I was an associate member of the law firm of Busch & Harrington at Champaign, Ill. When I left that firm to become State's attorney of Champaign County, Charlie Davis took my place in that firm. This was an old and trusted firm engaged in the general practice of law in Champaign County, Ill. That firm's practice consisted in the preparation and trial of lawsuits, including appeals, in the appellate and supreme courts of Illinois. It also had a substantial practice in the United States Federal courts. Charlie Davis fitted into this group and did an outstanding job as an associate member of that firm. During his practice in Champaign County, I, as State's attorney, had an opportunity to observe him many times in court. He created for himself a reputation for industry, integrity, and ability, and I feel sure that if he had continued to practice in that county he would today have been one of the outstanding members of the bar of the State of Illinois.

Instead he chose to transfer this early training and experience to the Federal Government and became an expert in tax legislation. All of these years since he

left Champaign I have followed his career with considerable interest. I have noted the splendid work he has done since leaving Champaign County and that he has continued to apply himself with the same industry that he showed at the Champaign County bar.

This man has all of the qualities necessary to make him an outstanding counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. At least there is one thing we can be sure of—he will conduct his activities in this Bureau as honestly as it can be done—and that, as I see it, is the prime requisite for this department at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY], is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### PAYMENTS TO PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today reluctantly placed on the desk of the Clerk of this House Discharge Petition No. 7 to bring out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce H. R. 3719, which I introduced on April 13, 1951, 9 months ago. I say reluctantly because I have done everything else possible, including numerous appeals to the committee and the membership of this honorable body, to obtain consideration of this measure, which would require payment by Japan, Germany, and other former enemy nations under the terms of the Geneva Convention to our own boys for compulsory labor and inhumane treatment when they were prisoners of war in the enemy prison camps.

For 5 years these men have waited for us to take the necessary action to bring about payment of those just claims, waited in vain despite the fact that they and the surviving dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice for us have, in a great many cases, suffered privation and have been in dire need of even the meager funds these payments would provide.

On October 2 I made the last of several appeals on this floor for action on this legislation. This resulted in hearings by the committee during the closing days of the first session of this Eighty-second Congress. I have called upon the chairman of the committee by letter on several occasions to afford this House the opportunity to do its duty by these former prisoners of war by reporting out this bill or one comparable in purpose. His reply each time has been that the legislation was receiving appropriate attention.

The only appropriate attention it has received, so far as I am able to ascertain, has been from the State Department and the Treasury Department, both of which have reported to the committee that it should not be enacted at this time. That has been going on for 5 years, so I feel you cannot consider my action in placing the discharge petition before you for signature as being precipitate.

This long, needless delay, however, is not the only contributory reason for my

action. There is another imminent and far more dangerous threat to our ability, regardless of the willingness I am sure the great majority has, to see that these 132,000 former prisoners of war are treated justly by the nations which imprisoned them, forced them to work, often tortured them barbarously and starved them, and are obligated under the terms of the Geneva Convention to pay them. It is well to bear in mind, too, that we already have paid the prisoners of war whom we held a total of \$169,000,000 under the Geneva Convention terms. We did that years ago, but not 1 cent has been paid to our men or their dependents.

Further delay on our part may shut the door tightly and permanently on any chance our fighting men have of receiving what is justly theirs. It is because time is of the essence that I am making this final appeal to you today.

Consider this, if you please. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings on the proposed World War II treaty with Japan for several days. It will very shortly report to the Senate its determination regarding ratification of that treaty, probably one day this week. I have brought to the attention of that Senate committee, through some of its members, what I believe to be the danger that ratification in its present form will return to Japanese nationals the money and property we have been holding and which is sufficient, according to our War Claims Commission, to satisfy the rightful claims of these former prisoners of war held by Japan.

I have asked the committee to consider carefully that eventuality and to give me the benefit of the committee's opinion whether my fears are justified. In event they are, I am asking the committee to give consideration to such change in the treaty terms as will prevent this injustice to thousands of our own men and allow the former enemy nation to escape from its obligations.

The membership of this House is not responsible for this dangerous emergency. The responsibility lies entirely at the door of the State Department. I do not make that charge without what I believe to be ample proof and full justification.

Why is the State Department seeking to hold up consideration of this legislation? The answer in blunt language is this: The State Department is merely conforming to its customary and constant policy of giving first consideration to foreign nations and their citizens regardless of the welfare of and cost to our own citizens.

It has prevailed upon the House committee to hold back this legislation which would see that justice is done to our men who suffered terrible torture and came home wrecked in mind and body because it is seeking ratification of a treaty that gives no direct assurance that Japan ever will pay its just obligations to those men.

Let me quote to you from a letter written on September 21, 1951, by Mr. Jack K. McFall, Assistant Secretary of State,

to a Member of this House in reply to an inquiry made by that Member:

There is no provision in the peace treaty—

Writes the Assistant Secretary of State—

providing for compensation for claims on account of death or physical suffering.

Then he continues:

However, article 16 of the treaty provides that as an expression of its desire to indemnify those members of the armed forces of the Allied Powers who suffered undue hardships while prisoners of war of Japan, Japan will transfer its assets and those of its nationals in countries which were neutral during the war, or which were at war with any of the Allied Powers, or, at its option, the equivalent of such assets, to the international committee of the Red Cross which shall liquidate such assets and distribute the resultant funds to appropriate national agencies, for the benefit of former prisoners of war and their families on such basis as it may determine to be equitable.

The five long years our needy men and their dependents have already waited will drag out into another 5 or 10 years before any such plan could be carried out. In the meantime many of them are hungry.

And, please note this carefully, the treaty would permit Japanese nationals to have their property held by us returned to them. The treaty proposes to transfer Japanese property in neutral or other former enemy countries only. We do not know what the value may be. Those funds held by us are ample and under the plans of the War Claims Commission, which we have set up to handle such matters, would be used to pay Japan's obligations to our men who were Japan's prisoners. That can be done now by the War Claims Commission—not 5 years or 10 years from now. But it cannot be done unless we pass the legislation now bottled up in committee at the State Department's insistence.

Now, let us consider one more most significant statement in the letter of the Assistant Secretary of State:

In view of the limited resources available to Japan, it was necessary, in agreement with our allies, to limit compensation to compensation payable in Japanese currency to allied nationals arising out of property losses or damage to property of allied nationals within Japan on December 7, 1941.

Please get the full significance of that. It puts property losses and only a part of them above human lives, human suffering, human rights. What chance do you think our former fighting men, who were victims of barbarous and inhumane treatment, have being paid anything—even a small part of what is due them—under such treaty provisions as that?

And the Assistant Secretary of State comments—just incidentally and casually—in the same letter on the fact that the United States has furnished economic aid to Japan in the amount of nearly \$2,000,000,000 since the end of World War II, up to the date of the letter. There has been more since. Still the State Department takes the position that the Congress should make no move to see that our own 132,000 former prisoners of war and their dependents receive from former enemy

alien funds held by us a comparatively trifling \$82,000,000.

Is not it about time—is not the time long since past—when we should live up to our full responsibility and stop this sort of thing? It may be, by some stretch of the imagination, what is called diplomacy, but to my mind it is outright and shameful disregard of the rights of our own patriotic men. If it is diplomacy, then for the sake of our own people and our Nation let us supplant it with common sense and see that prompt action is taken to do the right, fair and honorable thing as far as our former prisoners of war and their dependents are concerned.

As for me, I have done all that I can do to see that those boys who gave their Nation their blood, their sweat, their tears and, too frequently, their lives, receive the money to which they are entitled. It does not cost our taxpayers 1 cent now, but it most certainly will if we heed the State Department's demand for delay.

Is this just another instance of waving flags, martial music by marching bands, and gushing oratory when the boys are inducted and go out to fight for us, then find on their return that there is a sudden coldness—a decided chill in the air that once was supercharged and overheated with patriotism? I hope not.

As I pleaded with you last October, let us lift this blight of negligence on our part from our collective conscience and bring out H. R. 3719 at once—and pass it. Your signature on the discharge petition will be a long step in the right direction and I most fervently urge you to sign it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that a great deal of that money has gone to other countries for luxuries?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; absolutely.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should be very glad to sign the gentleman's petition.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I should be very happy if the gentleman would, because in putting this petition on the desk today I am doing the last—the final—thing I can do. I have done everything possible for 9 months to bring this to the attention of the Congress and to bring it to the attention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If sufficient Members sign it, we will get this legislation on the floor and pass it. Everybody I have talked to naturally wants it passed. We want our boys to get at least what was paid individuals in other countries.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I will be glad to sign that petition also. I cannot conceive that any Member of this body would oppose it. I am somewhat surprised that the committee does not report it out. Where is the opposition coming from?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The State Department asked to withhold action on the bill. That is why they have not reported it out.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. While I have refrained through the years from signing petitions, if I were in the habit of doing it, I would sign the gentleman's petition, because I think he has a worthy cause. I am surprised that our Government has done nothing to protect, defend, or even benefit our own people.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan, for whom I have the highest respect—I have known him a long time and we have served together many years in this Congress—that we are the direct representatives of the people of this Nation, and I think it is our duty to see that our citizens get fair treatment. If there is a department of the Government that ignores the citizens of this country; if there is a department that will not readily consent to a proposal that we pay returned soldiers what is due them—many of these soldiers have been injured, many of them have passed on leaving dependents, whom even this little mite would help—then I think it is manifestly our duty to see that they get this money.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, even if they call it relief to foreign countries, it would be better to have the relief go here than over there.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts that in this same letter from the State Department, which was written last September, they pointed out that since the war and up to last September they have found it necessary to help Japan economically to the extent of \$2,000,000,000. There has been more since then. How much up to date, I do not know, but I do know that the record shows, at least the statement of the Assistant Secretary of State, that they paid \$2,000,000,000 to rehabilitate Japan. I am not fighting with that. I am simply complaining because something has not been done for the boys of this country who went over and fought and won the battles. Many of them did not come back, and many who did come back will never be the same as when they went over there. I think it is a small thing for the Congress to provide what we can for them.

We have ample Japanese funds and property impounded now, according to the War Claims Commission, to pay those former prisoners of Japan. It should be done by the War Claims Commission, which was set up for the purpose, and has a fine administrative record. Mrs. Georgia Lusk, one of the members of that Commission and a former member of this honorable body, is a most efficient and capable woman from New Mexico. I know that in hands like hers the payment to these former prisoners of war will be handled competently, fairly, and as economically as possible.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. When the gentleman refers to Mrs. Lusk, is she not also on the commission to pay the Philippine claims?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, the claims of those imprisoned after capture in the Philippines.

Mr. JOHNSON. Were the people that the gentleman represents or talks for interned in the Philippines?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Some of them.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have a brother and a sister that got caught in the Philippines. They did not get into a military prison; they lived in the jungles for over 3 years, with their little baby, and they have been paid only what I consider a nominal amount. Now, have your people gotten anything to date?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not 1 cent, not any soldier in the United States who has been held a prisoner in the Philippines by the Japanese, or in Japan, or in Germany. They have received nothing.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think the thesis of the gentleman's argument is correct, and we ought to take care of these people. Certainly the gentleman's State has been unusually hard-hit because of the population of New Mexico. A great number of boys saw service from that area.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We supplied a great number of men, because they took our entire New Mexico National Guard before the war broke out and sent it to the Philippines. I am talking not only for them, but for all the boys who were prisoners.

Mr. JOHNSON. It should not apply to your people alone, but let us go across the board and take care of these people who took care of us in time of need.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If we can get enough signatures we will bring the bill out and pass it on this floor. Otherwise I feel it will not be enacted. Why the State Department takes it upon itself to interfere in legislation of this kind I just cannot understand, because eventually someone, some beneficiary of these boys, will be paid the money to which these former prisoners of war are now entitled. It will come from the Treasury of the United States at that time—out of the pockets of our taxpayers. That is where it is going to come from eventually unless we do what we are supposed to do now and take it from the moneys and property of our former enemies—moneys and property we are now holding and are rightfully entitled to use for this purpose.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask if the State Department assigned any reason for opposition to the bill?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have not heard that they assigned any reason. They made a report and they asked that no action be taken. That is all I know about it. The Justice Department was asked for a report and they made a factual statement but took no position on the passage of the legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project has become a national issue in this country and in Canada for over 40 years, and for over 40 years the people of my State of Minnesota and the people of that entire Great Lakes midwest area have waited in vain for Congress to take the necessary legislative action to make the St. Lawrence project a reality. However, the Congress has not acted due to the pressure and manipulation of vested interests who have stood in the way of this project which is so essential to the national defense and the economic welfare of our country.

But the time has come when we must face this issue squarely because it is no longer possible for Congress to evade its duty to the American people. The reason I say this is because the seaway is going to be built whether Congress acts or not. As you know, the Canadian Parliament has just adopted legislation which permits the Dominion of Canada to build the seaway alone if the United States does not desire to be an active partner in its construction. This legislation has been approved; it is now a part of the public law of Canada, and I am told that Canada intends to start construction this coming spring. In other words, Mr. Speaker, Canada means business on the St. Lawrence seaway and unless Congress acts during this session of Congress to approve the seaway resolution—House Joint Resolution 337—this country will lose its last chance to be a partner in the construction and the management of this great inland waterway and power project.

Yesterday the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress in which he pointed out the urgency of approving St. Lawrence legislation. In this message, Mr. Truman said:

The question before the Congress \* \* \* no longer is whether the St. Lawrence seaway shall be built. The question before the Congress now is whether the United States shall participate in its construction and thus maintain joint operation and control over this development which is so important to our security and our economic progress.

It is, therefore, obvious, Mr. Speaker, that since the decision on whether or not we shall have this seaway has already been made, it is just a question of whether the United States shall play the dog in the manger by refusing to become a partner in this joint undertaking or whether we shall accept our obligation to our own people and to our friendly ally to the north, Canada, by joining in the construction.

