that has grown between our two peoples, and it is the only kind of friendship worth having.

The next decade will test that friendship. Because it is a strong friendship, the test will make it all the stronger. That is what I believe. I hope you believe it, too.

For I say to you that what is at stake is something even more precious than the land I love, the Philippines—and more precious than your own beloved country, the United States. What is at stake is the very future of the human race. Only if the East and the West can truly meet on an equal footing, only if you can show your respect for the national sovereignty, the aspirations, the needs, and the problems of the nations that have just been reborn, only if you can adjust to the revolution of the 20th century, can the human race hope to achieve the liberty, the prosperity, the happiness that is the dream of civilized man.

The men who died on Bataan and Corregidor offered that which was most precious to them—their own lives—on the altar of human freedom and human friendship. We who survive have an obligation to them that cries out to be repaid. We owe them the continuation of the battle. We owe them the never-ending pledge to carry on until all the peoples of the earth see the birth of a new freedom, a new brotherhood, and a new and lasting peace.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1957

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

Our Father, God, in whose merciful yet just hands are the souls of men, and whose final appraisals we who see through a glass darkly cannot discern. Help us to live and act as if each new day were the last with which we were to be entrusted, knowing that—

The busy tribes of flesh and blood
With all their cares and fears
Are carried downward by the flood
And lost in following years.

While life on this earth's stage is granted us, save us from living on a small scale in a great day, and from toying with the tiny when we ought to be lured by the titanic.

Until there comes for each of us the one clear call, above all other loyalties and fealties may the ruling passion of our hearts be to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 6, 1957, was approved, and its reading 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.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 1957.*

(A similar message was sent to the House of Representatives.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, late a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 120. An act for the relief of James F. Walsh;

S. 394. An act to waive the limitation on the time within which a Medal of Honor may be awarded to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy; and

S. 998. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 358. An act to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 1264. An act to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized;

H. R. 1520. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Takai and Thomas Takai;

H. R. 1591. An act for the relief of the Pacific Customs Brokerage Company of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1612. An act for the relief of Frances Pompa;

H. R. 1648. An act for the relief of Rachel Nethery;

H. R. 1700. An act for the relief of Western Instruments Associates;

H. R. 1758. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth;

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program;

H. R. 2493. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the construction of a bridge and road across Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3077. An act that the lake created by the Jim Woodruff Dam on the Apalachicola River located at the confluence of the Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers be known as Lake Seminole;

H. R. 3366. An act to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3588. An act for the relief of John R. Hill;

H. R. 4193. An act to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, so as to conform to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 538–540);

H. R. 4240. An act for the relief of Cornelia S. Roberts;

H. R. 5062. An act for the relief of Albert H. Ruppar;

H. R. 5220. An act for the relief of the estate of Higa Kensai;

H. R. 5807. An act to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended;

H. R. 7221. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution relating to the stockpile of extra long staple cotton under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act;

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Heart Mountain division, Shoshone Federal reclamation project, Wyoming;

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4803. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicagoland Commerce and Industry Exposition, to be held at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6304. An act to extend for a period of 2 years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 358. An act to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; and

H. R. 1264. An act to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1520. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Takai and Thomas Takai;

H. R. 1591. An act for the relief of the Pacific Customs Brokerage Co., of Detroit, Mich.;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 1612. An act for the relief of Frances Pompa;

H. R. 1648. An act for the relief of Rachel Nethery;

H. R. 1700. An act for the relief of Western Instruments Associates;

H. R. 1758. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth;

H. R. 3366. An act to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3588. An act for the relief of John R. Hill;

H. R. 4193. An act to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, so as to conform to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 538-540);

H. R. 4240. An act for the relief of Cornelia S. Roberts;

H. R. 5062. An act for the relief of Albert H. Ruppar;

H. R. 5220. An act for the relief of the estate of Higa Kensai;

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to grant relief with respect to claims arising out of deliveries of eligible surplus feed grains on ineligible dates in connection with purchase orders under its emergency feed program; and

H. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution relating to the stockpile of extra long staple cotton under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2493. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the construction of a bridge and road across Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3077. An act that the lake created by the Jim Woodruff Dam on the Apalachicola River located at the confluence of the Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers be known as Lake Seminole; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5807. An act to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7221. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Heart Mountain division, Shoshone Federal reclamation project, Wyoming; placed on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement for the information of the Senate; and then I shall propound a unanimous-consent request pertaining to the morning hour.

First of all, following the morning hour, the calendar will be called. When the call of the calendar is completed, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the nominations on the executive calendar, in the order in which they appear.

From time to time I have received requests that the transaction of certain public business be postponed because of the engagements of individual Senators. I wish to accommodate every Senator whom it is possible to accommodate; but, Mr. President, we cannot have the entire Senate wait on the return of some Senator. I am trying to arrange the business of the Senate in such a manner as to accommodate the maximum number of Senators.

Our friends on the minority side are to have a conference during the luncheon hour. Senators who need to be in the Senate Chamber for the call of the calendar will be here.

At the conclusion of the call of the calendar, there will be a quorum call; and then a motion will be made that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

This afternoon, the Appropriation Committee's hearings on the State-Justice-Judiciary and related agencies appropriation bill will continue, and there will be a markup of the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. I am informed that the committee will hear again from Postmaster General Summerfield.

Mr. President, this will be an extremely busy month for the Senate. I had hoped it would not be necessary for the Senate to be in session except on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays, so the remaining days could be devoted to committee business. However, in view of the fact that there are so many appropriation bills to be considered, and in view of the further fact that there is a difference of opinion regarding what action the Senate should take on those bills, they will require much more time than usual.

I am hopeful that the Senate will be able to proceed to the consideration of the Hells Canyon bill, perhaps the housing bill, and perhaps an immigration bill, during this month. We shall attempt to sandwich the handling of those bills between the consideration of appropriation bills.

I expect that some half a dozen or more appropriation bills will be reported during the month of May, perhaps bringing to the calendar half of the appropriation bills on which the Senate will act this year.

Mr. President, I wish now to make a unanimous consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business; and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoint the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) to fill the vacancy on the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, caused by the death of the late Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. MCCARTHY).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET (S. DOC. NO. 35)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1958, involving a net increase in the amount of $812,400 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE, ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, together with reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1956 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, confidential reports submitted by the Department of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency, listing individual procurement actions, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1956 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

A letter from Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., reporting, pursuant to law, on certain property acquisitions by that Administration, for the quarter ended March 31, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PERSONAL PROPERTY MADE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION TO CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law a report covering personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, for the calendar quarter, January 1 through March 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2680 (j) of title 28 of the United States Code so as to permanently exclude claims arising out of combatant activities or war-like operations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspensions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien,

and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO THE NAMING OF CERTAIN PUBLIC BUILDINGS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to name, rename, or otherwise designate any building under the custody and control of the General Services Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 29

"Joint resolution relative to the air raid warning system

"Whereas on May 1, 1957, the Federal Civil Defense Administration will make effective the national warning system (NAWAS); and

"Whereas under this system the Continental Air Defense Command makes known to FCDA warning centers military conditions of 'air defense emergency' and 'air defense warning;' and

"Whereas FCDA Advisory Bulletin No. 211 indicates that FCDA does not intend to assume responsibility of deciding whether an air attack is 'probable' or 'imminent' and of directing the sounding of the appropriate 'alert' or 'take cover' signal ('yellow' or 'red'), but intends to disseminate descriptive messages and impose the responsibility of determining the appropriate signal upon local authorities; and

"Whereas such determination can be made better and more promptly at the Federal level, and the proposed procedure will result in delay, lack of uniformity and confusion, and could mean that thousands of lives might be lost that would otherwise be saved; and

"Whereas a warning signal of 'yellow' or 'red,' signifying 'alert' or 'take cover' can be disseminated more rapidly throughout the country than any descriptive message with its opportunity for being garbled every time it is repeated: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States and the Federal Civil Defense Administration are respectfully urged to withold this proposed action until the problem can be further studied and given more consideration; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Governor of each State in the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Resolution 31—Relative to Residence Housing at State Colleges

"Whereas bills now pending before Congress, and particularly H. R. 6659, would provide for an increase in the interest rate on Federal loans for college residence housing from 2⅞ percent to 3½ percent, and would make such increase apply retroactively to applications filed after March 15, 1957; and

"Whereas State colleges in this State were not eligible to apply for such loans until action was taken at the current legislative session, and an application could not be filed in their behalf until April of 1957; and

"Whereas the financing of the State college program was developed on the basis of the availability of Federal loans at a 2⅞ percent interest rate, and any increase in the interest rate on such funds would result in a substantial curtailment of an essential program for the construction of residence housing at State colleges; and

"Whereas the projected enrollment at State colleges for the near future anticipates a tremendous growth in the student population, making it essential that residence facilities be constructed immediately: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature of this State respectfully memorializes Congress, if it desires to increase the interest rate on Federal loans for college residence housing, to make such increase effective on applications filed after May 1, 1957, to permit the State colleges in this State to secure the benefit of the existing lower rate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from this State in the Federal Congress."

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 26—Memorializing Congress To Provide for the Construction of a Highway From Winnemucca, Nev., to Viewland, Calif.