If we do not take this last remaining opportunity to become a partner in the seaway, then Canada, and Canada alone, will have complete control over the project and it shall be utilized largely for the benefit of Canada. Canada will control the question of tolls on American shipping; Canadian ships will have first priority on the use of the navigation part of the project; and Canada will own the seaway lock, stock, and barrel, free

of all debt once the tolls have paid for its construction. The United States on the other hand will be helping pay for the project through shipping tolls on American cargo and unless we act now this country can never hope to be a joint owner of the project nor have a voice in its management.

The obvious advantages of the St. Lawrence project to the Midwest-Great Lakes area, and to the Nation, have been pointed out many times in congressional committees, on the floor of the House and Senate, and in the public press from one end of the country to another. So I need not dwell to any great length on this subject.

However, I do want to mention a few facts, not because they are new, but because they should be repeated again and again. First, the navigation facilities to be provided by the project will mean cheaper transportation costs and an expansion of commerce and trade for half the people of the United States. Using the seaway channel, grain can be shipped from the Midwest to the east coast at a savings of 5 to 10 cents per bushel; lumber can be shipped eastward at a savings of \$5 per 1,000 board feet; dairy products can be moved to eastern consuming areas at a savings in shipping costs of \$2 per ton. In fact, the average savings in transportation costs will be around \$3 to \$3.50 per ton of cargo.

These savings will benefit everyone. The farms and factories of the Midwest would be stimulated to new heights of production. The same would be true of producers in the East shipping to Midwest markets, and to manufacturers who sell in the Great Lakes area. The businessman would benefit, the consumer would benefit, and the farmer would benefit. The opening to the Great Lakes area to ocean shipping and world trade must inevitably mean an expansion of commerce and trade for the entire northern part of the United States.

The power features of the project will be of an immediate and direct benefit to the entire Northeast area. It is no secret that New York and New England are suffering from an acute power famine which is hampering war production and industrial development. The St. Lawrence power project is the solution to the problem of this area. St. Lawrence power will be cheap power. At the bus bar it would cost 1.77 mills per kilowatt-hour, and it can be delivered to load centers within a 300-mile radius at about half the present price of electricity in this same area.

As it has been pointed out by the President, by the Defense Establishment, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Defense Mobilizer, and others responsible for defense and defense production, the St. Lawrence project is essential to the national security of both the United States and Canada. It is necessary to move Labrador iron ore to the steel-making centers of this country in times of heavy steel production when Mesabi ore is not available in sufficient quantities. Its navigation facilities are especially vital during times of emergency, and no one can deny that the additional electric power that the project will afford is in crying demand today.

These advantages of the project are obvious to all who have eyes and who want to see. Then why is it that no congressional action has been taken to approve the project. It is not because of lack of public support—one only has to consult with civic groups, farm, and labor groups, business associations, and one finds that a majority of the people look with favor on it.

It is not because of the lack of support from the executive branch of the Government that the project has not been approved—every President since Woodrow Wilson has endorsed the project.

Instead, the bottleneck has been right here in Congress where for too long there has been a tendency to listen to the siren song of certain selfish vested interests—the eastern railroads, the coal interests, the private utility lobby, and some eastern and Gulf port cities who have opposed it on the grounds that it might affect their own interests.

The Congress of the United States cannot afford to listen to these selfish interests any longer. The people want action—the people want the St. Lawrence project because they recognize in it a project of great merit which will provide lasting benefits to the whole Nation.

It is, therefore, my hope that Congress will meet the challenge of the House—that it will take this last opportunity to pass the St. Lawrence project, and thus authorize United States partnership in this single most important development remaining on the North American Continent. Let it never be said by future generations that the Congress failed to do its duty when it was called upon to do so. I again call upon the Congress to enact the St. Lawrence project into law while there is still an opportunity. Time is running out, and this is our last chance.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I noticed that the gentleman in his statement said vested interests had stopped the program for the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway. As members of that committee on public works, as the gentleman is and as I am, you voted for it and I voted against it. I wonder if the gentleman would put the vested interests in the RECORD that he is speaking about.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes; I surely will. That is one of the things that we hope to do to bring this important proposal before the House, and unfold it, and expose it to the light of day, and have full argument for and against.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is the gentleman contending that vested interest prevailed upon members of your committee to stop this?

Mr. BLATNIK. Oh, I apologize if I inadvertently cast any reflection on the motives of the members of the committee.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am sure that the gentleman did not mean to do that.

Mr. BLATNIK. I did not, sir.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is what the gentleman did do, however,

Mr. BLATNIK. I want to make clear that the witnesses who appeared in op-

position represented or spoke in behalf of economic groups, primarily railroads, coal management, coal labor organizations, private utilities, the Atlantic ports and the Gulf ports—these witnesses did express before the committee that they feared that the seaway would either hurt rail transportation, that it might cut down the consumption of coal as it is used in steam-generating plants in that area, and the Atlantic and Gulf Coast ports expressed deep concern that there might be a diversion of traffic that would hurt them. Those are the special interests to which I had reference.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I agree with the gentleman that that was the testimony there, but do you think that is the testimony that caused the members to vote as they voted?

Mr. BLATNIK. I did not go into the motives or try to justify or qualify the votes of the individual members. I am sure each member, whether he voted for or against it, voted out of deep convictions and honest reasons for voting as he did.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BLATNIK. Under no circumstances, either directly or indirectly, in any way whatsoever do I want to cast any reflection upon the votes of any member. They are all honorable men, and fine and able men on the committee. I am talking about these economic groups which have been consistently leading this fight to oppose this project on grounds that it may hurt their business.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Do you not think there was a little leading on both sides of the fence?

Mr. BLATNIK. I will not answer that, but I will say that the witnesses from the Government who testified for the project from the standpoint of national economic development to promote sound resource use, which would contribute to a sound, long-term growth, and development of that area, and the witnesses from the defense establishment who spoke to us in the interests of defense and national security, top-level persons such as the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of State, and Defense Mobilizer Charles Wilson, and the Canadian-American Joint Board for Defense, all down the line without exception these men of high authority and grave responsibility have maintained that this project was vital and necessary to our defense and security.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, in some way to answer our good friend from New Mexico, there is a difference of opinion on all great projects. There was a difference of opinion on the Panama Canal. There were those who were in opposition to it. That is the America idea of everybody expressing their opinion either for and against, and giving their reasons. That is why we have this great forum of debate here in the House of Representatives. But, out of it all, as the matter stands today, I believe that a great majority of the American people

want this thing done, and they should have it done for their own defense.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank my very good friend and colleague. I want to say for the record that the gentleman from Michigan has been one of the outstanding leaders in the House in the drive and the move to secure approval of this legislation during the 5 years that I have been here, and for years before that.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I can say from Wisconsin that most of us are for the seaway project. I was a bit concerned, as was the gentleman from New Mexico, about this vested interest charge because out my way the group that is most violently opposed to the construction of the seaway consists of the railway brotherhoods.

I am sure the gentleman would not charge them with being a part of the vested interests.

Mr. BLATNIK. I appreciate the contribution of my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], but I am sure he will agree with me that this great project would help not only the great State of Wisconsin as it would my State of Minnesota, and the State of Michigan, and the entire Great Lakes area, by which we add a fourth coast line to this great country of ours. Here are these two great friendly countries, Canada and the United States, who have stood shoulder to shoulder on so many issues for so many years, now have this great opportunity to demonstrate to the nations of the world how we can work together, side by side, and promote resources held in common for mutual benefit and security. After working together as friends and neighbors for so many years, I think it would be most unfortunate, perhaps I might say shameful, should we have a falling out now on this great project that means so much to both of us. It is therefore my hope that the Congress will meet the challenge and that it will take this last opportunity to pass the St. Lawrence project.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to thank the gentleman for his allusion to me a moment ago. May I say in return that no one on the Committee on Public Works has been more diligent, more industrious, or hardworking in promoting this project than the gentleman from Minnesota now addressing the House [Mr. BLATNIK]. The gentleman lives in Minnesota, on the Mesabi Range, and is thoroughly familiar with the problem and knows the dwindling supplies in this country better than any man in this country. I say to you and to the House and to the country that you are entitled to great credit for the work you have done in behalf of this great unfinished project on the North American continent.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks



in the RECORD and include an address made by Alfred E. Smith to the American people, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated to cost \$252. Permit me to say that I hope every Member of this House will read this speech delivered January 25, 1936, when he said at that time that the choice would have to be made then between Moscow and Washington, D. C., as the capital of this world. Talk about statesmanship. That was 16 years ago. Read the last paragraph of that speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Colorado). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### SECURITY

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the watchword of this Government for the past 20 years apparently has been "security"; security for the Nation, national security, and individual security. Security from fear and want were two of the main pronouncements in the Atlantic Pact. They drew a great deal of attention at the time, almost as much as did President Wilson's 14 points during the latter part of the First World War, and were apparently just as soon forgotten.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that complete national or individual security is not possible in this world. The first breath that a new-born baby draws into its lungs carries with it a number of the bacterial flora of this world, and its life from that time until its death is a continual battle between two forces, a battle between the destructive forces which are inherently threatening life at every moment of our existence in the external world, and the reparative forces present within our cells and the blood stream, which protect us against the onslaughts of at least some of these destructive forces. In our country unless you look for it within the walls, grim and guarded as they are, of a modern penitentiary, if you want complete security from fear and want, you would not have a great deal of difficulty in acquiring it there; but outside of that I know of no security present in life. The constant history of life has been throughout all the era of history that if and when a nation acquired a certain degree of security either by war or by intrigue so that the conquered nation's wealth was taken over, the inevitable result has been, to the extent that peace and security were enjoyed at the expense of the conquered nation, it has eventually destroyed the predatory nation. I do not need to quote examples of that if you are students of history; they are present on almost every page: Greece, Rome, Persia, Egypt, are examples of where with the advent of peace and security at the expense of someone else it has invariably lent to the destruction of that race and civilization.

The brand of security we are attempting to attain and enjoy in the United States is very largely supposed to be attained at the expense of someone else's labor. No one can quarrel with the security which you earn yourself; no one has a right to expect security at the expense of the labor of others, and I think you will find that if you make a careful study of the Constitution—and this is, after all, although you might not know it unless you went back in history some time—this is a constitutional republic; it is our Westminster catechism, if you please; it is our only excuse for existence as a government. Nowhere within the pages of that Constitution will you find the word "charity" mentioned. The Constitution is a cash and carry document. Nowhere within its pages, not once, is charity mentioned. That was definitely left to the individual. Those bills can only be paid and the taxpayers' money expended through appropriations regularly made by Congress for which bills are submitted, passed on by the appropriate authority set up by Congress, and paid by the order and will of Congress through its requisite executive department. So with all of this security for America which has not been earned by the individual enjoying it, if there is any such thing—and the security, God help us, which for the last 20 years we have been inexcusably stealing from our taxpayers' pockets and shipping to foreign countries—I repeat there has never been the slightest authority within the Constitution for the expenditure of a single red penny of those sums.

When the Pilgrim Fathers left England on that little *Mayflower*, which would not be much bigger than a tender in New York Harbor today, they were not looking for security. They came to find freedom, to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience.

When the Revolutionary heroes declared their independence from Great Britain and signed the Declaration of Independence, pledging their lives, their property, and their sacred honor to attaining that freedom, they were not looking for security. Security they could have had at any moment by simply paying a few cents on every pound of tea. It would have been much more simple than fighting the Revolutionary War. They could have afforded the tax. But they were not fighting for security. They were seeking to attain freedom.

When the early colonials went across the wilderness and the mountains into Kentucky and the Southern Plains they were not looking for security. They were men of high emprise. They took their lives in their hands. They wished for freedom and the opportunity to go out into the west and carve out an empire for themselves. They were not looking for security.

When those intrepid Jesuit "black robes" left the peace and quietness of their monasteries around St. Louis and started across the Western Plains and mountains, taking their lives in their hands, with the almost complete certainty of meeting the stake or the scalping knife, they were not looking for security. They had a noble vision of winning the western Indians to Christ.

The men and women of the great Mormon trek were not marching toward security when they left their blood-stained tracks on the wind-swept plains and alkali deserts of the great West. They were content to risk all—even life itself—for religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the great basic rule of life seems to be, "Nothing venture, nothing have." The oak tree becomes strong by withstanding the wintry blasts. And men of derring-do would not have it otherwise. To what depths of degradation have we sunk as a nation when stark, maudlin fear dictates our governmental policies rather than the faith in God and ourselves, upon which firm foundation the founding fathers built this wonderful Government we are now apparently trying to trade in for a cheap government of international poltroons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### THE NATIONAL CEMETERY IN HONOLULU, HAWAII

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I introduced a bill—House Joint Resolution 338—which would restore the crosses in the National Memorial Cemetery in Honolulu, Hawaii, that were removed recently by the Army. On tomorrow morning the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a hearing on that bill and on some others. I shall be very glad to cooperate with the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] in the measure that comes out of that committee. I know his interest in that cemetery and I believe he is desirous of having the crosses restored to those graves.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read part of a letter which was written by the mother of a veteran of the Korean war who is now buried there. She states:

When I visit his grave I hope to find the crosses in place. The parents of these boys certainly have the right to some consideration. The Army is plenty extravagant in some things but want to be so conservative in others.

The Army has given expense as a reason. Expense is nothing. We know of the waste that has gone on during this war by the armed services.

Mr. Speaker, I have had many letters from clergymen requesting that the crosses be replaced on the graves in Honolulu. They feel it is a mark of religion, a mark of sacrifice, and they believe as I and thousands of others do all over this land that these veterans, of all people, deserve the crosses over their graves. For years it has been the military custom to put crosses on the graves of soldiers who have left us for a better land. I never had a greater response for any measure than the bill which calls for the replacing of these crosses. One letter, in part, says:

The use of the white cross has always been a custom of the service, from the very beginning, and will always remain so. To substitute something else for it would be like substituting communism for Christianity.

We all know that these boys gave their lives for freedom, even freedom of religion, to worship God, and to fight communism.

I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, this letter that I received from Mr. James A. O'Brien, director, Territorial Council on Veterans Affairs, Territory of Hawaii:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,  
TERRITORIAL COUNCIL  
ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,

Honolulu, T. H., January 25, 1952.

We in Hawaii are deeply appreciative of the battle you are putting up for the restoration of crosses to the National Cemetery of the Pacific. I am taking the liberty of forwarding you additional ammunition in the form of resolutions, editorial extracts, and pictures.

The enlargements contained herein show the cemetery before the crosses were taken down. One of the pictures was taken on Memorial Day and shows all the crosses wreathed with leis—56,000 of them—from all the islands. Included are some contact shots showing the placing of the leis on the night before Memorial Day.

All the veteran organizations in the Territory have passed resolutions urging the restoration of crosses.

There is one point that the Army has not brought out in its defense of the action and that is the alternative of upright white crosses was never offered to the next of kin.

Again, our deep appreciation for your magnificent battle and if there is anything further we can do please call upon us.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. O'BRIEN,  
Director.

Mr. Speaker, I have had numerous letters from families of these men who are buried here. These people say they cannot bear to go to the cemetery at the present time because it looks like a cow pasture with the flat markers.

I have photographs here, Mr. Speaker, showing the crosses in the Punchbowl Cemetery in Honolulu. Those who have seen it tell me it is a wonderful sight; a most inspiring sight.

Then there is one picture that shows the cemetery without those crosses, and it looks like a cow pasture. I wish that all Members would join with me before the committee in asking for the restoration of those crosses and other religious symbols.

Mr. Speaker, I have numerous resolutions passed by various veterans' organizations that I would like to have inserted as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

KEYSER, W. VA., January 26, 1952.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EDITH NOURSE ROGERS: More power to your bill to have the crosses restored to the graves in the National Cemetery in Honolulu. Certainly our boys who gave their all deserve some distinction from other cemeteries.

Our boy, who was killed in Korea May 30, 1951, is buried there. I was grieved when I learned the crosses had been removed.

When I visit his grave I hope to find the crosses in place.

The parents of these boys certainly have the right to some consideration.

The Army is plenty extravagant in some things but want to be so conservative in others.

These boys are forgotten all too soon anyway, they never should have been in Korea. Respectfully,

AUBURNDALE, MASS., January 25, 1952.  
Representative EDITH N. ROGERS,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I wish to go on record as protesting strongly against the removal of markers on our dead soldiers' graves. Certainly a marker is cheap in price when compared to a boy's life.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. C. H. EAMES.  
(Clayton H. Eames.)

HONOLULU, T. H., January 25, 1952.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
Republican Representative from Massachusetts, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The enclosed article and one in last night's paper (January 24) encouraged me to add my personal protest to the sudden and ruthless removal of the white crosses in Honolulu's National Memorial Cemetery.

From my home on Pacific Heights, near to that of JOSEPH FARRINGTON'S, I could look down at a distance and see these crosses, row upon row, in memory of the thousands of men who had sacrificed their lives for their country. With the sun shining on them it was an inspiring sight.

Now it looks blank and dreary, the flat brown markers taking the places of the crosses, not to be seen unless one is right there walking through, and looking down or bending over to read the inscription.

I would like to quote from a letter I received at Christmastime from a man who lives in Philadelphia. He visited the islands in May 1950, the main purpose to see the grave of his nephew, an officer, a doctor who put aside his private practice for the duration and was killed in the war. He left a wife and two small children.

Quotation from his uncle's letter:

"I was really shocked when you told me the crosses had been removed from the graves of the soldiers in National Memorial Cemetery. When I think of that never-to-be-forgotten scene on Memorial Day 1950, just at the close of the ceremonies after a hot breezeless morning a brisk breeze arose and all the 12,000 flags did likewise and fluttered and the crosses stood out prominently. I consider it almost sacrilege that these crosses should have been removed." (E. M. Pomeroy.)

I would like also to enclose a card, a photograph of the cemetery as it was with the crosses. In the background is the ancient crater of Diamond Head and Pacific Ocean on the right. In the foreground, at a slight elevation, is one of our unusual plants, the cup of gold in blossom.

I am also a New Englander, born and raised in Boston, though for many years I have lived in Honolulu.

May I offer my heartiest sympathy and best wishes for success in your effort to restore the crosses in the National Cemetery in the Punchbowl Crater in Honolulu.

Very sincerely yours and aloha,

GRACE D. NOBLE  
(Mrs. Byron E. Noble.)

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of January 16, 1952]

#### THE FIGHT RENEWED FOR PUNCHBOWL'S CROSSES

With quiet determination, several Congressmen are at work to get the white crosses restored in the National Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl Crater.

In the face of the Army's refusal to restore the crosses it removed last September, these Congressmen are preparing to push through a congressional mandate. The Army has its reasons, but a lot of people don't agree with it.

The initial steps already have been taken. Three bills have been introduced and are in committee—two in the House and one in the

Senate. Their authors are Representatives EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, and GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland, and Senator HERBERT R. O'CONNOR, of Maryland.

Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Veterans' Committee, has promised his support.

Hawaii's people, dismayed when the orderly rows of crosses were uprooted in a few hours by an Army "task force," have taken new hope from the firm expressions of determination which have come from Washington as Congress picks up its business where it left off before the year-end holidays.

For months now we have felt the vast emptiness of the cemetery with the crosses gone. The inadequate flat headstones fall far short of the field of crosses in evoking the symbolism of sacrifice we as a people should never forget.

It is a symbolism immortalized in the touching cadences of John McCrae's tribute to the fallen in Flanders fields. It is a symbolism given new meaning each Memorial Day by Hawaii's outpouring of flowers woven into strands of remembrance.

We as Americans need those crosses not only to honor the memories of the fallen, but to keep fresh the memories of those who remain.

By those symbols of sacrifice we are constantly reminded of our great obligation, our duty not only to defend our land against its enemies, but to fashion in this world a true and lasting peace so that each new generation will not have to make its sacrifice on war's altar.

That is why Hawaii's heart goes out over the thousands of miles of land and water with its message of encouragement to the people's spokesmen in Congress who also realize this need of the sympathetic mind and the devoted heart.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,  
TERRITORIAL COUNCIL  
ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,  
Honolulu, T. H., January 25, 1952.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Under separate cover we are sending you enlarged photographs of the National Cemetery of the Pacific before the crosses were removed.

These photographs were prepared and furnished by the local chapters of the Disabled American Veterans. The chapters are intensely interested in the restoration of the crosses.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. O'BRIEN, Director.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 29, 1951]

#### THEY AWAIT THE VERDICT

The mute white crosses have been taken from the graves of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific—but protests may restore them.

It took only 2 hours for the energetic task force of the Army to remove from Punchbowl more than 13,000 little wooden crosses. It will require more time to restore them—if they are to be restored.

But there is time for this task of restoration—those who sleep beneath the green turf in the ancient crater have no need for haste. They will wait, in patience, for the verdict.

All the hurry, all the ordered speed and discipline of their training, all the furious urgency of their attacks on the battle lines, all the sudden anguish of their mortal wounds before they fell, are of the past.

For them the suns will rise and will set over that dedicated Hill of Sacrifice in long, unhurried procession. The gentle winds and the stars will keep them company, even if in a burst of organized effort as well timed and precise as the burst from a machinegun, the

13,000 white crosses came down in one unexpected afternoon.

In Washington, D. C., Delegate FARRINGTON has appropriately said that the wishes of the families of the men who lie in the Punchbowl graves should be consulted.

That can be done, and should be done. It should have been done, and thoroughly, sympathetically, before the order was given that tore the crosses from the ground.

To do it rightly, the families should have a clear picture of the alternatives—the graves with crosses and also with the flat stone marker, or the graves with only that flat, inconspicuous and unimpressive headstone.

And the families should know—many of them know already—that in our military cemeteries abroad, the white crosses still stand.

And these next of kin should feel that it is not a question of economy—our doing fitting honor to those who are buried in Punchbowl.

It is a question of giving to these heroes of our country the greatest possible evidence of respect and devotion we can give them.

It is a question also of developing this National Memorial Cemetery as one of our Nation's most impressive, most distinctive burial places.

It is a question of maintaining the physical facilities so that each Memorial Day the people of Hawaii can pay their distinctive tribute of leis and garlands, appropriately wreathed above the graves.

Yes, those who lie asleep in Punchbowl can await the verdict.

For them, all mortal haste is ended. They lie quietly in the ultimate discipline of death, relying upon a grateful country to do them justice.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,  
TERRITORIAL COUNCIL ON  
VETERANS AFFAIRS,  
Honolulu, T. H.

Many men from your State who made the supreme sacrifice during World War II have found their last resting place in the National Cemetery of the Pacific. Because of this we feel that you are close to us in our efforts to have permanent crosses decorate the graves of those who gave their lives so that others might live.

As you know, until recently the 13,000 graves were decorated with wooden crosses. The wooden crosses were installed by the Army as a temporary measure pending the complete installation of surface marble markers throughout the cemetery. Recently, the installation was completed and the Army carried out its previously announced orders of removing and destroying the crosses.

However, during the tenure of the crosses they bore into the hearts of the people of Hawaii and to the many, many relatives of the men buried there who came from the mainland to visit the resting place of their son, husband or brother.

The cemetery, now, without the row upon row of white crosses and Stars of David looks bare and forlorn. It was a distinct shock to the people who visited the cemetery after the crosses were destroyed. To them, the crosses have become an integral part of the cemetery.

May we enlist your assistance in securing a permanent type cross, either of concrete or of some other lasting material, so that the cemetery may be restored to its former beauty and symbolism.

This we know necessitates congressional action. The veterans organizations and the people of the Territory and we know the relatives of the mainland men buried here, would appreciate anything that you can do.

We are enclosing an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 29 that expresses some of the feeling of the people of the territory.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. O'BRIEN, Director.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISABLED AMERICAN  
VETERANS, OAHU CHAPTER NO. 1 AND HONO-  
LULU CHAPTER NO. 3 FOR THE RETENTION OF  
THE WHITE CROSSES THAT HONOR OUR  
WAR DEAD BURIED IN PUNCHBOWL NATIONAL  
CEMETERY, HONOLULU, T. H.

Whereas the removal of the white crosses said to be an act of economy in keeping with the national policy not to maintain the white crosses under present Government appropriations; and

Whereas the white crosses have, since World War I, been the symbol of this country's fallen heroes who have given their lives in defense of their country in time of war; and

Whereas the white crosses served as a proper and constant reminder to the living that our present blessings of the Government represent the dividends paid by the supreme sacrifice; and

Whereas the entire Nation on May 30 pays proper tribute to the war dead holding memorial services—part of which services is the decorating of each grave with flowers. This sight of flowers on white crosses is a scene of beauty and demands respect; and

Whereas to remove the crosses would leave a field of grass, except for its hidden markers, unable to deliver its rightful message, "The cost of freedom"; and

Whereas Punchbowl National Cemetery has buried there soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines from all the 48 States and the Territories—truly is representative of the Nation's youth and marks the final resting place of men and women from every race, creed, and color. No active economy on their memory shall ever be warranted as the price has been "paid in full": Therefore be it

*Resolved by this joint resolution of the Disabled American Veterans, Oahu Chapter No. 1 and Honolulu Chapter No. 3, That the Congress of the United States of America be asked to consider our request for the necessary appropriation to properly maintain the traditional white crosses to serve as they have in the past "lest we forget."*

Commander, Oahu Chapter, No. 1, Disabled American Veterans.

Commander, Honolulu Chapter, No. 3, Disabled American Veterans.

At a regular meeting of Gaylord Dillingham Post, No. 4951, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held in Honolulu, T. H., on October 4, 1951, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Army has recently removed the white wooden crosses which marked the graves at the National Memorial Cemetery, Puawaina Crater, in Hawaii, following the installation of flat stone grave markers at such cemetery; and

"Whereas the crosses represent the faith and the highest aspiration of mankind, and can never be wholly replaced as a memorial by any other form of grave marker; and

"Whereas the families of those who lie at rest in the National Memorial Cemetery have been deeply grieved by the removal of the crosses from the graves of their loved ones: Therefore be it

*Resolved by Gaylord Dillingham Post No. 4951, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to install crosses to replace the white wooden ones which until recently marked the graves at the National Memorial Cemetery, Puawaina, T. H.; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America enact proper legislation for the permanent installation of white crosses over the graves of our heroic dead at the National Memorial Cemetery, Puawaina, T. H.; and be it further*

*Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded through channels to the De-*

partment of Hawaii, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to the President of the United States, President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of the Congress of the United States of America, and to the national headquarters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and to Senators and Representatives of Congress in favor of the restoration of the white crosses at the National Memorial Cemetery, Puawaina, T. H."

M. M. YOUNG,  
Adjutant, Gaylord Dillingham  
Post No. 4951.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE DEPARTMENT  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN LEGION, DE-  
PARTMENT OF HAWAII, IN REGULAR MEETING,  
OCTOBER 10, 1951

Whereas the graves in the national cemetery of the Pacific, at Punchbowl, Territory of Hawaii, were decorated with temporary wooden crosses; and

Whereas the Army recently removed and destroyed the said crosses; and

Whereas during the tenure of the crosses they bore into the hearts of the people of Hawaii and the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas the wooden crosses were symbols of the devotion in which the people held those who gave their lives that freedom might live and who now sleep beneath the green turf in the ancient crater; and

Whereas the cemetery without the row upon row of white crosses looks bare and forlorn; Now therefore be it

*Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Hawaii, forward copies of this resolution to the national commander of the American Legion, Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, and the Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.*

Approved by action of the department executive committee, department of Hawaii, October 10, 1951.