"Whereas the State of California, civil defense agencies and United States military authorities need an adequate highway system leading easterly from the central and northern portions of the State; and

"Where the construction of a highway from the vicinity of Viewland, Lassen County, Calif., on United States Highway 395 to a point on United States Highway 40 near Winnemucca, Nev., would alleviate this situation; and

"Whereas State Highway 36 is open the year around and is one of the lowest and most accessible passes over the Sierra Nevada Mountains; and

"Whereas in the event of a national emergency, the present highway system would be inadequate for transportation to and from the State of California, and a serious problem would confront the inhabitants of northern and central California as well as military and civil defense authorities; and

"Whereas the Sierra Ordnance Depot at Herlong, Lassen County, Calif., is a vital military installation, and most of the supplies shipped to such depot from the eastern part of the United States are transported through Salt Lake City, Utah; and

"Whereas the construction of this proposed highway would shorten the route into the Sierra Ordnance Depot from Salt Lake City thereby effecting a substantial savings in the money spent for transporting supplies, and also lessen the highway mileage between Salt Lake City and northern California and southern Oregon; and

"Whereas the development of northern Nevada, northern California, southern and western Oregon as a tourist and recreation area, would be enhanced by the construction of this proposed highway, by facilitating travel over United States Highway 395, United States Highway 299, State Highways 32, 36, 89, and 44, joint highway 14 and Federal Highway 92; and

"Whereas, headquarters, Sixth Army, Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., and Nevada and California civil defense agencies are on record as favoring the construction of this proposed highway: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States of America enact legislation and appropriate funds for the construction of a Federal highway from Winnemucca, Humboldt County, Nev., to Viewland, Lassen County, Calif., via Gerlach and Empire, Nev.; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

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

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to liberalize restrictions relating to old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance

"Whereas persons under 72 receiving old-age and survivors insurance are penalized if they by working earn more than $1,200 a year; and

"Whereas such restrictions encourage idleness, low subsistence living, and favor persons having private income not beset by the need of earnings; and

"Whereas many old-age assistance recipients are destitute and because of inadequacies in existing laws, live below the minimum American subsistence level; and

"Whereas under the current matching formula of the public-assistance section of the Federal Social Security Act of 1936 those States which cannot afford adequate financial assistance to its needy aged because their per capita income is low and said formula does not recognize disparities between rich and poor States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to liberalize the old-age and survivors insurance restrictions and allow beneficiaries to earn up to $1,800 yearly without being penalized, and to allow old-age assistance recipients to earn monthly sums of $50 for maintaining at least a minimal American standard of living and that the secretary of state be directed to transmit duly attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, and to our congressional delegation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to devise a more equable, flexible, and realistic formula to correct the inequity and to be based on, and vary with, States' per capita incomes, thus providing more favorable financial consideration to less wealthy States.

"CHARLES H. BROWN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved May 1, 1957.

"JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 49th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in

legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas there is urgent need for additional irrigation water in the area served by the Vale Oregon Irrigation District; and

"Whereas it is desirable and in the best interests of the citizens of Malheur County and the State of Oregon that flood damages on Bully Creek and the Malheur River be reduced and minimized; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of the Interior has investigated and filed a feasibility report on a proposed Bully Creek dam and reservoir that will serve the needs herein set forth: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That your memorialists earnestly petition for the immediate authorization and Federal construction of the Bully Creek Dam, Reservoir and related facilities under existing plans and repayment requirements contained in the report of the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of Interior; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by senate April 3, 1957.

"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
"*Chief Clerk of Senate.*
"BOYD R. OVERHULSE,
"*President of Senate.*

"Adopted by house April 9, 1957.

"PAT DOOLEY,
"*Speaker of House.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Legislature of Nebraska, 68th Session,
Legislative Resolution 17

"Whereas the United States of America has become the greatest power in the history of mankind because it is a united nation of equal and sovereign States and not an empire; and

"Whereas the people of the United States devised a method and program of incorporating Territories, which method, as a first step leading to the full privileges of statehood, imposes on the people of such Territories the obligations of the citizens of the several States, while withholding from such Territorial citizens, however, the basic rights of self-government and full representation in the councils of the United States; and

"Whereas Alaska and Hawaii have been incorporated as Territories of the United States for many years, and by the very act of such incorporation as United States Territories have been promised the full privileges of statehood with first-class citizenship for the peoples of Alaska and Hawaii; and

"Whereas both political parties have recognized that every consideration of fairness demands that the people of these territories be given the full privileges of American citizenship in their platforms and other policy declarations; and

"Whereas the granting of statehood to these Territories will strengthen the United States immeasurably in human resources and in its foreign relations particularly as regards the great Pacific Basin area; and

"Whereas we in the West have a particular interest in and close ties with the people of Alaska and Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 68th session assembled:

"1. That Alaska and Hawaii be admitted to the Union in the year 1957.

"2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to every western Senator and Congressman and that each of them are requested to make every effort to see that bills to grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii be promptly considered and passed.

"DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
"*President of the Legislature.*

"I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 17, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 68th regular session on the 26th day of April 1957.

"HUGO F. SRB,
"*Clerk of the Legislature.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider favorably a Federal program to improve Delaware waterways

"Whereas an oil tanker known as the U. S. N. S. *Mission San Francisco*, and a Liberian freighter known as the steamship *Elna II*, collided in the Delaware River, near New Castle, Del., on Thursday, March 7, 1957, which resulted in a great loss of life, personal injury, and much property damage; and

"Whereas there have been many other collisions and groundings of vessels in that area in recent years which clearly necessitates an immediate Federal program of improvement of Delaware waterways for the benefit of shipping; and

"Whereas the United States Senators from Delaware have expressed their intent to urge Congress to approve legislation which would improve both the Delaware River and the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein), That the 119th General Assembly of the State of Delaware urges and requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation with sufficient appropriation which would make possible the necessary steps to make the Delaware River and the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal safe passageways for all ships; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives of the United States from Delaware are respectfully requested to exert every effort and utilize all facilities at their disposal to further said action; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution shall forthwith be transmitted to the Presiding Officer of each House, and to the chairmen of the proper committees in the House and Senate of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Delaware."

Five concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Enrolled Concurrent Resolution 2

"A concurrent resolution making application to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, for a convention proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring)—

"SECTION 1. The General Assembly of the State of Indiana, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in lieu of article V:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the Legislature of any 12 of the several States by two-thirds of each house shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment, which, in any case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

"'SEC. 2. The act of proposal, concurrence in a proposal, or ratification of an amendment shall not be revocable.

"'SEC. 3. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 15 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

"'SEC. 4. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justifiable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States.'

"SEC. 2. The State of Indiana requests that such amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"SEC. 3. For the reason that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States by convention under article V has never been exercised and no precedent exists for the calling or holding of such convention, the State of Indiana hereby declares the following basic principles with respect thereto: That the power of the sovereign States to amend the Constitution of the United States under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution by convention under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States extends over such convention and the scope and control thereof, and that it is within their sovereign power to prescribe whether such convention shall be general or shall be limited to the proposal of a specified amendment or of amendments in a specified field; that the exercise by the sovereign States of their power to require the calling of such convention contemplates that the applications of the several States for such convention shall prescribe the scope thereof and the essential provisions for holding the same; that the scope of such convention and the provisions for holding the same are established in and by the applications therefor by the legislatures of the two-thirds majority of the several States required by article V to call the same, and that it is the duty of the Congress to call such convention in conformity therewith; that such convention is without power to transcend and the delegates to such convention are without power to act except within the limitations and provisions so prescribed.

"SEC. 4. The State of Indiana requests that such convention shall be called and held in conformity with the following limitations and provisions, and that the Congress, in the call for such convention, hereby is requested to and shall prescribe:

"1. That such convention shall be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, on the first Monday of the first December following transmission to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the

Congress of the United States of applications for such convention by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, and, in honor of the Nation's founders and for invocation, shall convene at Constitution Hall, at Independence Square, at the hour of 10 o'clock in the morning of such day, and thereupon adjourn to more commodious quarters within said city for session as the convention shall determine;

"2. That the several States shall have equal suffrage at such convention; that each of the several States shall be entitled to 3 delegates thereat and that each of such delegates shall be entitled to 1 vote; that the delegates to such convention from the several States shall be the highest officer of the senate and the highest officer of the house of representatives of their respective legislatures at the time of such convention, except that in States where the lieutenant governor is president of the senate the president of the senate pro tempore or other highest officer from the membership of the senate shall be such delegate from the senate and in States having a unicameral legislature the 2 highest officers of its legislature shall be such delegates, which 2 delegates in each of the several States shall jointly designate a citizen of such State at large who shall be the third delegate from such State to such convention; that in case of a vacancy in the office of any delegate during such convention, not otherwise filled pursuant to law or by legislative act or as herein provided, such vacancy shall be filled by the governor of such State from the senate or house of its legislature or the State at large, respectively, as the case may be; that during such vacancy and during the absence of a delegate from the floor of the convention the delegates present from such State shall be empowered to exercise the vote of the absent delegate or delegates from such State; that the legislature of any State may choose its delegates to such convention, other than hereinabove designated, in which case the delegates so chosen shall be certified to the convention by the secretary of state of such State and shall constitute the delegates of such State at such convention in lieu of the delegates otherwise hereinabove designated;

"3. That such convention shall be limited and restricted specifically to the consideration and proposal of such amendment to article V, or such other amendments as may be proposed by the several States of these United States; the choosing of officers and adoption of rules of procedure for the conduct of such convention and the maintenance of order thereat; the determination of any issue respecting the seating of delegates; adjournment from day to day and to a day certain and from place to place within said city as may be convenient, and adjournment sine die; and such convention shall not be held for any other purpose nor have any other power, and the delegates thereto shall have no power other than within the limitations herein prescribed;

"4. That a permanent record shall be made of the proceedings of such convention, which shall be certified by the secretary of the convention, the original of which shall be placed in the Library of Congress and printed copies of which shall be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States;

"5. That the powers of such convention shall be exercisable by the States represented at such convention by duly constituted delegates thereat by majority vote of the States present and voting on such proposal, and not otherwise.