Copies forwarded to the national commander, Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, and to the Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., October 18, 1951.

C. E. MORRIS,  
Department Adjutant, American Legion,  
Department of Hawaii.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it seems just a few days ago when we listened to that great British statesman, Winston Churchill. I think many of us, after having heard him, expressed the feeling that somewhere, sometime, someplace, there might be a great American statesman who would speak out for this country as Churchill has spoken out for Britain.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we have such a statesman in the person of Herbert Hoover, who on last Sunday afternoon again took to the air waves and spoke to the American people out of the depths of his heart, bringing to all of us his sincere convictions on this matter of our foreign policy. Our fumbling foreign

policy is bound to be the real issue in the 1952 campaign and the American people will heed the voice of Mr. Hoover.

I was much surprised on yesterday to find a headline in the New York Times which states, "Hoover asks withdrawal of Army from Europe."

Mr. Speaker, nowhere in that great radio address by Mr. Hoover can I find any language which would justify that headline. It seems to me that New York Times has deliberately and on purpose distorted the views of Mr. Hoover because it does not agree with him.

Here is what Mr. Hoover said:

We should state that not only will we send no more ground troops, but that we expect they will rapidly relieve us of that burden except to protect our airfields outside the NATO countries.

By no stretch of the imagination can that language be construed as the Times has stated. It is an outright distortion. NATO has promised that there would be 40 divisions in Western Europe by the end of 1952, and we know that if they are going to fulfill their obligation and their agreement with us they will replace our troops with Europeans. Why should the United States police Europe—from now on?

Mr. Speaker, I want to read into the RECORD, at this point because it is so important and should have a permanent place in the archives of this great body, the points that Mr. Hoover has made in his broadcast and which he believes are so necessary for the preservation of our country. Here are some recommendations for an American foreign policy:

In view of this past year's experience, and these rising pressures, the Congress should again reexamine our situation.

I believe there are methods more effective to check the Communist menace in the long run and at the same time to lessen our domestic dangers.

As a basis for test I may repeat the essentials of the proposals some of us made a year ago which were supported by many military and economic authorities:

First. That the first national purpose of this Republic must be the defense of this final Gibraltar of freedom—and that is the Western Hemisphere.

Second. That the only way to save Europe from destruction is to avoid the third world war. The real and effective deterrent which we can, within our resources, contribute to that end is in cooperation with the British to expand our already strong air and navies up to a striking force. The Communists know that such striking force could destroy their military potential if they started an invasion and it could punish any such aggression. And this applies to aggression against other non-Communist countries as well as Western Europe.

In Korea, however correct the original decisions to use ground armies may have been, our experience during the past year has certainly demonstrated that we should have relied upon air and sea forces to punish that aggression. We should have avoided most of the sacrifice of 20,000 American boys and the injury of 80,000 others. The long-run injury to the South Koreans would have been less devastating.

#### WOULDN'T SCATTER ARMIES

Third. That the only way we can hold the initiative in this cold war is not to scatter our ground armies all around the 25,000 miles of Communist borders but to concen-

trate on such a highly mobile striking force by air and sea.

Three weeks ago General Wedemeyer, one of our greatest military strategists stated we should not dissipate our ground armies over the world and should put our emphasis upon a striking force of air and sea power.

Fourth. That we should furnish such munitions as we can afford to other nations who show a determined will to defend themselves.

Fifth. That to maintain the economic strength of the United States and to prevent its socialization does not permit our building up great ground armies in addition to overwhelming air and sea forces and supply of munitions to other nations. If our economy should collapse, Stalin's victory over the world would be complete. We cannot take that risk.

Sixth. That true friendship with Western European nations requires they be told certain things in no uncertain terms. They should realize the limit of our economic aid is this deterrent air and sea power and munitions. That, protected by this shield, we expect them on the basis of their performance in previous wars, and now with the aid of munitions from us, to realize that ground armies are Europe's sole problem. We should state that we expect them to provide ground protection for our airfields within their boundaries. We should state that not only will we send no more ground troops, but that we expect they will rapidly relieve us of that burden except to protect our airfields outside the NATO countries.

And they should be told that their delays leave our 250,000 American garrison in Europe in a most exposed position.

Seventh. Our relations to the United Nations Charter should be revised. It must not be allowed to dominate the internal sovereignty of our Government. Our courts have already made decisions that the Charter overrides our domestic laws.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States will support the program suggested by Mr. Hoover.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that here is a program for America, and here is our greatest statesman speaking out not as a Republican or as a Democrat, but as a great American, one who loves these United States with intense fervor. He is deeply concerned about its welfare. Let all our citizens rally to his standard, for our security and the preservation of freedom. Our present foreign policies are leading to disaster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, when the Great Architect of the Universe created this earth, He placed in the center of the North American continent, six of the great fresh water seas of the world, the Great Lakes. Those lakes contain approximately one-half of the sweet or fresh water of the globe. They have but one outlet to the sea, and that is the St. Lawrence River. Not only is that river the sole outlet of these great lakes, it is also the international boundary line for part of its course between two great English speaking governments, friendly governments, the United States and Canada.

The Almighty, in His wise purpose, saw fit to leave an obstruction for part of its way in the rapids of the St. Lawrence River, to be removed by man if he intended to use that great waterway for his own purpose. This seaway will open up a vast territory composed of the Middle Western States affecting fifty-five or sixty million of the inhabitants of our country.

The question which has been proposed to the House today is not whether the St. Lawrence seaway will be built. It will be built. But whether we go in with Canada and pay half, or stay out and pay it all. So today America stands at the crossroads. It must make a momentous decision soon which will affect this country in the years ahead, nobody knows how long.

It was said on the floor today—and in the Senate yesterday—that this great seaway is of no interest to the Americans, and therefore let Canada build it alone. Canada has already passed the needed legislation, created an agency, and authorized the work to be done. Now, why is this seaway of such great importance to us? The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], who spoke so eloquently here today and who lives on the Mesabi Range in Minnesota, indicated one of the many great reasons why we should join Canada to complete this work. The whole economy of the United States is based on the steel industry. If you had been a member of the Committee on Public Works like the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and myself, and listened to the testimony presented to us for 2½ months last year, you would have come to the same conclusion we did—that the iron-ore supply of this country is dwindling and vanishing at a rapid rate. The expanding steel industry demands more and more ore each succeeding year and only a few years of grace remain before it is all gone. Those who oppose this project may well ask themselves, "Where will the United States obtain its iron ore to provide the steel which is so essential and badly needed for national defense and for our own economy?"

The best information we obtained is that we have about a 10- or 15-year supply left. If anyone says to you, "We have sufficient ore supply in this country," just ask him the question: "Why is it that every great steel company in our Nation is searching the world today to find new deposits of iron ore?" That is it. God in His wisdom has placed on this continent, so we would not have to bring it across the ocean, a deposit of iron ore in Labrador and Quebec, which will replace the dwindling supply in our own land. Testimony presented to our committee was to the effect that development in the Labrador field has hardly scratched the surface, but the result thus far would yield somewhere between four and five billion tons of rich iron ore. How can that ore reach the steel mills of this country? Just as we brought it down from the Mesabi Range in Minnesota for 75 years—that is, by water transportation. It has been moving down the Great Lakes at the rate of about a hundred million tons a year, most of it from

the Mesabi Range in the State of my distinguished and able friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. The most feasible and the best way to bring Labrador ore to the steel industry of the United States where it is now located—that is, Ohio, western Pennsylvania, and around the Lakes—is for that ore to move up the St. Lawrence River just as ore is coming down the Great Lakes today, namely, in great ships that carry as much as 20,000 tons. The same ships can be used; the same docks can be used; the same equipment can be used. We do not have to change any part of it. Yet here we are, debating whether or not this country should go in with Canada to complete this seaway.

As far as I have been able to learn, never in the history of man where a great government has once obtained control or joint control of a great waterway did that government ever relinquish control to another. But that is precisely the situation in which we are today when we consider the St. Lawrence seaway, because Canada proposes to build it alone unless the United States is willing to go in as her partner. When we let Canada build it alone control will pass to her. Thank God, may I say, that we have Canada, a friendly nation, to the north of us. She can then stipulate the tolls and we will pay them and thereby pay the entire cost, or practically all of it, on iron ore alone. We still have one chance to go in 50-50 and each nation pay half.

I am amazed sometimes to hear the ridiculous figures as to what it will cost the United States. There is only one thing wrong with the St. Lawrence seaway. If it were located somewhere in the center of Europe it would have been built and completed long ago, because every time Congress votes for a foreign-aid bill of from eight to ten billion dollars we send a dozen or more St. Lawrence seaways to Europe to be built over there. Whenever we ask that something be done for our own country to preserve our national security, to preserve our great steel industry which we must do because, I repeat, the whole economy of this country is based upon the steel industry, then we back away from it and find every reason on the face of the earth why it ought to be defeated and never adopted.

Something was said here about its being frozen up 5 months of the year. We all know that navigation on the Great Lakes lasts about 8 months of the year; only 4 or 4½ months is it obstructed by ice; but for 75 years we have been able to bring down all the ore necessary to supply the demands of the steel industry. Why could it not be done the same way if we bring the ore up from Labrador by the same ships and over the same water?

Let me tell you something that happened at the beginning of the last war if we are to depend upon ore from abroad, from South America, or from Africa, or some other place across the water. It may not be generally known that out of a fleet of eight ships which were bringing ore to this country from

Chile, German submarines within weeks sank six in the Gulf of Mexico and nearby waters, and the Government withdrew the other two in order to keep them from being sunk. That is an indication of how vulnerable we would be in this country if we depend upon having ore shipped from abroad or across the sea should we get into war with a foreign foe. That is what did happen; it could happen again.

I read the President's message carefully; I reread it this morning. It sets forth the facts of just what the picture is in relation to the St. Lawrence seaway as it affects the United States. I hope our committee will report a bill this year and give this House a chance to express itself on what I think is the master project of the North American continent. It is vital to our national security and essential to our general welfare.

And now as to its cost: The figure that was presented to us by the Corps of Army Engineers as to the American share of the cost was \$564,000,000. We can immediately write off \$200,000,000 of that for the power that will be developed in the rapids of the river. The State of New York through its representatives informed our committee, that they stand ready to purchase the hydroelectric power for that amount of money and reduce the cost to the rest of the taxpayers of the Nation to about \$364,000,000. Spread that over 6 years which it will take to build the seaway and we find it will take but \$60,000,000 annually over that period to build the greatest project left unfinished on this continent. I believe through the payment of tolls the entire cost can be liquidated. Why should it not be done? We still have the opportunity. But, in my judgment, 6 months from now may be too late.

May I say, incidentally, that I do not often agree with the President of the United States; however, he said to me not long ago that if Canada builds this alone she will get the money from the United States of America. It will be American money that will build it. I have to agree with the President in that statement. I think he is correct. Why do we not join Canada in this undertaking, a friendly nation and a friendly neighbor which has cooperated with us and waited these many years for us to act?

It has been my privilege to meet with Canadian officials on three different occasions during the last 15 years and they have never deviated from the position they have taken. They are willing and ready to cooperate with their American friends, to build what appears to me to be one of the last great projects on this continent, one that will be of great benefit to our people.

I have said nothing about the economy or savings in commerce, the savings in transportation cost of agricultural products, of industrial products and raw materials that would certainly use the seaway. It will create an expanding commerce.

I fear that those groups in our land who oppose it, the three groups mentioned by the gentleman from Minnesota,

the coal industry, the Atlantic and Gulf ports and the railroads, are mistaken in their position that it will hurt their business. I do not think so. With the expansion of our economy everywhere in the land it will create more business and they will get more business. I think the same position was taken more than 50 years ago when the Panama Canal was built, yet the Panama Canal has proven to be of much benefit to the railroads. Again I say we stand at the crossroads today.

Ours is the decision to make and unless we make that decision soon in the right way the United States will lose one of the greatest opportunities it ever had to help industrial expansion and benefit the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

#### WASTE PAPER AND WASTE

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the quantity of Government literature, printed communications, and offers of more of the same which have reached the people of the district which I represent has finally reached such a volume that it has caused a spontaneous protest. I presume that the experience in one congressional district is typical of the experience in all others.

Congress has been conscious of the waste which occurs when the facilities of Government are used too freely for spreading information, propaganda or personal views, usually through the medium of material printed by the Government Printing Office and mailed postage free.

During the debates a few months ago on H. R. 3709, the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency, a typical amendment was adopted to prohibit the use of Government funds for unauthorized printing and propaganda. It was estimated by one speaker that the expenditures in the executive branch for publicity and propaganda amounted to something over \$100,000,000 per year. During fiscal 1951 it was estimated that the cost of postage for the mail of the executive branch would have been approximately \$81,000,000, had regular rates been paid. The cost of the time which many Government employees must have spent in preparing material for use in such literature must have involved additional millions.

A variety of agencies contribute to the great stream of printed material which leaves the Nation's capital. Possibly none of these agencies appreciates the volume of the total stream which reaches each congressional district and the effect that this appalling total has on the taxpayers of the Nation. The letter which I will include in these remarks

may give them some indication of the result of their total efforts.

The author of the letter, Kacy Ward, is the editor of the Berkeley Daily Gazette, a newspaper in Berkeley, Calif. Kacy is a good newspaperman of long experience, a trained observer, an accurate reporter, a thoughtful interpreter and a man not given to outbursts of hasty, ill-considered opinions. I recommend a consideration of his views to the men in Government who start the movement of printed material from Washington, D. C. The small deluge of correspondence which has reached me confirming Mr. Ward's opinion indicates that his views are shared by many thinking citizens. During a time in which the strictest economy in Government is so essential to the welfare of the Nation, it would be well if those views were shared by many more people in Government.

I commend for careful consideration the letter which Mr. Ward wrote in his column of the Berkeley Daily Gazette of January 10, 1952, which is as follows:

Congressman JOHN J. ALLEN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALLEN: I have received in the mail (postage free, of course) some literature from the United States Government Printing Office, Division of Public Documents, Washington 25, D. C. The material was addressed to me at my home and sent to me as an individual, not as a newspaper editor.

Inasmuch as I am, as an individual, paying income taxes, gasoline taxes, excise taxes, luxury taxes, and a number of other taxes, I feel that I have a right to object when I feel my money being thrown away. I don't mind paying my honest share for reasonable operations of the Government and for defense of this Nation. I do object to my tax money being used in fields in which I feel the Government—my Government—has no business.

As our Representative in Congress I feel it is your job to do your part to clean up the mess that surrounds you in Trumanville. If you can't do anything else, you can get up in the House and talk about it. If you do, I'm sure we'll hear about it.

When I had the pleasure of visiting you in Washington some time ago, I noticed the huge stacks of Government literature piled in the tunnels that connect the Congress Office Building with the Capitol. Keeping an eye on the Government mail that comes into the news office, I have come to the conclusion that nine-tenths of that portion that reaches me is utterly, completely a waste of our (taxpayers) money.

However, I can understand—to a certain extent—the interest of various tax-fed propaganda services in Trumanville in attempting to reach and impress the various news outlets of the country.

The literature I have received at home from our Government Printing Office does not fall in that category.

I have before me the envelope and contents. The envelope is marked "official business—penalty for private use to avoid payment of postage, \$300." Inside is a pamphlet offering me selected United States Government publications, with a notation that apparently the sheet is issued biweekly by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Attached is an order form, part of which is a return mail envelope slip, also from the Government Printing Office, that permits me to receive whatever publications I wish sent me postage-free from that office.

In addition there is a nice piece of advertising, a slip offering me a 66-page bulletin titled "Brief History of the American Labor Movement," prepared by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. It says the bulletin, among other things, will inform me of the development of the labor movement, present organization activities, and aims. It is offered at 25 cents a copy, with a 25-percent discount on orders of 100 or more.

Well, Congressman ALLEN, I don't want a bulletin by the Department of Labor on the history of the labor movement. There is plenty of free material available to keep me informed on the present aims of labor and its bearing on and in the next election. I don't understand why the Government has to pay for printing the booklet, taking the mailman's and my time and money to advertise it by free postage. And the same goes for the bulletins offered among the "selected publications" our Government is offering, printed, I presume, with our money. We don't see how the Government can afford to put out a leaflet on Apples in Appealing Ways to sell for 10 cents, or why it should. Isn't it up to the apple growers and packers to offer that sort of thing? Do we have to pay for it out of taxes? Or for a 23-page booklet on Work Injuries in the United States During 1949. Frankly, we doubt there is enough demand for that stuff to pay the time of the person stuffing the junk in the envelopes to mail it. Or a bulletin entitled "How Children Learn To Think." It says the "bulletin deals with how children learn to think. The examples given show how important it is to have a classroom environment in which good thinking is expected and encouraged."

Honestly, Congressman ALLEN, what in heck is the Government doing anyway, in publishing that sort of stuff? Is there no limit to what we poor taxpayers must work and slave to provide at a cut rate through the very channels of government that is supposed to be taking care of our interests? The list could go on and on. For example, the offering of a List of 1,000 Large Manufacturing Companies, Their Subsidiaries and Affiliates, 1948. How many want that sort of thing, especially for the long-past year of 1948? Must we pay for having it printed? Is it that we have a lot of tax-eating employees in Washington and the more stuff they can turn out the bigger the staff and the more secure their job?

There was a time when there was talk about "two chickens in every pot." I suggest we change that, as far as Washington is concerned, possibly to "two workers in every job."

Of course, I am only speaking for myself. I haven't any "in." No one has given me a deep freezer, ever. My wife hasn't a mink coat. I have never tried to get a loan from the RFC to open a gambling joint. I have never held a political appointment. I don't owe anything to any ward boss, any politician or Government official. But there has been a bit of revolt against taxation in the history of some good, solid American families, back at the time of the Boston Tea Party.

I'm running this letter in my column. I know I'm only one voice in thousands—thousands you represent in Congress, where the percentage is cut so that we all have a voice in the House, through you.

And I hope that at least one of my nine readers will clip and mail this to you to show I am not alone. And I don't think I am.

Sincerely,  
"KACY" WARD,  
Berkeley Daily Gazette, Berkeley, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ASSIST APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE IN FINDING WAYS TO PROMOTE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY IN DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Military Appropriations is now conducting hearings on the \$52,000,000,000 military budget submitted by the President to Congress on January 21. Hearings have been in progress since January 10.

On behalf of the subcommittee, I wish to invite all Members of the House who may have any suggestions as to how to achieve greater economy and efficiency in the operation of the Military Establishment—Army, Navy, and Air Force—to appear before the subcommittee and submit ideas and suggestions and suitable amendments to the bill.

This course of action will give the subcommittee an opportunity to weigh carefully all suggestions and amendments proposed and interrogate witnesses from the Department of Defense when they appear on the specific questions involved. If suggestions and amendments are not proposed until after the bill is presented to the floor for consideration and passage, there will not be ample opportunity for the committee to carefully study and investigate the pros and cons of the proposals made and hear the necessary witnesses on the points raised.

The invitation which I am making is extended to committees and subcommittees as well as to individual Members. Particularly is the invitation extended to committees and subcommittees that have investigated or which are investigating various aspects of the operations of the Department of Defense. It has been reported that about 30 committees, subcommittees, and task forces of one kind or another of the Congress have recently investigated or are in the process of investigating some aspect of the operations of the Department of Defense. These investigations will not be of maximum benefit to Congress unless the groups involved present specific recommendations and proposed amendments to the Appropriations Committee. Investigations are of little value unless the lessons learned are translated into legislative and administrative action.

The Government is confronted with a huge deficit. Taxes are high and a major effort to achieve economy and efficiency in the Department of Defense, the agency which spends the largest portion of the tax dollar, is mandatory. Greater economy and efficiency in the operations of the Department of Defense must be achieved and all Members are now urged to cooperate with the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations in this important undertaking.

Following the adjournment of Congress last October, I addressed to all Members of the House the following letter:

OCTOBER 25, 1951.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As you know, the biggest thing in Government today is national defense. Since the 1st of January we have

appropriated for the Army, Navy, and Air Force the total sum of \$83,995,718,422.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, I should like to call upon you to visit military installations which may be in your congressional district prior to the convening of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress. I don't want to be presumptuous in making this request and I realize that you may not have time to make a detailed study of the military programs and defense production in your district, but I believe you can in a brief period of time get some pretty good information as to whether or not the services are operating on a fairly common sense and economical basis in your area. I am hopeful that the military-construction program is moving along on a better basis than during World War II inasmuch as we have insisted that competitive bids be resorted to wherever possible. I am informed that about 95.6 percent of military construction in this country is being handled on the competitive-bid basis.

Members of the subcommittee and the committee staff will undertake to visit many installations in various areas of the country, but it is a physical impossibility for us to visit all military installations in the United States and abroad.

If you do find it possible to visit military installations in your district, I trust you will provide the committee with a memorandum in regard to significant findings and any suggestions which you think might prove helpful. I hope to see to it that all reports are thoroughly screened by members of the committee staff and presented to the subcommittee for consideration early next year.

All of us, as I see it, must bend every effort toward greater economy and more efficiency in the operation of our military program. Best personal regards.

Yours very cordially,

GEORGE MAHON, *Chairman,*  
*Military Appropriations Subcommittee.*

In paragraph one of the letter just quoted, I make reference to the appropriation of \$83,000,000,000 for the Department of Defense in 1951—calendar year 1951. The statement is a little misleading. The actual appropriations for the Department of Defense made by the Eighty-second Congress in 1951 totaled \$67,209,537,422.

The sum of \$16,795,181,000 was appropriated for the Department in December 1950, but the bill was not approved by the President and the funds did not become available to the Department until January 6, 1951, 3 days after the convening of the Eighty-second Congress. In other words, the \$83,000,000,000 is the correct sum that became available to the Department in 1951, but Congress took action on a portion of the amount in late December 1950. In further clarification, let me say that in calendar year 1951, Congress appropriated for the current fiscal year, the fiscal year 1952, the sum of \$60,829,864,422, and in supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, the sum of \$6,379,673,000.

Our appropriations for the current fiscal year, the year that ends June 30, 1952, for the Department of Defense total about \$60,000,000,000. According to present indications, one-half of this money will be spent for major procurement—such things as aircraft, ships, guided missiles, and other hard goods. One-half of the major procurement

money will be spent for aircraft. For military personnel costs, 17 percent of the funds will be expended, and for operation and maintenance, 20 percent of the funds will be expended. This picture is not greatly different from the appropriations picture for the previous fiscal year, the year ending June 30, 1951.

Indications are that if Congress appropriates approximately the sum requested by the President for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1953, the military personnel costs will rise to about 22 percent of the budget, the costs for operation and maintenance will rise to about 25 percent of the budget, and the major procurement costs will approximate 45 percent of the budget. Four percent of the currently proposed budget would be devoted to research and development.

There is inevitably a wide disparity between appropriations for the Department of Defense and expenditures of the Department of Defense. The expenditures during the past fiscal year by the Department were approximately \$20,000,000,000. The expenditures this year will approximate \$40,000,000,000 and the expenditures for next year, fiscal year 1953, will approximate \$52,000,000,000.

This disparity between appropriations for the Department of Defense and expenditures for the Department can be high-lighted in another way. On June 30, 1950, the end of the fiscal year, the Department had on hand about \$9,000,000,000 in unexpended funds. The corresponding figure for June 30, 1951, was \$38,000,000,000 and it is estimated that the corresponding figure for June 30, 1952, will be \$58,000,000,000. It is anticipated that the estimated figure for June 30, 1953, will be \$58,000,000,000. These carry-over funds are necessary in order to enable the Department of Defense to make firm contracts with industry for long lead-time items such as aircraft, ships, tanks, guided missiles, electronic items, and other hard goods of complex design and structure.

It is evident from what I have said that the fact that the military budget now before Congress is about \$11,000,000,000 below the military budget for the current fiscal year does not mean that we are slowing down the military program. On the contrary, the military program is expanding with every passing month and will continue to expand throughout the fiscal year 1953.

The military budget before Congress is in no sense of the word a full mobilization budget, but it does provide for a gradual build-up in our military strength. Department of Defense officials have recommended this more gradual approach to military strength in view of the fact that they do not know if world war III will come, and if it comes, just when the enemy will strike. If it were definitely known that within 1 year or 2 years we would be in the midst of a general war, no one would deny the necessity for providing funds for the Department of Defense far in excess of the amount requested in the

President's budget. In other words, the proposed military budget now before Congress is predicated on the assumption that we will not be in an all-out war within the next 2 years.

I sincerely hope that substantial reductions can be made in the present military budget without impairing the growth and development of our military might. If reductions are to be made, they must be made intelligently and the Committee on Appropriations needs all possible information tending to point out how specific savings can be made without impairing our military strength or retarding our military preparedness. It is almost valueless for Members of Congress to suggest that the Defense budget should be cut by some amount, such as so many billions of dollars, unless specific places where the reductions should be made are pointed out and unless it is demonstrated that such reductions can safely be effected and would not increase beyond the realm of prudence the calculated risks already taken. This admittedly is a difficult thing to do, but it is the only sound approach to a difficult problem.

This business of economy and efficiency and good government—this business of achieving the maximum in value for the military dollar is not solely the problem of the Appropriations Committee and the Department of Defense. Each Member of Congress should make whatever contribution he can to the solution of this highly complicated and difficult problem, particularly in view of the fact that the major portion of the tax dollar is expended for national defense.

#### APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM T. BYRNE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 506, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral of the late Honorable William T. Byrne: Mr. CELLER, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. REED of Illinois, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. O'TOOLE, Mr. BRYSON, Mr. LANE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MILLER of New York, Mr. OSTERTAG.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. BAKEWELL and to include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

Mr. POAGE.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous material.

Mr. WIER.

Mr. ASPINALL (at the request of Mr. WIER) and to include a quotation from one of his papers.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEMENTE and to include a speech by former Senator James M. Mead.

Mr. BARTLETT and to include an editorial.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include excerpts from an address by Philip Murray, and in another instance to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mr. PRICE and to include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post on the subject of mine safety legislation.

Mr. ROBINO and to include a resolution of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. LANE in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON and include a letter.

Mr. WITHROW and include a letter and a brief petition signed by 43 citizens of his district.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter from Hawaii and resolutions passed regarding replacement of white crosses in Punchbowl National Cemetery.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include an editorial on Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. GOODWIN) and include an editorial.

Mr. GOODWIN in three instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa and to include extraneous material.

Mr. McDONOUGH and include a speech made in Los Angeles recently by Federal Judge Pearson M. Hall.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two separate instances.

Mr. CANFIELD in two separate instances, in each to include editorials.

Mr. LANE and to include a speech delivered by Mr. Clifford Roberts, vice president of the United Shoe Machinery Corp. of Boston on the subject Research and Perspectives in the Tanning Industry, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$252.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances, in one to include copy of a letter sent by President Truman to Hon. James C. Quigley, and in the other an editorial.

Mr. SHEEHAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOW and to include an address by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts made at Niles, Ohio, on ex-President William McKinley.