"SEC. 5. The State of Indiana requests that this application shall constitute a continuing application for such convention under article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made like applications and such convention shall have been called and held in conformity therewith, unless the Congress itself propose such amendment within the time and the manner herein provided.

"SEC. 6. The State of Indiana requests that proposal of such amendment by the Congress and its submission for ratification to the legislatures of the several States in the form of the article hereinabove specifically set forth, at any time prior to 60 days after the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made application for such convention, shall render such convention unnecessary and the same shall not be held; otherwise such convention shall be called and held in conformity with such applications.

"SEC. 7. The State of Indiana requests that, as this application under article V of the Constitution of the United States is the exercise of a fundamental power of the sovereign States under the Constitution of the United States, a receipt of this application by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be officially noted and duly entered upon their respective records, and that the full context of this resolution be published in the official publication of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress.

"SEC. 8. Certified copies of this resolution shall be transmitted forthwith to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative in the Congress from this State, and to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States, attesting the adoption of this resolution by the legislature of this State.

"CRAWFORD F. PARKER,
"President of Senate.
"GEORGE S. DIENER,
"Speaker of House of Representatives.
Approved March 12, 1957.
"HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
"Governor of the State of Indiana.
"Filed March 12, 1957.
"FRANK A. LENNING,
"Secretary of State of Indiana."

"House Enrolled Concurrent Resolution 4

"A concurrent resolution making application to the Congress of the United States pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States for a convention proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring)—

"SECTION 1. The General Assembly of the State of Indiana, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE

"'SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement not made in pursuance of this Constitution shall have no force or effect. This section shall not apply to treaties made prior to the effective date of this Constitution.

"'SEC. 2. A treaty or other international agreement shall have legislative effect within the United States as a law thereof only through legislation, except to the extent that the Senate shall provide affirmatively, in its resolution advising and consenting to a treaty, that the treaty shall have legislative effect.

"'SEC. 3. An international agreement other than a treaty shall have legislative effect within the United States as a law thereof only through legislation valid in the absence of such an international agreement.

"'SEC. 4. On the question of advising and consenting to a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the Senators voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.'

"SEC. 2. The State of Indiana requests that such amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

SEC. 3. For the reason that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States by convention under article V has never been exercised and no precedent exists for the calling or holding of such convention, the State of Indiana hereby declares the following basic principles with respect thereto: that the power of the sovereign States to amend the Constitutions of the United States under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution by convention under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States extends over such convention and the scope and control thereof and that it is within their sovereign power to prescribe whether such convention shall be general or shall be limited to the proposal of a specified amendment or of amendments in a specified field; that the exercise by the sovereign States of their power to require the calling of such convention contemplates that the applications of the several States for such convention shall prescribe the scope thereof and the essential provisions for holding the same; that the scope of such convention and the provisions for holding the same are established in and by the applications therefor by the legislatures of the two-thirds majority of the several States required by article V to call the same, and that it is the duty of the Congress to call such convention in conformity therewith; that such convention is without power to transcend, and the delegates to such convention are without power to act except within, the limitations and provisions so prescribed.

"SEC. 4. The State of Indiana requests that such convention shall be called and held in conformity with the following limitations and provisions, and that the Congress, in the call for such convention, hereby is requested to and shall prescribe:

"1. That such convention shall be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, on the first Monday of the first December following transmission to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of applications for such convention by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States and, in honor of the Nation's founders and for invocation, shall convene at Constitution Hall, at Independence Square, at the hour of 10:00 o'clock in the morning of such day, and thereupon adjourn to more commodious quarters within said city for session as the convention shall determine;

"2. That the several States shall have equal suffrage at such convention; that each of the several States shall be entitled to three delegates thereat and that each of such delegates shall be entitled to one vote; that the delegates to such convention from the several States shall be the highest officer of the senate and the highest officer of the house of representatives of their respective legislatures at the time of such convention, except that in States where the lieutenant governor is president of the senate, the president of the senate pro tem or other highest officer from the membership of the senate shall be such delegate from the senate and in States having a unicameral legislature the two highest officers of its legislature shall be such delegates, which two delegates in each of the several States shall jointly designate a citizen of such State at large who shall be the third

delegate from such State to such convention; that in case of a vacancy in the office of any delegate during such convention, not otherwise filled pursuant to law or by legislative act or as herein provided, such vacancy shall be filled by the governor of such State from the senate or house of its legislature or the State at large, respectively, as the case may be; that during such vacancy and during the absence of a delegate from the floor of the convention the delegates present from such State shall be empowered to exercise the vote of the absent delegate or delegates from such State; that the legislature of any State may choose its delegates to such convention, other than hereinabove designated, in which case the delegates so chosen shall be certified to the convention by the secretary of state of such State and shall constitute the delegates of such State at such convention in lieu of the delegates otherwise hereinabove designated.

"3. That such convention shall be limited and restricted specifically to the consideration and proposal of this amendment, or such other amendments as may be proposed by the several States of these United States; the choosing of officers and adoption of rules of procedure for the conduct of such convention and the maintenance of order thereat, the determination of any issue respecting the seating of delegates, adjournment from day to day and to a day certain and from place to place within said city as may be convenient, and adjournment sine die; and such convention shall not be held for any other purpose nor have any other power, and the delegates thereto shall have no power other than within the limitations herein prescribed;

"4. That a permanent record shall be made of the proceedings of such convention, which shall be certified by the secretary of the convention, the original of which shall be placed in the Library of Congress and printed copies of which shall be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States;

"5. That the powers of such convention shall be exercisable by the States, represented at such convention by duly constituted delegates thereat, by majority vote of the States present and voting on such proposal, and not otherwise.

"SEC. 5. The State of Indiana requests that this application shall constitute a continuing application for such convention under article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made like applications and such convention shall have been called and held in conformity therewith, unless the Congress itself propose such amendment within the time and manner herein provided.

"SEC. 6. The State of Indiana requests that proposal of such amendment by the Congress and its submission for ratification to the legislatures of the several States in the form of the article hereinabove specifically set forth, at any time prior to sixty days after the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made application for such convention, shall render such convention unnecessary and the same shall not be held; otherwise such convention shall be called and held in conformity with such applications.

"SEC. 7. The State of Indiana requests that as this application under article V of the Constitution of the United States is the exercise of a fundamental power of the sovereign States under the Constitution of the United States, a receipt of this application by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be officially noted and duly entered upon their respective records, and that the full context of this resolution be published in the official publication of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress.

"SEC. 8. Certified copies of this resolution shall be transmitted forthwith to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative in the Congress from this State, and to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States, attesting the adoption of this resolution by the legislature of this State.

"CRAWFORD F. PARKER,
"President of Senate.
"GEORGE S. DIENER,
"Speaker of House of Representatives.
"Approved March 12, 1957.
"HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
"Governor of the State of Indiana.
"Filed March 12, 1957.
"FRANK A. LENNING,
"Secretary of State of Indiana."

"House Enrolled Concurrent Resolution 7

"A concurrent resolution making application to the Congress of the United States pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States for a convention proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the senate concurring),

"SECTION 1. The General Assembly of the State of Indiana, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Two of each State's electors of President and Vice President shall be elected by the people thereof; and each State's remaining electors shall be elected by the people in single-member districts established by the legislature thereof, such districts to be composed of contiguous and compact territory and containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitles the State to one Representative in the Congress; and such districts when formed shall not be altered until another census has been taken. If the legislature of any State fails to establish such districts, the Congress may establish them upon petition of not less than one-fifth of the members of the legislature of such State. The electors in each State who elect electors of President and Vice President shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

" 'SEC. 2. If no person voted for as President or Vice President has a majority of the whole number of electors chosen, then from the three persons having the highest numbers on the lists of those voted for as President and Vice President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, assembled and voting as one body, shall choose immediately from the respective lists the President, and then the Vice President, or either, as the case may be; a quorum for these purposes shall consist of three-fourths of the whole number of the Senators and Representatives, and the person receiving the greatest number of votes for President and for Vice President on the respective rollcalls, if such numbers are a majority of those present and voting, shall be the President and the Vice President. If additional rollcalls be necessary for either office the choice shall be between the two persons having the highest numbers on the first rollcalls for President and Vice President. But no person ineligible to the Office of President shall be eligible to the Office of Vice President.

" 'SEC. 3. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of said Offices, of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President or a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.'

"SEC. 2. The State of Indiana requests that such amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"SEC. 3. For the reason that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States by convention under article V has never been exercised and no precedent exists for the calling or holding of such convention, the State of Indiana hereby declares the following basic principles with respect thereto: That the power of the sovereign States to amend the Constitution of the United States under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution by convention under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States extends over such convention and the scope and control thereof and that it is within their sovereign power to prescribe whether such convention shall be general or shall be limited to the proposal of a specified amendment or of amendments in a specified field; that the exercise by the sovereign States of their power to require the calling of such convention contemplates that the applications of the several States for such convention shall prescribe the scope thereof and the essential provisions for holding the same; that the scope of such convention and the provisions for holding the same are established in and by the applications therefor by the legislatures of the two-thirds majority of the several States required by article V to call the same, and that it is the duty of the Congress to call such convention in conformity therewith; that such convention is without power to transcend, and the delegates to such convention are without power to act except within, the limitations and provisions so prescribed.