Mr. DELANEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD in two instances in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. NORELAD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. BURNSIDE.

Mr. COLMER and to include a speech.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PROUTY (at the request of Mr. COTTON), on account of the serious illness of his father.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 870. An act for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad;

H. R. 961. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospera Dunikowski;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of Edward C. Brunett;

H. R. 1964. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Bernard R. Novak;

H. R. 2072. An act for the relief of Jeremiah Coleman;

H. R. 2505. An act for the relief of Carl Weitlanner;

H. R. 2589. An act for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez;

H. R. 2662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen;

H. R. 3006. An act for the relief of the Antonio Corrao Corp.;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of O. L. Osteen;

H. R. 3946. An act for the relief of Master Sgt. Orval Bennett;

H. R. 4228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorene M. Williams;

H. R. 4318. An act for the relief of Allen W. Spangler;

H. R. 4671. An act for the relief of Mark Paul Crowley; and

H. R. 4876. An act for the relief of Francesco Fratalla.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 30, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1099. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1100. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report of the District of Columbia Armory Board, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 605, an act of June 4, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1101. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1102. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain members of the naval service, with respect to shipments of household effects"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1103. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Angela Louisa Sebazco, file No. A-6986726 CR 31346, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3813. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Cecll; with amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4472. A bill for the relief of Henry T. Weber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5955. A bill for the relief of Delma L. Mauzey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6065. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. Logan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:  
H. R. 6283. A bill to provide a further extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:  
H. R. 6284. A bill to amend the Alaska Fisheries Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6285. A bill to amend the Alaska game law; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:  
H. R. 6286. A bill to provide for the acquisition, restoration, and maintenance of the burial ground of 256 Maryland heroes of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6287. A bill to amend the license law of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DURHAM:  
H. R. 6288. A bill to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOGARTY:  
H. R. 6289. A bill to prohibit Federal officers and agencies from entering into contracts which are to be performed by prison labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:  
H. R. 6290. A bill to prohibit the manufacture of combustible sweaters and other



inflammable clothing to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 6291. A bill to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6292. A bill to amend certain sections of chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 6293. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6294. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide increases in certain annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6295. A bill to provide that the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall have a permanent, rather than temporary, rank of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6296. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6297. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide that certain members of the National Guard and other Reserve components, who served during World War II, shall be released from active duty upon completing 17 months' active duty after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6298. A bill to provide, in certain cases, reduced postal rates on fourth-class mail sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 6299. A bill to amend the immigration laws so as to eliminate discrimination based on race and sex; to provide for the use of unused immigration quotas; to provide nonquota status for parents of citizens, orphans, and alien members and former members of the Armed Forces; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6300. A bill to amend the India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 6301. A bill to authorize the judicial review of arbitrary, capricious, or grossly erroneous decisions of Government contracting officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 6302. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 6303. A bill providing for a joint study and investigation of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project to be conducted by the Chief of Engineers and the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 509. Resolution to establish a new dining room or cafeteria in the House wing of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 510. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 33; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts condemning the awarding by the Federal Government of contracts for army blankets to prison industries in preference to New England textile mills; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6304. A bill for the relief of Edward F. Knasin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6305. A bill to effect entry of a minor child to be adopted by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 6306. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Belina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6307. A bill for the relief of Winifred Wendy Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6308. A bill for the relief of William F. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 6309. A bill for the relief of Antonio Scorza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6310. A bill for the relief of Michel Antoine Mamlouk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6311. A bill for the relief of Abdel-Jawad Mohamad Salameh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6312. A bill for the relief of W. A. Sampsel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6313. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Halasz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 6314. A bill for the relief of Kiko Oshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

521. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of Mrs. Nora B. Powell and 677 other citizens of New Castle County, Del., urging enactment of legislation prohibiting alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

522. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Elizabeth, N. J., relative to protesting the use of the Newark, N. J., Airport, because of the recent air accidents, and recommending that it be removed to another site; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

##### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 8, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph O. Parker.....	Counsel.....	\$903.83
John J. Heimburger.....	do.....	5,822.96
Altavene Clark.....	Executive officer.....	5,822.96
Mabel C. Downey.....	Clerk.....	5,822.96
Lydia Vaein.....	Staff assistant.....	3,169.13
Alice Baker.....	do.....	2,890.28
Lorraine Greenbaum.....	do.....	2,428.28
Betty Prezioso.....	do.....	2,217.15

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 5,635.03

Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 5,267.95

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1951..... 10,902.98

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1952..... 39,097.02

HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
Chairman.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey.....	The clerk.....	\$5,822.96
Kenneth Sprankle.....	The assistant clerk.....	5,822.96
William A. Duvall.....	Second assistant clerk.....	5,792.88
Corhal D. Orescan.....	Assistant clerk.....	5,792.88
Robert E. Lambert.....	do.....	5,792.88
Paul M. Wilson.....	do.....	5,584.88
Ross P. Pope.....	do.....	5,561.83
Jay B. Howe.....	do.....	5,527.27
Arthur Orr.....	do.....	5,286.88
Robert P. Williams.....	do.....	5,158.60
Adelbert W. Heinmiller.....	do.....	4,771.52
Frank Sanders.....	do.....	4,605.62
Carson W. Culp.....	do.....	4,605.62
Robert M. Moyer.....	do.....	4,398.04
Robert L. Michaels.....	do.....	3,052.52
Lawrence C. Miller.....	Junior assistant clerk.....	3,145.24
G. Homer Skarin.....	do.....	2,826.58

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Earl C. Silsby.....	Junior assistant clerk	\$2,826.58
Francis G. Merrill.....	Clerk-stenographer	2,189.30
Samuel E. Preston.....	do.	1,361.12
Melvin E. Lefever.....	do.	331.71
Robert M. Lewis.....	Messenger	1,854.74
Willie Tarrant.....	Janitor-messenger	1,451.66
John C. Pugh.....	Consultant	1,216.12
E. L. Eckloff.....	Clerk to the majority	4,893.62
Robert E. Lee.....	Clerk to the minority	5,822.96
Lawrence A. Dizenzo.....	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member	2,189.30
Julia M. Elliott.....	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	2,189.30
Helen G. Boyle.....	do.	1,860.00
Geneva Nichols.....	do.	2,189.30
William J. Neary.....	do.	2,189.30
Norjean Ray.....	do.	2,189.30
Michael J. McGrath.....	do.	2,189.30
Marie Silvers.....	do.	2,189.30
Joseph V. Gartlan, Jr.....	do.	1,294.27
Theodora M. Grant.....	do.	1,094.66
Lena W. Adams.....	do.	547.33
Vivian V. Martin.....	do.	331.71
Eula D. Rigsby.....	do.	1,641.96
Alice C. Keffe.....	do.	995.13

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$275,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported, Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	128,597.13
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	128,597.13
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	146,402.87

CLARENCE CANNON,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederic D. Vechery.....	Chief investigator	\$4,612.44
James E. Nugent.....	Investigator	4,712.70
Florence M. Leonard.....	Clerk-stenographer	2,071.39
Lois A. Eggers.....	do.	2,100.10

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Atomic Energy Commission:		
H. Monroe Radley.....	Investigator	\$4,615.38
DuVal Stooks.....	do.	2,400.00
Bonneville Power Administration: Milton S. Sachs.....	do.	304.62
Civil Service Commission:		
James S. Crawford.....	do.	1,440.00
Wilfred V. Gill.....	do.	1,286.16

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Department of Agriculture:		
John Cooper.....	Investigator	\$192.31
Melvin M. Culp.....	do.	1,836.33
Department of Commerce:		
George A. Ball.....	do.	73.92
Ellsworth J. Hand.....	do.	186.84
Rodney P. Lane.....	do.	752.16
Jefferson D. McPike.....	do.	1,157.06
Butcher E. Prescott.....	do.	1,373.73
George J. Roewe.....	do.	252.00
John Norman Sweeley.....	do.	936.72
Adrian E. Velthuis.....	do.	658.72
Perry Watzman.....	do.	2,263.83
Department of the Interior:		
Arnold O. Babb.....	do.	671.84
Don S. Campbell.....	do.	433.92
Wilbur A. Dexeheimer.....	do.	785.84
Harlowe M. Stafford.....	do.	649.78
Department of Justice:		
John J. Donnelly, Jr.....	Counsel	2,217.16
Herbert Peters.....	Assistant counsel	974.37
Department of Labor:		
David Schenker.....	Investigator	889.44
Department of the Air Force:		
Joe M. Hansman.....	do.	1,427.38
Harold K. Knoy.....	do.	1,515.32
Department of the Navy:		
Fred P. Bowser.....	do.	1,027.13
William F. E. Cabanis.....	do.	1,034.40
Martin P. Callan.....	do.	988.80
Louis R. LaPorte.....	do.	988.80
Lee J. Smith.....	do.	854.90
Howard H. Terhune.....	do.	1,372.00
Department of the Treasury:		
T. Jack Gary.....	do.	423.08
Wilbur H. Ziehl.....	do.	192.40
Economic Stabilization Agency:		
William J. Kilma.....	do.	1,093.26
Olin O. Taylor.....	do.	1,479.06
Export-Import Bank:		
John D. Fitch.....	do.	296.24
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Marshall J. Bell.....	do.	4,402.90
Charles G. Haynes.....	do.	3,235.79
Adrian L. Meyer.....	do.	692.17
Robert E. Rightmyer.....	do.	4,319.82
Paul G. Travers.....	do.	1,514.44
General Services Administration:		
Louis J. Graham.....	do.	2,911.51
Wesley C. Mohrkern.....	do.	2,538.48
Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Eli Abbott, Jr.....	do.	2,699.60
George C. Bell.....	do.	3,558.08
Perley W. Clogston.....	do.	4,165.25
Interstate Commerce Commission: Alexis P. Bukovsky.....	do.	3,507.39
National Labor Relations Board: Carroll K. Shaw.....	do.	2,950.02
Reconstruction Finance Agency: Ben B. Hood.....	do.	2,001.61
Securities and Exchange Commission: James A. Swink.....	do.	146.15
Tennessee Valley Authority: James E. Goddard.....	do.	1,000.54
The Panama Canal: Edwin M. McGinnis.....	do.	325.51
Veterans' Administration: Vern L. McMurrin.....	do.	1,842.72

TEMPORARY CLERICAL AND STENOGRAPHIC ASSISTANCE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Department of Agriculture:		
Beulah G. Cardran.....	do.	\$69.20
Catherine C. Gonzales.....	do.	50.34
Isabelle M. Grotzinger.....	do.	59.20
Department of Commerce: Ruth O. Gaines.....	do.	62.80
Department of Justice:		
Marie C. Hoepner.....	do.	11.88
Meriam M. Howell.....	do.	264.22
Mary E. McGovern.....	do.	435.99
Department of State: Mary E. Simon.....	do.	137.50
Department of Treasury: James C. Nealey.....	do.	224.43
Federal Security Agency:		
Jeanette Dickinson.....	do.	33.12
Elizabeth Moflatt.....	do.	93.10
Nancy M. Summers.....	do.	50.50
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Robert L. Michaels.....	do.	558.29
National Securities Resources Board:		
Thecla Bombard.....	do.	157.56
Joan LeFavre.....	do.	181.88
Mary F. Lawler.....	do.	227.37
Defense Production Administration: Carlene M. Klett.....	do.	39.84
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$225,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported, Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....		119,391.55
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....		119,391.55
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....		105,608.45
Payment of bills rendered for prior fiscal period.....		616.25

CLARENCE CANNON,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 3, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bryce N. Harlow.....	Chief clerk	\$5,822.96
James A. Deakins.....	Assistant clerk	2,810.64
John R. Blandford.....	Professional staff	5,822.96
Charles F. Ducander.....	do.	5,822.96
Robert W. Smart.....	do.	5,822.96
Janice Angell.....	Clerical staff	369.53
Rosemary Curry.....	do.	936.87
Gladys Flanagan.....	do.	2,810.64
Olga K. Greene.....	do.	2,810.64
Agnes H. Johnston.....	do.	3,065.57
Berniece Kalinowski.....	do.	2,810.64
John J. Courtney.....	Special counsel	5,822.96
Paul L. Monahan.....	Assistant to special counsel (Sept. 4 through Dec. 31)	3,074.97
Richard W. Webb.....	Assistant to special counsel	4,547.28
Mary E. Morrill.....	Secretary to special counsel (Office of Special Counsel pursuant to H. Res. 38 and H. Res. 114)	2,810.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000.00  
 Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 9,624.97  
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31..... 19,961.89  
 Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31..... 29,586.86  
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951..... 20,413.14  
**CARL VINSON,**  
*Chairman.*

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY**  
 JANUARY 11, 1952.

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**  
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink.....	Technical staff.....	\$5,158.60
John E. Barriere.....	do.....	4,774.94
William J. Hallahan.....	Clerk.....	5,822.96
Elsie L. Gould.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,093.91
Helen E. Long.....	do.....	2,858.46
Margaret P. Battle.....	do.....	433.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000.00  
 Amount of expenditures previously reported.....  
 Amount expended from Oct. 17 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 10,804.37  
 Total amount expended from Oct. 17 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 10,804.37  
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951..... 39,195.63  
**BRENT SPENCE,**  
*Chairman.*

**COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**  
 JANUARY 15, 1952.

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**  
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.....	Clerk.....	\$5,822.24
Wendell E. Cable.....	Minority clerk.....	4,605.62
Ruth Butterworth.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,463.89
George R. Stewart.....	Counsel.....	4,951.22
Marie E. Herda.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,667.27
Flora McLeod.....	Assistant clerk stenographer, appointed Aug. 6, 1951.....	1,847.01

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$2,000.00  
 Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 7.60  
 Amount expended from July 1 to December 31, 1951..... 894.87  
 Total amount expended from February 20 to December 31, 1951..... 902.47  
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951..... 1,097.53  
**JOHN L. McMILLAN,**  
*Chairman.*

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR**  
 JANUARY 15, 1952.