"SEC. 4. The State of Indiana requests that such convention shall be called and held in conformity with the following limitations and provisions, and that the Congress, in the call for such convention, hereby is requested to and shall prescribe:

"1. That such convention shall be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, on the first Monday of the first December following transmission to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of applications for such convention by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States and, in honor of the Nation's Founders and for invocation, shall convene at Constitution Hall, at Independence Square, at the hour of 10 o'clock in the morning of such day, and thereupon adjourn to more commodious quarters within said city for session as the convention shall determine;

"2. That the several States shall have equal suffrage at such convention; that each of the several States shall be entitled to 3 delegates thereat and that each of such delegates shall be entitled to 1 vote; that the delegates to such convention from the several States shall be the highest officer of the senate and the highest officer of the house of representatives of their respective legislatures at the time of such convention, except that in States where the lieutenant governor is president of the senate, the president of the senate pro tempore or other highest officer from the membership of the senate shall be such delegate from the senate and in States having a unicameral legislature the 2 highest officers of its legislature shall be such delegates, which 2 delegates in each of the several States shall jointly designate a citizen of such State at large who shall be the third delegate from such State to such convention; that in case

of a vacancy in the office of any delegate during such convention, not otherwise filled pursuant to law or by legislative act or as herein provided, such vacancy shall be filled by the Governor of such State from the senate or house of its legislature or the State at large, respectively, as the case may be; that during such vacancy and during the absence of a delegate from the floor of the convention the delegates present from such State shall be empowered to exercise the vote of the absent delegate or delegates from such State; that the legislature of any State may choose its delegates to such convention, other than hereinabove designated, in which case the delegates so chosen shall be certified to the convention by the secretary of state of such State and shall constitute the delegates of such State at such convention in lieu of the delegates otherwise hereinabove designated.

"3. That such convention shall be limited and restricted specifically to the consideration and proposal of this amendment or such other amendments as may be proposed by the several States of these United States; the choosing of officers and adoption of rules of procedure for the conduct of such convention and the maintenance of order thereat, the determination of any issue respecting the seating of delegates, adjournment from day to day and to a day certain and from place to place within said city as may be convenient, and adjournment sine die; and such convention shall not be held for any other purpose nor have any other power, and the delegates thereto shall have no power other than within the limitation herein prescribed;

"4. That a permanent record shall be made of the proceedings of such convention, which shall be certified by the secretary of the convention, the original of which shall be placed in the Library of Congress and printed copies of which shall be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States;

"5. That the powers of such convention shall be exercisable by the States, represented at such convention by duly constituted delegates thereat, by majority vote of the States present and voting on such proposal, and not otherwise.

"SEC. 5. The State of Indiana requests that this application shall constitute a continuing application for such convention under Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made like applications and such convention shall have been called and held in conformity therewith, unless the Congress itself propose such amendment within the time and the manner herein provided.

"SEC. 6. The State of Indiana requests that proposal of such amendment by the Congress and its submission for ratification to the legislatures of the several States in the form of the article hereinabove specifically set forth, at any time prior to 60 days after the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made application for such convention, shall render such convention unnecessary and the same shall not be held; otherwise such convention shall be called and held in conformity with such applications.

"SEC. 7. The State of Indiana requests that as this application under Article V of the Constitution of the United States is the exercise of a fundamental power of the sovereign States under the Constitution of the United States, a receipt of this application by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be officially noted and duly entered upon their respective records, and that the full context of this resolution be published in the official publication of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress.

"SEC. 8. Certified copies of this resolution shall be transmitted forthwith to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative in the Congress from this State, and to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States, attesting the adoption of this resolution by the legislature of this State.

"CRAWFORD F. PARKER,
"President of Senate.
"GEORGE S. DIENER,
"Speaker of House of Representatives.
"Approved: March 12, 1957.
"HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
"Governor of the State of Indiana.
"Filed March 12, 1957.
"FRANK A. LENNING,
"Secretary of State of Indiana."

"House Enrolled Concurrent Resolution 8

"A concurrent resolution making application to the Congress of the United States pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States for a convention proposing an amendment to the constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring)—

"SECTION 1. The General Assembly of the State of Indiana, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum top rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all top rates) of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by, income shall not exceed 25 percent: *Provided, however,* That the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each house may fix such a maximum top rate in excess of 25 percent, for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each, if such rate so fixed does not exceed the lowest rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all lowest rates) by more than 15 percentage points. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates of tax applicable to the incomes of individuals may be different from the rates applicable to the incomes of corporations, which term shall include also associations, joint stock companies, and insurance companies. The determination of income subject to tax shall be by uniform rules of general application which shall not vary with the size of the income.

"'SEC. 3. The Congress shall have no power to lay or collect any tax, duty, or excise with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift.

"'SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on, with respect to, or measured by, income from any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.'

"SEC. 2. The State of Indiana requests that such amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"SEC. 3. For the reason that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States by convention under article V has never been exercised and no precedent exists for the calling or holding of such convention, the State of Indiana hereby declares the following basic principles with respect thereto: That the power of the sovereign States to amend the Constitution of the United States under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution by convention under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States extends over such convention and the scope and control thereof and that it is within their sovereign power to prescribe whether such convention shall be general or shall be limited to the proposal of a specified amendment or of amendments in a specified field; that the exercise by the sovereign States of their power to require the calling of such convention contemplates that the applications of the several States for such convention shall prescribe the scope thereof and the essential provisions for holding the same; that the scope of such convention and the provisions for holding the same are established in and by the applications therefor by the legislatures of the two-thirds majority of the several States required by article V to call the same, and that it is the duty of the Congress to call such convention in conformity therewith; that such convention is without power to transcend, and the delegates to such convention are without power to act except within, the limitations and provisions so prescribed.

"SEC. 4. The State of Indiana requests that such convention shall be called and held in conformity with the following limitations and provisions, and that the Congress, in the call for such convention, hereby is requested to and shall prescribe:

"1. That such convention shall be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, on the first Monday of the first December following transmission to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of applications for such convention by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States and, in honor of the Nation's founders and for invocation, shall convene at Constitution Hall, at Independence Square, at the hour of 10 o'clock in the morning of such day, and thereupon adjourn to more commodious quarters within said city for session as the convention shall determine;

"2. That the several States shall have equal suffrage at such convention; that each of the several States shall be entitled to three delegates thereat and that each of such delegates shall be entitled to one vote; that the delegates to such convention from the several States shall be the highest officer of the senate and the highest officer of the house of representatives of their respective legislatures at the time of such convention, except that in States where the lieutenant governor is president of the senate, the president of the senate pro tem or other highest officer from the membership of the senate shall be such delegate from the senate and in States having a unicameral legislature the two highest officers of its legislature shall be such delegates, which two delegates in each of the several States shall jointly designate a citizen of such State at large who shall be the third delegate from such State to such convention; that in case of a vacancy in the office of any delegate during such convention, not otherwise filled pursuant to law or by legislative act or as herein provided, such vacancy shall be filled

by the governor of such State from the senate or house of its legislature or the State at large, respectively, as the case may be; that during such vacancy and during the absence of a delegate from the floor of the convention the delegates present from such State shall be empowered to exercise the vote of the absent delegate or delegates from such State; that the legislature of any State may choose its delegates to such convention, other than hereinabove designated, in which case the delegates so chosen shall be certified to the convention by the secretary of state of such State and shall constitute the delegates of such State at such convention in lieu of the delegates otherwise hereinabove designated.

"3. That such convention shall be limited and restricted specifically to the consideration and proposal of this amendment or such other amendments as may be proposed by the several States of these United States; the choosing of officers and adoption of rules of procedure for the conduct of such convention and the maintenance of order thereat, the determination of any issue respecting the seating of delegates, adjournment from day to day and to a day certain and from place to place within said city as may be convenient, and adjournment sine die; and such convention shall not be held for any other purpose nor have any other power, and the delegates thereto shall have no power other than within the limitations herein prescribed;

"4. That a permanent record shall be made of the proceedings of such convention, which shall be certified by the secretary of the convention, the original of which shall be placed in the Library of Congress and printed copies of which shall be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States;

"5. That the powers of such convention shall be exercisable by the States, represented at such convention by duly constituted delegates thereat, by majority vote of the States present and voting on such proposal, and not otherwise.

"SEC. 5. The State of Indiana requests that this application shall constitute a continuing application for such convention under article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made like applications and such convention shall have been called and held in conformity therewith, unless the Congress itself propose such amendment within the time and manner herein provided.

"SEC. 6. The State of Indiana requests that proposal of such amendment by the Congress and its submission for ratification to the legislatures of the several States in the form of the article hereinabove specifically set forth, at any time prior to 60 days after the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made application for such convention, shall render such convention unnecessary and the same shall not be held; otherwise such convention shall be called and held in conformity with such applications.

"SEC. 7. The State of Indiana requests that as this application under article V of the Constitution of the United States is the exercise of a fundamental power of the sovereign States under the Constitution of the United States, a receipt of this application by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be officially noted and duly entered upon their respective records, and that the full context of this resolution be published in the official publication of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress.

"SEC. 8. Certified copies of this resolution shall be transmitted forthwith to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative in the Congress from this State, and to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States, attesting the adoption of this resolution by the legislature of this State.