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**  
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 30, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession (Standing or select committee)	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hussey, Fred G.....	Chief clerk.....	\$5,823.00
Forsythe, John S.....	General counsel.....	5,823.00
Henderson, David N.....	Assistant general counsel.....	5,823.00
Derrickson, Russell C.....	Investigator.....	5,823.00
Graham, John O.....	Minority clerk.....	5,823.00
Smith, Mary Pauline.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,001.86
Stent, Barbara Ann.....	do.....	3,001.86
Kivett, Kathryn.....	do.....	3,001.86
Locher, Myrtle.....	do.....	3,001.86
Sanders, Mary E. Gilbert.....	Assistant clerk (July 1 to Oct. 31, 1951).....	2,001.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$30,000.00  
 Refund..... 687.89  
 Total..... 30,687.98

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 1,339.66  
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 30, 1951..... 4,210.26  
 Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 30, 1951..... 5,549.92  
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 30, 1951..... 25,128.97  
**GRAHAM A. BARDEN,**  
*Chairman.*

**COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS**  
 JANUARY 15, 1952.

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**  
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession (Standing or select committee)	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas A. Kennedy.....	General counsel.....	\$5,822.96
William A. Young.....	Staff director.....	5,822.96
Christine Ray Davis.....	Chief clerk.....	5,822.96
Martha C. Roland.....	Assistant chief clerk.....	5,296.88
J. Robert Brown.....	Research analyst.....	4,605.62
William F. McKenna.....	Minority counsel (Oct. 15 to Dec. 31, 1951).....	2,323.96
Carl E. Hoffman.....	Minority counsel (July 1 to Sept. 30, 1951).....	2,448.45
Annabell Zue.....	Minority clerk.....	4,605.62
Dolores Fel'Dotto.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,463.89
Olive M. Willeroy.....	Clerk-stenographer (July 1 to Aug. 31, 1951).....	1,154.62
Mabel C. Baker.....	Clerk-stenographer (Aug. 1 to Dec. 31, 1951).....	2,753.79

Unexpended balance of appropriation July 1, 1951..... \$159,637.17

Expenses from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951:  
 Full committee..... \$1,208.96  
 Subcommittee making inquiry into Federal Home Loan Bank Board and related agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman..... 1,365.70  
 Special Subcommittee on Veterans' Administration, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman..... 357.13  
 Federal Relations With International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman..... 4,118.27  
 Public Accounts Subcommittee, Congressman FRANK M. KARSTEN, chairman..... 2,402.46  
 Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman..... 11,615.85  
 Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman..... 44,076.19  
 Inter-Governmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman..... 14,286.79  
 Total spent from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 79,431.35  
 Total unexpended Jan. 1, 1952..... 80,205.82

Expenses of full committee:  
 Stationery supplies for full committee and subcommittees..... 990.06  
 Telephone..... 106.50  
 Plane transportation..... 80.50  
 Reimbursements for cab fares, postage—official business..... 31.90  
 Total..... 1,208.96

Subcommittee making inquiry into Federal Home Loan Bank Board and related agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman: Expenses in connection with investigation..... 1,365.70  
 Special Subcommittee on Veterans' Administration, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman: Expenses in connection with investigation..... 357.13

Federal Relations With International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman:  
 Franklin D. Rogers, Jr., clerk..... 4,115.64  
 Travel expense..... 72.63  
 Total..... 4,118.27

Public Accounts Subcommittee, Congressman FRANK M. KARSTEN, chairman:  
 General Accounting Office, reimbursement for salary of Harry E. Harper from July 1 to Oct. 31, 1951..... 2,288.55  
 Travel expense..... 113.91  
 Total..... 2,402.46

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:  
 Herbert Roback, staff director..... 5,822.96  
 Dorothy D. Morrison, clerk..... 3,463.89  
 Olive M. Willeroy, assistant clerk, Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 2,309.26  
 Reimbursements for cab fares, postage, official business..... 19.74  
 Total..... 11,615.85

Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman:  
 Charles A. Miller, administrative assistant..... 4,812.98  
 William A. Brewer, administrative assistant..... 3,325.74  
 Thomas G. Fleming, administrative assistant..... 4,812.98  
 Michael Balwan, administrative assistant, Aug. 16 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 3,127.47  
 Robert E. Shaw, administrative assistant, Oct. 8 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 1,633.96  
 Lewis J. Latham, administrative assistant, Oct. 13 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 1,535.53  
 Smith Blair, Jr., administrative assistant, Oct. 15 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 1,597.05  
 John C. Vick, administrative analyst..... 2,667.27  
 Eugene F. Sullivan, legal assistant..... 2,268.95  
 Frances G. Hardy, research clerk..... 2,977.47  
 Sylvia Swartzel, clerk-stenographer..... 2,244.81  
 Margaret P. Hogan, clerk-stenographer, Oct. 15 to Dec. 8, 1951..... 597.05  
 Garnette S. Benton, clerk-stenographer, Dec. 1 to 31, 1951..... 301.16  
 Alice Cravetts, stenographer, July 1 to Oct. 31, 1951..... 1,243.09  
 Mildred Deen, stenographer, Oct. 18 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 753.86  
 General Accounting Office, reimbursement for services of Ralph E. Casey, counsel from July 1 to Oct. 31, 1951..... 3,893.98  
 Gordon Pickett Peyton, legal services as special counsel..... 714.00

Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman—Continued

Plane travel.....	\$1,219.36
Railroad transportation.....	15.28
Reporting away from Washington, D. C.....	2,073.83
Expenses, conducting investigations away from Washington, D. C.....	2,260.37
Total.....	44,076.19

Inter-Governmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman:

John H. W. Small, clerk.....	3,304.55
Cora Louise Harris, clerk-stenographer.....	2,507.93
Eugene J. Pajakowski, serving subpoenas re Bunker Hill, Ind., hearing.....	28.34
Reporting away from Washington, D. C.....	326.00
Plane travel.....	602.04
Expenses, investigation in Texas.....	99.30
Expense incurred on behalf of 9 members, 4 staff members, 4 liaison representatives making study of military supplies, disposal of surplus property and ECA aid to foreign countries in the Far East and Europe from Oct. 20-Dec. 1, 1951.....	7,418.63
Total.....	14,286.79

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 8, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford.....	Staff administrator and committee clerk.....	\$5,823.00
Sheldon Z. Kaplan.....	Staff consultant.....	5,823.00
George Lee Millikan.....	Staff consultant (resigned Nov. 30, 1951).....	4,852.50
Roy J. Bullock.....	Staff consultant.....	5,823.00
Albert C. F. Westphal.....	do.....	5,823.00
June Nigh.....	Staff assistant.....	3,145.25
Winifred G. Osborne.....	do.....	3,384.23
Mabel Wofford.....	do.....	3,145.25
Helen C. Mattas.....	do.....	3,145.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	2,629.93
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	1,101.76
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	3,731.69
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	71,268.31

JAMES P. RICHARDS,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 8, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lea Booth.....	Clerk, Committee on House Administration.....	\$4,951.22
Marjorie Savage.....	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.....	4,812.98
Jack Watson.....	do.....	4,674.74
Lura Cannon.....	do.....	3,304.55
Ruth Bradley.....	do.....	2,348.62
Frances Morrison.....	do.....	1,383.06

THOMAS B. STANLEY,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<b>PROFESSIONAL STAFF</b>		
Preston E. Peden.....	Committee counsel.....	\$5,822.96
James K. Carr.....	Technical consultant (irrigation and reclamation).....	5,822.96
James R. Queen.....	Consultant (mines and mining).....	5,573.36
William H. Hackett.....	Consultant (territories and insular affairs).....	5,573.36
<b>CLERICAL STAFF</b>		
Claude E. Ragan.....	Clerk.....	5,822.96
Virginia McMichael.....	Assistant to the chairman.....	5,822.96
Nancy J. Arnold.....	Minority clerk.....	4,093.91
Geraldine Eaker.....	Clerk.....	3,145.24
Ruth I. Timmony.....	do.....	2,999.18
Elizabeth L. Angus.....	do.....	2,567.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	8,563.28
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	26,924.26
Total amount expended from Feb. 2 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	35,487.54
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	14,512.46

JOHN R. MURDOCK,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, pro-

fession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<b>CLERICAL STAFF</b>		
Elton J. Layton.....	Clerk.....	\$5,556.32
Royce Reno.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,954.62
Harold W. Lincoln.....	do.....	2,879.78
Georgia G. Glassman.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.....	2,655.28
Helen A. Grickis.....	do.....	2,565.50
Elizabeth J. Gergely.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer (authorized by H. Res. 123).....	2,428.28
Melba J. Coutsonikas (from Nov. 5, 1951).....	do.....	842.20
Roy P. Wilkinson.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,056.62
<b>PROFESSIONAL STAFF</b>		
Arlin E. Stockburger.....	Aviation and engineering consultant.....	5,556.32
Andrew Stevenson.....	Expert.....	5,556.32
Kurt Borchardt.....	Professional assistant.....	5,556.32
Sam G. Spal.....	Research specialist.....	5,182.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (funds authorized under H. Res. 123).....	\$40,000.00
---	-------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	1,305.36
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	4,392.76

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	5,698.12
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	34,301.88

ROBERT CROSSER,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Dick, Bess Effrat.....	Chief clerk.....	\$5,822.96
Bernhardt, C. Murray <sup>1</sup> .....	Committee counsel.....	4,334.72
Besterman, Walter M.....	Legislative assistant.....	5,822.96
Brickfield, Cyril F. <sup>2</sup> .....	Committee counsel.....	1,488.08
Foley, William R.....	do.....	5,822.96
Lee, Walter R.....	Legislative assistant.....	5,822.96
Smedley, Velma.....	Assistant chief clerk.....	5,822.96
Benn, Violet T.....	Clerical assistant.....	3,563.40
Goldsmith, Helen.....	do.....	3,862.19
Berger, Anne J.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,211.59
Christy, Frances.....	do.....	2,979.25
Coble, Jeannine S. <sup>3</sup> .....	do.....	1,977.29
Hahn, Jane.....	do.....	2,979.25
Kaslow, Berta.....	do.....	4,245.99
Singman, Julian H. <sup>4</sup> .....	do.....	615.14

<sup>1</sup> July 1, 1951 to Nov. 14, 1951.  
<sup>2</sup> Appointed Nov. 15, 1951.  
<sup>3</sup> Appointed Sept. 1, 1951.  
<sup>4</sup> July 1, 1951 to Aug. 31, 1951.

**1. Funds for preparation of United States Code and revision of the laws:**

**A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year):**

Unexpended balance June 30, 1951 (including \$13,036.89 not previously brought forward).....	\$99,805.01
Expended.....	28,765.87
Balance Dec. 31, 1951.....	71,039.14

**B. Revision of the laws, 1951:**

Unexpended balance June 30, 1952, appropriation available July 1, 1952.....	12,600.00
Expended.....	5,846.96
Balance Dec. 31, 1951.....	6,753.04

**C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):**

Unexpended balance June 30, 1951.....	29,436.94
Expended.....	2,064.76
Balance Dec. 31, 1951.....	27,372.18

**D. Revision of the laws 1951: Unexpended balance June 30, 1951 (to be returned to Treasury).....**

	254.04
--	--------

**2. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by H. Res. 470 (pursuant to H. Res. 469).....**

Amount expended.....	18,000.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	9,102.98
	8,897.02

**3. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by H. Res. 54 (pursuant to H. Res. 95).....**

Amount expended.....	75,000.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	69,217.95
	5,782.05

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF MONOPOLY POWER**

Pursuant to H. Res. 95 (H. Res. 54) employees of the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, House Committee on the Judiciary, were paid as follows during the period July 1 through December 31, 1951:

Eileen R. Browne, subcommittee clerk.....	\$3,180.27
Peter S. Craig, special assistant.....	2,086.67
E. Ernest Goldstein, general counsel.....	5,769.64
J. Bruce Hannaford, clerk-typist.....	1,092.90
Virginia H. North, clerk-stenographer.....	2,005.36
John Paul Stevens, associate counsel.....	5,769.64
Veronica Strozak, clerk-stenographer.....	2,194.03
Jerrold Walden, assistant counsel.....	4,006.75
John F. Woog, assistant counsel.....	3,146.45
Total.....	29,251.71

**EMANUEL CELLER,**  
*Chairman.*

**COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES**

JANUARY 14, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry.....	General counsel.....	\$5,822.96
Thomas F. Flynn, Jr.....	Assistant counsel.....	4,951.26
Reginald S. Losee.....	Chief investigator.....	4,882.10
Gus S. Caras.....	Investigator to the minority.....	4,882.10
Frances Still.....	Chief clerk.....	5,124.00
Madonna Haworth.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,304.55
Leonard P. Pliska.....	Clerk to the minority.....	3,304.55
Lucile P. Lamon.....	Secretary.....	2,667.27
Total.....		34,938.79

**EDWARD J. HART,**  
*Chairman.*

**COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE**  
JANUARY 11, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore.....	Chief counsel.....	\$5,822.96
Frederick C. Belen.....	Counsel.....	5,882.98
John B. Price.....	Staff assistant.....	3,463.89
Lucy K. Daley.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,224.90
Elayne M. Hoffman.....	Secretary.....	2,826.58
Lillian Hopkins.....	do.....	2,826.58
Ann Hayden.....	Stenographer.....	2,667.27