"CRAWFORD F. PARKER,
"President of Senate.
"GEORGE S. DIENER,
"Speaker of House of Representatives.
"Approved: March 12, 1957.
"HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
"Governor of the State of Indiana.
"Filed March 12, 1957.
"FRANK A. LENNING,
"Secretary of State of Indiana."

"House Enrolled Concurrent Resolution 9

"A concurrent resolution making application to the Congress of the United States pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States for a convention proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring)—

"SECTION 1. The General Assembly of the State of Indiana, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE—

" 'SECTION 1. On or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimates of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimate of receipts. If the Congress shall authorize expenditures to be made during such ensuing fiscal year in excess of such estimated receipts, it shall not adjourn for more than 3 days at a time until action has been taken necessary to balance the budget for such ensuing fiscal year. In case of war or other grave national emergency, if the President shall so recommend, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may suspend the foregoing provisions for balancing the budget for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each.

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall take effect on the first day of the calendar year next following the ratification of this article.'

"SEC. 2. The State of Indiana requests that such amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"SEC. 3. For the reason that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States by convention under article V has never been exercised and no precedent exists for the calling or holding of such convention, the State of Indiana hereby declares the following basic principles with respect thereto: That the power of the sovereign States to amend the Constitution of the United States under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution by convention under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States extends over such convention and the scope and control thereof and that it is within their sovereign power to prescribe whether such convention shall be general or shall be limited to the proposal of a specified amendment or of amendments in a specified field; that the exercise by the sovereign States of their power to require the calling of such convention contemplates that the applications of the several States for such convention shall prescribe the scope thereof and the essential provisions for holding the same; that the scope of such convention and the provisions for holding the same are established in and by the applications therefor by the legislatures of the two-thirds majority of the several States required by article V to call the same, and that it is the duty of the Congress to call such convention in conformity therewith; that such convention is without power to transcend, and the delegates to such convention are without power to act except within, the limitations and provisions so prescribed.

"SEC. 4. The State of Indiana requests that such convention shall be called and held in conformity with the following limitations and provisions, and that the Congress, in the call for such convention, hereby is requested to and shall prescribe:

"1. That such convention shall be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, on the first Monday of the first December following transmission to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of applications for such convention by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States and, in honor of the Nation's founders and for invocation, shall convene at Constitution Hall, at Independence Square, at the hour of 10 o'clock in the morning of such day, and thereupon adjourn to more commodious quarters within said city for session as the convention shall determine;

"2. That the several States shall have equal suffrage at such convention; that each of the several States shall be entitled to 3 delegates thereat and that each of such delegates shall be entitled to 1 vote; that the delegates to such convention from the several States shall be the highest officer of the senate and the highest officer of the house of representatives of their respective legislatures at the time of such convention, except that in States where the lieutenant governor is president of the senate, the president of the senate pro tempore or other highest officer from the membership of the senate shall be such delegate from the senate and in States having a unicameral legislature the 2 highest officers of its legislature shall be such delegates, which 2 delegates in each of the several States shall jointly designate a citizen of such State at large who shall be the third delegate from such State to such convention; that in case of a vacancy in the office of any delegate during such convention, not otherwise filled pursuant to law or by legislative act or as herein provided, such vacancy shall be filled by the Governor of such State from the senate or house of its legislature or the State at large, respectively, as the case may be; that during such vacancy and during the absence of a delegate from the floor of the convention the delegates present from such State shall be empowered to exercise the vote of the absent delegate or delegates from such State; that the legislature of any State may choose its delegates to such convention, other than hereinabove designated, in which case the delegates so chosen shall be certified to the convention by the secretary of state of such State and shall constitute the delegates of such State at such convention in lieu of the delegates otherwise hereinabove designated;

"3. That such convention shall be limited and restricted specifically to the consideration and proposal of this amendment or such other amendments as may be proposed by the several States of these United States; the choosing of officers and adoption of rules of procedure for the conduct of such convention and the maintenance of order

thereat, the determination of any issue respecting the seating of delegates, adjournment from day to day and to a day certain and from place to place within said city as may be convenient, and adjournment sine die; and such convention shall not be held for any other purpose nor have any other power, and the delegates thereto shall have no power other than within the limitations herein prescribed;

"4. That a permanent record shall be made of the proceedings of such convention, which shall be certified by the secretary of the convention, the original of which shall be placed in the Library of Congress and printed copies of which shall be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States;

"5. That the powers of such convention shall be exercisable by the States, represented at such convention by duly constituted delegates thereat, by majority vote of the States present and voting on such proposal, and not otherwise.

"SEC. 5. The State of Indiana requests that this application shall constitute a continuing application for such convention under article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made like applications and such convention shall have been called and held in conformity therewith, unless the Congress itself propose such amendment within the time and the manner herein provided.

"SEC. 6. The State of Indiana requests that proposal of such amendment by the Congress and its submission for ratification to the legislatures of the several States in the form of the article hereinabove specifically set forth, at any time prior to 60 days after the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made application for such convention, shall render such convention unnecessary and the same shall not be held; otherwise such convention shall be called and held in conformity with such applications.

"SEC. 7. The State of Indiana requests that as this application under article V of the Constitution of the United States is the exercise of a fundamental power of the sovereign States under the Constitution of the United States, a receipt of this application by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be officially noted and duly entered upon their respective records, and that the full context of this resolution be published in the official publication of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress.

"SEC. 8. Certified copies of this resolution shall be transmitted forthwith to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative in the Congress from this State, and to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States, attesting the adoption of this resolution by the legislature of this State.

"CRAWFORD F. PARKER,
"President of Senate.
"GEORGE S. DIENER,
"Speaker of House of Representatives.
"Approved: March 12, 1957.
"HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
"Governor of the State of Indiana.
"Filed March 12, 1957.
"FRANK A. LENNING,
"Secretary of State of Indiana."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"House Concurrent Resolution 174

"A resolution to declare the United States Supreme Court decisions usurping the powers reserved to the States and relating to education, labor, criminal procedure, treason and subversion to be null, void, and of no effect; to declare that a contest of powers has arisen between the State of Florida and the Supreme Court of the United States; to invoke the doctrine of interposition; and for other purposes

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida (the Senate concurring), That the Legislature of Florida doth hereby unequivocally express a firm and determined resolution to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of this State against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the fundamental principles, embodied in our basic law, by which the liberty of the people and the sovereignty of the States, in their proper spheres, have been long protected and assured;

"That the Legislature of Florida doth explicitly and preemptorily declare that it views the powers of the Federal Government as resulting solely from the compact, to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument creating that compact;

"That the Legislature of Florida asserts that the powers of the Federal Government are valid only to the extent that these powers have been enumerated in the compact to which the various States assented originally and to which the States have assented in subsequent amendments validly adopted and ratified;

"That the very nature of this basic compact, apparent upon its face, is that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to surrender certain of their sovereign rights, but only certain of these sovereign rights, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, have been reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;

"That the State of Florida has at no time surrendered to the General Government its right to exercise its powers in the field of labor, criminal procedure, and public education, and to maintain racially separate public schools and other public facilities;

"That the State of Florida, in ratifying the 14th amendment to the Constitution, did not agree, nor did the other States ratifying the 14th amendment agree, that the power to regulate labor, criminal proceedings, public education, and to operate racially separate public schools and other facilities was to be prohibited to them thereby;

"And as evidence of such understanding as to the inherent power and authority of the States to regulate public education and the maintenance of racially separate public schools, the Legislature of Florida notes that the very Congress that submitted the 14th amendment for ratification established separate schools in the District of Columbia and that in more than one instance the same State legislatures that ratified the 14th amendment also provided for systems of racially separate public schools;

"That the Legislature of Florida denies that the Supreme Court of the United States had the right which it asserted in the school cases decided by it on May 17, 1954, the labor-union case decided on May 21, 1956, the cases relating to criminal proceedings decided on April 23, 1956, and January 16, 1956, the antisedition case decided on April 2, 1956, and the case relating to teacher requirements decided on April 9, 1956, to enlarge the language and meaning of the compact by the States in an effort to withdraw from the States powers reserved to them and as daily exercised by them for almost a century;

"That a question of contested power has arisen; the Supreme Court of the United States asserts, for its part, that the States did in fact prohibit unto themselves the power to regulate labor matters, criminal proceedings, and public education, and to maintain racially separate public institutions and the State of Florida, for its part, asserts that it and its sister States have never surrendered such rights;

"That these assertions upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by threats of coercion and compulsion against the sovereign States of this Union, constitute a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court to prohibit to the States certain rights and powers never surrendered by them;

"That the Legislature of Florida asserts that whenever the General Government attempts to engage in the deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to it, the States who are parties to the compact have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them;

"That failure on the part of this State thus to assert its clear rights would be construed as acquiescence in the surrender thereof; and that such submissive acquiescence to the seizure of one right would in the end lead to the surrender of all rights, and inevitably to the consolidation of the States into one sovereignty, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created;

"That the question of contested power asserted in this resolution is not within the province of the Court to determine because the Court itself seeks to usurp the powers which have been reserved to the States, and, therefore, under these circumstances, the judgment of all of the parties to the compact must be sought to resolve the question. The Supreme Court is not a party to the compact, but a creature of the compact and the question of contested power should not be settled by the creature seeking to usurp the power, but by the parties to the compact who are the people of the respective States in whom ultimate sovereignty finally reposes;

"That the constitution of the State of Florida provides for full benefits to all its citizens with reference to educational facilities and under the laws of Florida enacted by the legislature through the minimum foundation program its citizens under States' rights, all are being educated under the same general law and all teachers are being employed under identical educational qualifications and all are certified by the State Board of Education alike, which enables the people, themselves, in Florida to provide an educational establishment serviceable and satisfactory and in keeping with the social structure of the State. The people of Florida do not consent to changing State precedents and their rights by having doctrines thrust upon them by naked force alone, as promulgated in the school cases of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955;

"That the doctrines of said decisions and other decisions denying to the States the right to have laws of their own dealing with subversion or espionage, and criminal proceedings, and denying the States the right to dismiss individuals from public employment who refuse to answer questions concerning their connections with communism by invoking the fifth amendment, and denying the States the right to provide for protective 'right to work' laws, should not be forced upon the citizens of this State for the Court was without jurisdiction, power or authority to interfere with the sovereign powers of the State in such spheres of activity.

"That the Court in its decisions relating to public education was without jurisdiction

because (1) the jurisdiction of the Court granted by the Constitution is limited to judicial cases in law and equity, and said cases were not of a judicial nature and character, nor did they involve controversies in law or equity, but, on the contrary, the great subjects of the controversy are of a legislative character, and not a judicial character, and are determinable only by the people themselves speaking through their legislative bodies; (2) the essential nature and effect of the proceedings relating exclusively to public schools operated by and under the authority of States, and pursuant to State laws and regulations, said cases were suits against the States, and the Supreme Court was without power or authority to try said cases, brought by individuals against States, because the Constitution forbids the Court to entertain suits by individuals against a State unless the State has consented to be sued;

"That if said Court had had jurisdiction and authority to try and determine said cases, it was powerless to interfere with the operation of the public schools of States, because the Constitution of the United States does not confer upon the General Government any power or authority over such schools or over the subject of education, jurisdiction over these matters being reserved to the States, nor did the States by the 14th amendment authorize any interference on the part of the judicial department or any other department of the Federal Government with the operation by the States of such public schools as they might in their discretion see fit to establish and operate;

"That by said cases the Court announces its power to adjudge State laws unconstitutional upon the basis of the Court's opinion of such laws as tested by rules of the inexact and speculative theories of psychological knowledge, which power and authority is beyond the jurisdiction of said Court;

"That if the Court is permitted to exercise the power to judge the nature and effect of a law by supposed principles of psychological theory, and to hold the statute or constitution of a State unconstitutional because of the opinions of the judges as to its suitability, the States will have been destroyed, and the indestructible union of indestructible States established by the Constitution of the United States will have ceased to exist, and in its stead the Court will have created, without jurisdiction or authority from the people, one Central Government of total power;

"That implementing its decision relating to public education of May 17, 1954, said Court on May 31, 1955, upon further consideration of said cases, said: 'All provisions of Federal, State, or local law * * * must yield' to said decision of May 17, 1954; said Court thereby presuming arrogantly to give orders to the State of Florida;

"That it is clear that said Court has deliberately resolved to disobey the Constitution of the United States, and to flout and defy the supreme law of the land;

"That the State of Florida, as is also true of the other sovereign States of the Union, has the right to enact laws relating to subversion or espionage, criminal proceedings, dismissing public employees who refuse to answer questions concerning their connections with communism and 'right to work' protection, and has the right to operate and maintain a public school system utilizing such educational methods therein as in her judgment are conducive to the welfare of those to be educated and the people of the State generally, this being a governmental responsibility which the State has assumed lawfully, and her rights in this respect have not in anywise been delegated to the Central Government, but, on the contrary, she and the other States have reserved such matters to themselves by the terms of the 10th amendment. Being possessed of this lawful right, the State of Florida is possessed of power to repel every unlawful interference therewith;

"That the duty and responsibility of protecting life, property and the priceless possessions of freedom rests upon the government of Florida as to all those within her territorial limits. The State alone has this responsibility. Laboring under this high obligation she is possessed of the means to effectuate it. It is the duty of the State in flagrant cases such as this to interpose its powers between its people and the effort of said Court to assert an unlawful dominion over them: Therefore be is further

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida (the Senate concurring)—

"SECTION 1. That said decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States denying the individual sovereign States the power to enact laws relating to espionage or subversion, criminal proceedings, the dismissal of public employees for refusal to answer questions concerning their connections with communism, 'right to work' protection, and relating to separation of the races in the public institutions of a State are null, void, and of no force or effect.

"SEC. 2. That the elected representatives of the people of Florida do now seriously declare that it is the intent and duty of all officials, State and local, to observe, honorably, legally and constitutionally, all appropriate measures available to resist these illegal encroachments upon the sovereign powers of this State.

"SEC. 3. That we urge firm and deliberate efforts to check these and further encroachments on the part of the Federal Government, and on the part of said Court through judicial legislation, upon the reserved powers of all the States powers never surrendered by the remotest implication but expressly reserved and vitally essential to the separate and independent autonomy of the States in order that by united efforts the States may be preserved.

"SEC. 4. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by His Excellency the Governor to the governor and legislature of each of the other States, to the President of the United States, to each of the Houses of Congress, to Florida's Representatives and Senators in the Congress, and to the Supreme Court of the United States for its information."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint Resolution 2

"Requesting the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to provide for higher prices for raw sugar

"Whereas the sugar industry of the Territory of Hawaii is one of the major industries of the Territory and is a major contributing factor to the economy of the Territory; and

"Whereas there are many small independent growers of sugarcane in the Territory whose sole livelihood depends upon the prices received for raw sugar processed from their sugarcane; and

"Whereas the consumer price index has increased substantially while the yearly average price of raw sugar in the New York market has remained at approximately the same level since the year 1947, such yearly average prices being: 1947, $124.33; 1948, $111.37; 1949, $116.12; 1950, $118.65; 1951, $121.21; 1952, $125.27; 1953, $125.76; 1954, $121.80; 1955, $119.02; and 1956, $121.76; and

"Whereas during the same period of time, the cost of labor, material, and supplies necessary in the production of sugarcane and the cost of living have greatly increased; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States has authority under the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, to provide quotas for the marketing of raw sugar which will result in higher returns to sugarcane producers in the domestic sugar industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii—

"SECTION 1. The Secretary of Agriculture of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to take such action as is authorized under the terms of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, as will result in substantial increases in the price of raw sugar on the New York market.

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

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

"Approved this 23d day of April 1957.

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

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

"Joint Resolution 1

"Requesting the Congress to enact legislation providing for the admission of Hawaii to statehood

"Whereas Hawaii was annexed to the United States by agreement between the government of the people of Hawaii, which was then an independent Republic, and the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas under said agreement Hawaii was to become, and did become, an integral part of the United States; and

"Whereas in fulfillment of the terms of the Newlands resolution of annexation the Congress enacted the Hawaiian Organic Act, which constituted Hawaii an incorporated organized Territory; and

"Whereas every incorporated organized Territory in the history of the United States, except Alaska and Hawaii, has invariably been granted statehood upon the successful completion of a reasonable period of pupilage; and

"Whereas inherent in the public acts under which Hawaii became an integral part of the United States and was created an incorporated organized Territory, was the implied promise of ultimate statehood on an equal footing with the original States, upon the fulfillment of the traditional requirements for admission as a State established and followed in the admission of every previously incorporated organized Territory; and

"Whereas this implied promise has been repeatedly acknowledged by the executive and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and by the Congress of the United States, especially in the reports of committees of the Congress duly adopted by the Congress relating to statehood for Hawaii; and

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated their political maturity, their ability to govern themselves in accordance with the principles of representative government laid down by the United States Constitution, and their ability to maintain themselves as a sound economic unit; and have fully unequivocably met every historic qualification for statehood; and

"Whereas Hawaii is fully qualified for statehood, as has been found repeatedly by congressional committees holding hearings thereon; and

"Whereas Hawaii has adopted a constitution formed by a convention of duly elected delegates and ratified by the people, which constitution is republican in form, in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and in every other respect meets the requirements for admission of the State; and

"Whereas the people of Hawaii are ready to elect State officers, and Senators and Representatives in Congress, as shown by the adoption of suitable legislation therefore to take effect immediately upon authorization of such elections by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii—

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation providing for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union

"SEC. 2. This legislation does hereby reaffirm the desire and will of the people of Hawaii that statehood be granted them, and does hereby reassert that fulfillment of the rights of the people of Hawaii calls for enactment of statehood legislation without further delay.

"SEC. 3. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the said Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of said House of Representatives, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 21st day of March 1957.

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

"Joint Resolution 3

"Requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide for the employment and compensation of employees of the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii in accordance with the laws of the Territory of Hawaii

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to amend section 106 of the Hawaiian Organic Act substantially as set forth in the following form of bill:

"'A bill to amend section 105 of the Hawaiian Organic Act

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"'SECTION 1. That section 106 of the Hawaiian Organic Act be amended by amending the last sentence of the first paragraph to read as follows:

"'"The board shall likewise have power to appoint and remove clerks, wharfingers and their assistants, pilots and pilot-boat crews, and all such other employees as may be necessary, and to fix their compensation, in accordance with the laws of the Territory; to make rules and regulations pursuant to this section and not inconsistent with law; and generally shall have all powers necessary fully to carry out the provisions of this section."

"'SEC. 2. That the employees of the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii on the effective date of this act shall continue in employment, subject to suspension, demotion and dismissal as provided in the civil service laws of the Territory of Hawaii as amended from time to time.