**TOM MURRAY,**  
*Chairman.*

**COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS**

JANUARY 7, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles G. Tierney.....	Counsel professional staff.....	\$5,823.00
Robert F. McConnell.....	Professional staff assistant.....	5,823.00
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.....	Chief clerk.....	5,823.00
Mrs. Alice B. Norton.....	Assistant.....	4,640.22
Mrs. Florence Palmer.....	Chief clerk.....	3,862.20
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.....	do.....	3,862.20
Mrs. Margaret R. Beiter.....	do.....	3,862.20
Mrs. Helen Dooley.....	do.....	3,862.20
UNDER H. RES. 415		
Miss Ferol F. Davis.....	Stenographer.....	353.81
Miss Martha A. Webster.....	Secretary.....	591.23
Edward J. Michelson.....	Research specialist.....	1,679.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$20,000.00	\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	2,048.94	
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	10,085.87	5,880.15
Total amount expended from May 31 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	12,134.81	
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	7,865.19	19,119.85

**CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,**  
*Chairman.*

**COMMITTEE ON RULES**

JANUARY 14, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Humphrey Scott Shaw.....	Clerk.....	\$5,822.24
T. Howard Dolan.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,398.04
Richard R. Haas.....	Assistant to the clerk.....	4,398.04
E. M. Libonati.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,463.89
Mrs. Lyle O. Snader.....	Minority clerk.....	3,463.89

**A. J. SABATH,**  
*Chairman.*

**COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES**

JANUARY 8, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
EMPLOYEES PAID BY VOUCHER		
William A. Wheeler.....	Investigator.....	\$5,366.04
C. E. Owens.....	do.....	4,951.26
C. E. McKillips.....	do.....	4,674.78
James A. Andrews.....	do.....	4,536.54
Wm. Jackson Jones.....	do.....	4,536.54
Alvin W. Stokes.....	do.....	4,467.42
Robert B. Barker.....	do.....	4,605.64
Raphael I. Nixon.....	Director of research.....	3,792.70
Lillian E. Howard.....	Research clerk.....	3,065.58
Helen I. Mattson.....	do.....	3,224.94
Mary Ann Mericle.....	do.....	2,667.30
Asselia Poore.....	do.....	3,304.56
Blanche McCall.....	Liaison director.....	2,985.96
Pearle Gay.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,667.30
Sidney Phillips.....	do.....	2,507.94
Jane Collins.....	do.....	2,667.30
Lorraine Nichols.....	do.....	2,667.30
Rose Sanko.....	do.....	2,667.30
Ruth Tansill.....	do.....	2,667.30
Kathryn Zimmerman.....	do.....	2,746.98
E. Kathryn Smith.....	Research clerk.....	1,489.80
Virginia Truax.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,348.64
Alyce Gartrell.....	do.....	2,667.30
Lucille Fitzgerald.....	do.....	2,667.30
Eileen Sonnett.....	do.....	2,507.94
Alice Walker.....	do.....	2,667.30
Gladys Slack.....	do.....	2,507.94
Annie Merle Holton.....	do.....	2,348.64
Marian Edmonds.....	do.....	845.82
Josephine Sheetz.....	Switchboard operator.....	1,604.40
EMPLOYEES CARRIED ON PERMANENT PAY-ROLL		
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.....	Committee counsel.....	5,823.00
Thomas Beale.....	Assistant counsel.....	4,951.26
Louis J. Russell.....	Senior investigator.....	5,823.00
John W. Carrington.....	Clerk of committee.....	5,642.52
Donald T. Appell.....	Investigator.....	5,573.40
Ann Turner.....	File chief.....	4,467.42
Rosella A. Purdy.....	Secretary to counsel.....	4,093.92
Juliette Joray.....	Secretary to clerk.....	2,985.96
Carolyn Roberts.....	Assistant file chief.....	3,304.56
Thelma Seacree.....	Secretary to senior investigator.....	3,782.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
Feb. 9, 1951.....	\$200,000.00
Sept. 27, 1951.....	100,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>300,000.00</b>

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	101,592.16
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	122,913.55
<b>Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....</b>	<b>224,505.71</b>
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1952.....	75,494.29

JOHN S. WOOD,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 10, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ida Rowan.....	Chief clerk.....	\$5,823.00
Edwin B. Patterson.....	Professional aide.....	5,823.00
Casey M. Jones.....	do.....	5,823.00
Karl Standish.....	do.....	5,823.00
Paul K. Jones.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,951.25
Frances Montanye.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,826.60
Alice V. Matthews.....	do.....	2,826.60
Noah S. Sweat, Jr.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,463.92
George J. Turner.....	do.....	2,746.98

J. E. RANKIN,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JANUARY 9, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles W. Davis.....	Clerk (C).....	\$5,822.96
Leo H. Irwin.....	Professional assistant (P).....	4,936.81
Doris C. Mickelson.....	Staff assistant (C) (July 1 to Oct. 31, 1951).....	1,786.12
Betty R. Hill.....	Staff assistant (C).....	2,109.63
Anne Gordon.....	do.....	2,189.30
Jane E. Gardner.....	Staff assistant (C) (July 1 to Oct. 31, 1951).....	1,406.41
Jane E. Burkett.....	Staff assistant (C) (Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1951).....	703.22
Gordon Grand, Jr.....	Minority adviser (P).....	5,642.48
Susan Alice Taylor.....	Minority stenographer (C).....	2,615.47
Hughlon Greene.....	Messenger.....	1,575.42
Harry Parker.....	Messenger (July 1 to Aug. 18, 1951).....	230.32
Walter B. Little.....	Messenger.....	1,489.80

R. L. DOUGHTON,  
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS

JANUARY 28, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Adrian W. DeWind.....	Counsel (per retainer contract).....	\$11,250.00
Stanley S. Surrey.....	Special counsel (July 2 to Sept. 30).....	2,681.34
Bruno Schachner.....	Special counsel (Aug. 20 to Dec. 31).....	3,989.68
Joseph H. Flom.....	Special counsel (1 month per contract).....	525.00
Charles S. Lyon.....	Assistant counsel.....	4,882.10
Donald Schapiro.....	do.....	4,615.46
Thomas L. Howe.....	Attorney (Dec. 17 to 31).....	374.34
Walter C. Taylor.....	Attorney (Dec. 10 to 31).....	525.23
John E. Tobin.....	Attorney (July 9 to Dec. 31).....	2,884.33
William H. Berman.....	Attorney (Nov. 7 to Dec. 31).....	812.12
James Q. Riordan.....	Attorney (Nov. 1 to Dec. 31).....	902.19
Walter F. Hoffmann.....	Attorney (Oct. 26 to Dec. 31).....	920.02
James W. Dowling.....	Investigator.....	4,615.46
James P. Donovan.....	Investigator (Nov. 5 to Dec. 31).....	1,518.75
William A. Silk.....	Investigator (Nov. 19 to Dec. 31).....	520.12
Howard D. Levine.....	Investigator (Nov. 12 to Dec. 31).....	552.59
Beatrice B. Daly.....	Staff assistant.....	2,320.94
Norma M. Ervin.....	Staff assistant (Oct. to Dec. 31).....	1,177.36
Grace Good.....	Staff assistant.....	2,123.74
Bertha A. Brito.....	Stenographer (Sept. 5 to Dec. 31).....	1,324.41
Bertha Z. Heslowitz.....	Stenographer (Sept. 6 to Dec. 31).....	1,313.58
Mary Ryan.....	Stenographer (Nov. 19 to Dec. 31).....	473.65
Barbara A. Davis.....	Receptionist-typist (Oct. 24 to Dec. 31).....	540.35
Gertrude A. Powers.....	Stenographer (Aug. 20 to Oct. 31).....	770.77
Leonard Lehman.....	Staff assistant (June 25 to Aug. 31).....	382.01
James E. Riley.....	Staff assistant (June 18 to Sept. 14).....	503.51
Alan S. Rosenberg.....	Staff assistant (June 19 to Aug. 31).....	416.71
Daniel L. Skoler.....	Staff assistant (June 21 to Aug. 31).....	405.13
Henry C. Shayewitz.....	Staff assistant (June 18 to Aug. 31).....	422.49
Howard Solomon.....	do.....	422.49
Philip Hull.....	Staff assistant (July 9 to Aug. 31).....	300.96

<sup>1</sup> Law students employed during summer months only.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$200,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	5,837.65
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31.....	58,037.23
<b>Total amount expended from April 1 to Dec. 31.....</b>	<b>63,874.88</b>
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	136,125.88

Cecil R. King,  
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION OF THE FACTS, EVIDENCE, AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

JANUARY 14, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from September 27, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Mitchell.....	Chief counsel (Katyn Massacre Committee, Select).....	\$2,005.69
Barbara R. Boone.....	Secretary (Katyn Massacre Committee, Select).....	444.55

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$20,000.00
--	-------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	
Amount expended from Sept. 27 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	12,742.98

Total amount expended from Sept. 27 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	2,742.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	17,257.02

<sup>1</sup> Does not include trips made by Chief Counsel of Dec. 13 and Dec. 26, 1951.

RAY J. MADDEN,  
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM UNDER GI BILL

JANUARY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Oliver E. Meadows.....	Chief clerk.....	\$4,131.94
James E. Flannery.....	Investigator.....	1,532.78
Harry Hagency.....	do.....	1,911.78
George M. Rose.....	do.....	2,574.79
Bill J. Williams.....	do.....	1,182.42
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.....	General counsel.....	602.33
Irene Wade.....	Stenographer.....	2,295.75
Helen A. Wright.....	do.....	2,631.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....	\$60,000.00
--	-------------

Amount of expenditures previously reported.....	35,732.86
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	24,257.58

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.....	59,990.44
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951.....	9.56

OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOODS AND COSMETICS

JANUARY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Vincent A. Kleinfeld	Chief counsel	\$4,588.65
Alvin L. Gottlieb	Associate counsel	3,372.29
Camille O'Reilly Agnew	Clerk	2,507.93
Esther N. Schweigert	Stenographer	1,990.17
Total		12,459.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$75,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 7,234.37

Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 17,157.53

Total amount expended from Jan. 3. to Dec. 31, 1951..... 24,391.90

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951..... 50,608.10

JAMES J. DELANEY,  
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS  
JANUARY 15, 1952.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Duncan Clark	Research analyst	\$4,485.78
Jean C. Curtis	Clerk	3,025.74
Victor P. Dalmas	Executive director	5,823.00
Jane M. Deem	Secretary	2,946.09
Charles R. Delphenis	Research assistant	1,904.65
Clarence D. Everett	Investigator	3,218.50
Louise Kauffman	Stenographer	2,177.37
Arthur F. Lucas	Economist	5,573.41
Edith Marsh	Secretary	2,087.61
Laverne Maynard	Stenographer	2,561.78
Jeremiah T. Riley	Investigator	3,304.20
Mary Shaw	Stenographer	2,177.37
Elizabeth Soper	do	1,276.46
Ernest L. Stockton	Consultant	4,951.26
Mary D. Ward	Stenographer	1,779.09
Harriett B. Whitney	do	2,177.37
Wanita Wilson	do	689.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$135,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 50,368.15

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 56,038.74

Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1951..... 106,406.19

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1951..... 28,593.18

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 10, 1952)

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

Dr. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast declared through Holy Writ that the steps of a good man

are ordered of the Lord, help us Thy servants here assembled so to choose our steps that the people may not hesitate to follow in our tread. So we pray for ourselves and for the people whom we serve. Give us all a fresh baptism of common honesty in these days when the integrity of some of our fellow citizens is being questioned and their loyalty challenged. Incline each of us to turn searching eyes unto our own hearts to see whether there be anything in our personal lives that might prove hindering to better government or expose our loyalty and integrity to suspicion. Make us sensitive to all the little notes in our own eyes that may interfere with the clarity of our vision so that we may move consistently and conscientiously deal with the beams in the eyes of others.

And now if any amongst us are overwrought with care, cast down with discouragement, or burdened with some personal sorrow, especially those who mourn the passing of one who was near to this body, help us to obey the counsel of the Psalmist and the deep instincts of the heart and cast all our cares upon Him who is the great burden bearer. In His blessed name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 29, 1952, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without the time being charged to either side, Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

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

### REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh semiannual report of the Commission, dated January 1952, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

### EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY MEMBERS OF JAPANESE CONGRESSIONAL MISSION ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Aisuke Okamoto, Suejiro Yoshikawa, Sueji Hori, Sueji Kawamoto, Ryo Moji, Kiichiro Ryuno, Yoshio Yanagisawa, and Noboru Arimatsu, members of the Japanese Congressional Mission on Local Government, expressing their appreciation for the welcome extended them on their recent visit to the United States.

### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 2552. A bill to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2553. A bill to authorize the retirement of Capt. Joy Bright Hancock, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2554. A bill for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko; and

S. 2555. A bill for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 2556. A bill for the relief of Lem Kung Yim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2557. A bill to provide for the establishment of certain priorities in the awarding of military procurement contracts within regions suffering economic distress through unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

### PRIORITIES IN AWARDING CERTAIN MILITARY PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the establishment of certain priorities in the awarding of military procurement contracts within regions suffering economic distress through unemployment. I may say that that situation has particular application to the textile industry and the leather industry in Massachusetts, in the cities of Lawrence, Lowell, Fall River, New Bedford, Worcester, and North Adams, where the condition is particularly and acutely effective.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2557) to provide for the establishment of certain priorities in the awarding of military procurement contracts within regions suffering economic distress through unemployment, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE is as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE PRIORITIES FOR DISTRESSED AREAS—DEFENSE ORDERS

This bill is designed to bring a measure of relief to areas of this country where, in a period of high production, unemployment has reached abnormal proportions.

In Massachusetts there are two industries which have been particularly hard hit: The textile industry and the leather industry. Over 90,000 persons are now drawing unemployment compensation in Massachusetts. Expert statisticians advise me that this means that the number of unemployed is considerably in excess of 100,000. There are no