"'SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

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

"Approved this 25th day of April 1957.

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

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Joint Resolution 4

"Requesting the Congress of the United States to extend the provisions of section 373 of the Judicial Code to the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii

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

"SECTION 1.—The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact a bill substantially as follows:

"'A bill amending section 373 of the Judicial Code so as to extend the application thereof to the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 373 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. 373) is hereby amended by inserting after the words "any justice of the supreme court" the following: "or judge of a circuit court."

"'SEC. 2. This act shall apply to any judge of a circuit court of the Territory of Hawaii who, after the approval of this act, resigns, fails of reappointment, or is removed by the President upon the ground of mental or physical disability. Any such judge shall be credited, in the computation of the aggregate years of judicial service, with service, whether before or after the approval of this act, in any of the courts referred to in the first paragraph of section 373 of the Judicial Code, as amended by this act.

"'Any judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii who, after the approval of this act, resigns, fails of reappointment, or is removed by the President upon the ground of mental or physical disability, shall be credited, in the computation of aggregate years of judicial service, with his service in a circuit court of the Territory of Hawaii, whether before or after the approval of this act, as well as service in the other courts referred to in the first paragraph of section 373 of the Judicial Code.

"'SEC. 3. This bill shall take effect upon its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this resolution, upon its adoption, shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

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

"Approved this 26th day of April 1957.

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

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii the remaining public lands and the authority to legislate in respect thereto, as set forth in Joint Resolution 4 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955

"Whereas by Joint Resolution 4 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, the legislature requested the Congress of the United States to enact a bill transferring to the Territory of Hawaii the remaining public lands and the authority to legislate in respect thereto, substantially as set forth in the form of bill for the enactment of which the legislature petitioned by said Joint Resolution 4 of the 1955 session; and

"Whereas the recitals contained in said joint resolution show that the period of retention by the United States of the title to and authority over the public domain of Hawaii already has been unduly protracted; and

"Whereas the laws governing the public lands of Hawaii require amendment and revision, and it repeatedly has been necessary to resort to the Congress of the United States for legislation as to matters with which the Congress should not be burdened, and which the Legislature of Hawaii is capable of handling as demonstrated by the fact that the Congress has approved the measures submitted to it by the legislature; and

"Whereas the delays incident to the necessity of obtaining congressional legislation whenever amendment or revision of the laws relating to the public domain is required, are detrimental to the economic welfare of the people of Hawaii; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the 29th legislature (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact legislation substantially in the form set forth in Joint Resolution 4 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, entitled 'Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii the title to the remaining public lands and other public property in Hawaii, and to enact new provisions as to the authority of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of such property and other lands under the jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption, shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the said Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of said House of Representatives, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the Secretary of the Interior."

A resolution adopted by the Associated Church Press, at Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Mountain-Pacific States Conference of Public Service Commissions, at Phoenix, Ariz., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the mineral-leasing laws so as to enlarge limitation on coal lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Homer Hayes, of Ironton, Ohio, relating to legislative processes in the enactment of legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Toledo, Ohio, Chamber of Commerce, signed by Arthur C. Kochendorfer, executive manager, remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 1, providing Federal aid for school construction, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Jonas Matulionis, president, Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, New York, N. Y., expressing sympathy at the death of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy; ordered to lie on the table.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon State Legislature has recently passed House Joint Memorial 13 calling for enactment of legislation to grant a Federal charter of incorporation to the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America.

My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I have introduced Senate bill 1407 to grant a Federal charter of incorporation

to this deserving veterans organization, and we have been assured by the chairman [Mr. O'MAHONEY] of the Senate Judiciary Standing Subcommittee on Charters, Holidays and Celebrations, that hearings will be held on our bill.

Mr. President, the organization of Veterans of World War I of the United States of America is the only veterans organization whose membership is made up exclusively of World War I veterans. This rapidly growing veterans organization has 175,000 members, with members in all 48 States and Territories.

Of the patriotic Americans who served our Nation in the First World War 39 years ago, 2,995,000 were living on March 30, 1957. Their average age was 63 years. Twenty-four years separate the service of the veterans of World War I from the beginning of the Second World War. I feel that it is very appropriate that veterans of the first Great War should have their own veterans organization.

On behalf of my colleague [Mr. MORSE] and myself I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, House Joint Memorial 13 of the Oregon Legislature, and that it be appropriately referred.

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

House Joint Memorial 13

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 49th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas there is at present no federally chartered veterans' organization composed exclusively of veterans of America's First World War; and

Whereas there has now been organized a veterans' organization composed exclusively of World War I veterans, known as the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc.; and

Whereas the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., has a growing membership already numbering 175,000 nationally, with members in all the 48 States and the Territories; and

Whereas the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., have organized barracks (posts) in 45 States; and

Whereas the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., is the only veterans' organization of national character organized to maintain and perpetuate the memories and interests of World War I, exclusively: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to grant to the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., a Federal charter of incorporation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate April 23, 1957.

EDITH BYNON LOW,
Chief Clerk.

BOYD R. OVERHULSE,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house April 18, 1957.

PAT DOOLEY,
Speaker of House.

By Mr. THYE:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Resolution Relating to Employment Problems of Workers in the 50 to 64 Age Group

"Whereas the people of the State of Minnesota and the Minnesota Legislature are becoming increasingly aware of the problems confronting older workers in their search for employment; and

"Whereas, every recent study has shown that persons in the age group 50 to 64 are acutely affected by age restrictions in hiring policies and practices; and

"Whereas the number of persons in the total labor force in the State of Minnesota has increased 8 percent since 1950 and is expected to increase 13 percent by 1960 and 42 percent by 1975; and

"Whereas the number of persons in the age group 50 to 64 in the labor force in the State of Minnesota has increased 15 percent since 1950 and is expected to increase 20 percent by 1960 and 56 percent by 1975 and is increasing more rapidly than the total labor force thus intensifying the problems of creating job opportunities for this segment of our population; and

"Whereas, the erection of unrealistic age barriers affecting persons in the age group 50 to 64 has resulted in prolonged periods of unemployment which can create economic hardships accompanied by loss of self-respect and other serious sociological problems and maladjustments associated with inactivity of the mind and body; and

"Whereas these age barriers are inconsistent with the abilities, qualifications, significant skills, and experience of these persons, thereby creating a waste within our economy because of the failure to utilize the services of these persons and to recognize the importance of their potential contribution to our economy; and

"Whereas, recent validated studies reveal that discriminatory hiring policies often are based on erroneous beliefs concerning the abilities and physical capacities of persons within this age group to perform in an employment situation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That the government of the State of Minnesota through its factfinding, public information facilities, and the interdepartmental committee on aging should actively promote the employment of older workers within the age group 50 to 64 through promotional and educational activities among employers throughout the State in an effort to overcome unrealistic policies and practices working against the employment of these persons; be it further

"Resolved, That both the State and Federal Governments give serious thought to the development of job opportunities through the establishment of meaningful, worthwhile projects which would utilize the skills and abilities of citizens in this age group; be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor of the United States and to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"A. I. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

"Approved April 24, 1957.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF DELAWARE LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, urging the Congress to consider favorably a Federal program to improve Delaware waterways.

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

House Concurrent Resolution No. 5

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider favorably a Federal program to improve Delaware waterways

Whereas an oil tanker known as the U. S. N. S. *Mission San Francisco* and a Liberian freighter known as the steamship *Elna II* collided in the Delaware River, near New Castle, Delaware, on Thursday, March 7, 1957, which resulted in a great loss of life, personal injury and much property damage; and

Whereas there have been many other collisions and groundings of vessels in that area in recent years which clearly necessitates an immediate Federal program of improvement of Delaware waterways for the benefit of shipping; and

Whereas the United States Senators from Delaware have expressed their intent to urge Congress to approve legislation which would improve both the Delaware River and the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein), That the 119th General Assembly of the State of Delaware urges and requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation with sufficient appropriation which would make possible the necessary steps to make the Delaware River and the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal safe passageways for all ships, and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the United States from Delaware are respectfully requested to exert every effort and utilize all facilities at their disposal to further said action; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall forthwith be transmitted to the presiding officer of each House, and to the chairmen of the proper committees in the House and Senate of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Delaware.

RESOLUTIONS OF WESTERN GOVERNORS CONFERENCE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the Western Governors Conference held in Reno, Nev., April 26 and 27, of this year.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY WESTERN GOVERNORS CONFERENCE HELD IN RENO, NEV., APRIL 26–27, 1957

Whereas the mining advisory council to the Western Governors Conference has devoted much time and effort to making a comprehensive presentation of problems being faced by the western minerals industry; and

Whereas the contribution of the mining advisory council has provided the governors of the Western States with a wealth of valuable data and factual information: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Governors Conference heartily commends the work of the mining advisory council and expresses thanks for the valuable work accomplished; and be it further

Resolved, That the governors of the Western States, while recognizing that a final decision on each specific recommendation cannot be reached at this time, pledge their continuing study of the mutual problems involved and their full support of the program to provide a comprehensive, long-range solution to the problems faced by the minerals industry, such solution to be based on sound economic principles and not on considerations of expediency.

Whereas the Western Governors Conference fully recognizes and appreciates the efforts that have been made by the Federal Government to help the minerals industry adjust to postwar conditions in a greatly changed international climate; and

Whereas the conference further recognizes the fact that many of these efforts have, of necessity, been temporary in nature and of terminal value; and

Whereas the time has now come that it is imperative that these temporary programs be replaced by sound, long-range programs that will provide a climate conducive to attaining a permanent stability in the minerals industry; and

Whereas this permanent stability can only be achieved if the industry can, with confidence, formulate and carry out long-range plans, including exploration and development and the improvement of techniques of mining, recovery and ultimate use of metals; and

Whereas a stabilized minerals industry is necessary both to a sound peacetime economy in this country and to guarantee the national security in case of war; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the western governors agree that the necessary program can best be expressed in some form of protection for the domestic minerals industry against the differentials in the economic structures of various world producers of minerals; notably the differential between the wage scale in this country, which we wish to maintain, and that of many foreign areas; and that effective steps should be taken to prevent this country becoming a dumping ground for cheap foreign production, and to permit the domestic minerals industry to operate on a basis of normal supply and demand, with only the amount of protection needed to adjust the differentials previously referred to; and

Whereas the barter program was planned and implemented to reduce the surplus of domestic agricultural products through acquisition for stockpiling of free world surplus minerals and metals; and

Whereas such acquisition of surplus minerals and metals has served to stabilize the market price of minerals and metals acquired; and

Whereas the resulting price stabilization has temporarily benefited mines in the United States which produce similar products, through preventing those foreign materials from being offered as surplus in the domestic market; and

Whereas the temporary nature of the barter program makes it inadequate to provide a basis on which the domestic mining industry can justify long-range risk expenditures for exploration and development, critically related to continuity of that industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the barter program be continued and expanded to include all minerals and metals needing such aid and suitable for stockpiling, until such time, not too long delayed, as an equitable and effective long-range minerals policy, based on reasonable and effective import control measures, can be formulated and put into effect.

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in recognition of the need for relief from such tariff reductions, made under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act, as had resulted in imports harmful to domestic industry, did, in 1951, amend the Trade Agreements Act by the addition of an escape clause; and

Whereas numerous recommendations for the relief of domestic industry from harmful foreign imports have been made under the escape clause by the United States Tariff Commission, but most of which recommendations, including a unanimous recommendation in the matter of lead-zinc, have been denied by the executive department of Government; and

Whereas the Congress is charged in the Constitution with the responsibility of regulating foreign trade and commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference of Western Governors unanimously recommends that the legislation introduced before the 85th Congress, providing for review and action on escape-clause recommendations by the Congress rather than by the executive department of Government, be approved by the Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the Congress of the United States and to such branches of the executive department as may be directly concerned; be it

Resolved by the Western Governors Conference, meeting in Reno, Nev., on April 26, 1957, That, in the interest of national defense and the development of new resources within the borders of this country, the Congress of the United States is urged to grant to the oil-shale industry the same depletion allowance for Federal income-tax purposes as is now accorded oil and gas produced from wells.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1556. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries as they affect such States, and for related purposes (Rept. No. 292).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. Res. 78. Resolution to make a study of critical raw materials and resources of the Soviet Union and certain Eastern Hemisphere countries and its effect upon the United States (Rept. No. 288).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 2146. An act to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Rept. No. 293).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 413. A bill to provide for transfer of title to irrigation distribution systems constructed under the Federal reclamation laws upon completion of repayment of the costs thereof (Rept. No. 291); and

S. 1794. A bill to amend section 6 of the act approved July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215), relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Idaho by providing for the use of public lands granted therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvements, of public buildings at the capital (Rept. No. 289).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 864. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota (Rept. No. 295).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 999. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of North Dakota for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State School of Science (Rept. No. 290).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of the report entitled "The International Petroleum Cartel";

S. Res. 122. Resolution to print as a Senate document, with additional copies, certain proceedings of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee containing a statement of J. Edgar Hoover relative to the Communist Party; and

S. Res. 130. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report of the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions.

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

S. Res. 131. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the interim report of the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 126. Resolution providing additional funds for a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States (Rept. No. 294).

LULA B. GREEN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to pay a gratuity to Lula B. Green.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lula B. Green, widow of John A. Green, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 5 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE 59TH REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to print the 59th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1956, as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 136) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the 59th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the

American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1956, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1991. A bill to provide that the United States may be joined as a defendant in certain suits or controversies in the Supreme Court of the United States involving the Rio Grande compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1992. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1993. A bill for the relief of Inge Gertraud Pursel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1994. A bill to authorize certain compensation to members and former members of the uniformed services who were confined as prisoners of war or who evaded capture for a period of 1 year or more, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1995. A bill to provide relief for domestic producers of cobalt, a strategic and critical metal indispensable in the construction of jet engines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1996. A bill to approve the contract negotiated with the Casper-Alcova Irrigation District, to authorize its execution, to provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to the lands of the Kendrick project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1997. A bill for the relief of George Edward Hayes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1998. A bill for the relief of Mother Teresita de San Jose; and

S. 1999. A bill for the relief of Constantinos N. Alivantistos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2000. A bill to amend the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivors Benefits Act to provide that all retired members of the uniformed services who served not less than 25 years on active duty and who thereafter die shall be considered to have died service-connected deaths; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2001. A bill for the relief of AlaLu Duncan Dillard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2002. A bill for the relief of the heirs at law of James Allan Scarborough and Anne Elizabeth Scarborough, both deceased; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2003. A bill for the relief of Jozice Matana Koulis and Davorko Matana Koulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2004. A bill for the relief of George and Emma Clifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 2005. A bill to amend section 613 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the percentage depletion allowance for gold mines; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2006. A bill to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain responsibilities outside the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2007. A bill to amend the United States Grain Standards Act, 1916, as amended to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to charge and collect for certain services performed and to deposit such collections to the credit of the appropriation available for administration of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2008. A bill for the relief of Erdmuthe E. S. Jackman; and

S. 2009. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jytte Starel Synodis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2010. A bill for the relief of Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2011. A bill for the relief of Sarah Russell Lyons;

S. 2012. A bill for the relief of Giuliana Donadel Green; and

S. 2013. A bill for the relief of Rosemary Eggebraaten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 2014. A bill to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for reserve officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By My MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 2015. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to limit the amount payable to any producer in any one year for participation in the acreage-reserve program and the conservation-reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2016. A bill to increase the carryover allowance for peanuts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2017. A bill for the relief of Ahmed Hassan Homayssi; and

S. 2018. A bill for the relief of Erika Haberl Sain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2019. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2020. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LAUSCHE, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2021. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. FREAR (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 2022. A bill to amend section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide an exemption from the minimum wages, maximum hours, and child labor provisions of such act with respect to homeworkers engaged in the making of natural holly, pine, cedar, or other evergreen wreaths; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 2023. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide for the admission into the United States of certain escapees who, because of persecution, have fled from any Communist, Communist-dominated, Communist-occupied area, or from any other area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 2024. A bill for the relief of Wang Kwie Ding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2025. A bill to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1169), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 672 (a), and secs. 5 and 302 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1935 and 1992)), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 672a and 1132); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2026. A bill for the relief of Avelina Montes-Cueto;

S. 2027. A bill for the relief of Vendelin Kalenda; and

S. 2028. A bill for the relief of Sherwood Lloyd Pierce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2029. A bill to legalize maritime hiring halls; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2030. A bill to amend section 1 (14) (a) and section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide an incentive for construction and maintenance of an adequate national supply of freight cars, and to alleviate shortages of freight cars during periods of emergency or threatened emergency, and for other purposes; and

S. 2031. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of trucks and trailers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK (by request):

S. 2032. A bill to improve and extend, through reciprocal legislation, the enforcement of duties of support in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 2033. A bill to provide for the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System to consist of the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2034. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to transfer a noncompetitive specialty from the dutiable to the free list; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2035. A bill for the relief of Juan Krissillas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2036. A bill to amend section 1552 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide that every applicant for correction of his military record shall be afforded an opportunity for a hearing; to require the appearance of certain members of the Armed Forces before the boards for the correction of such records; and to provide for judicial review of the decisions of such boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 2037. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1946, authorizing the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 2038. A bill to authorize the sale of 10 merchant-type vessels to citizens of Italy for use in the intercoastal trade of Italy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2039. A bill to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2040. A bill for the relief of Ramon Notario Boytell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 2041. A bill for the relief of Sala Weisbart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2042. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a fee simple title to certain lands in the Territory of Alaska underlying war-housing project Alaska-50083, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN (by request):

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to amend the act of Congress approved August 7, 1935 (Public Law 253), concerning United States contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and certain associated unions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution designating the week of November 22-28, 1957, as National Farm-City Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of a Freedom Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Public Roads to designate and construct a highway system to be known as the Lewis and Clark National Tourway; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to legislative and administrative action of the Federal and State Governments in connection with the development of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries. Such compilation shall be prepared under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of such Senate document, of which 1,000 copies shall be bound in cloth and 4,000 copies shall be bound in paper. One-half of such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and one-half of such additional copies shall be for the use of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CONTINUING UNITED NATIONS FORCE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in reviewing the multitude of conflicting incidents and cross currents which have composed the still continuing crisis in the Mid-East, one fact emerges which is clear and incontestable. The United Nations emergency force, to date, has been a stabilizing agency in a highly unstable situation.

While France, Britain, and Israel may plead that they were driven to desperation by the situation which confronted them, it seemed to me from the start that the desperate means by which they sought to remedy the situation were doomed to failure. It might have been prophesied that in the event of invasion the canal would be blocked and the pipelines sabotaged. We now know that the leaders of the invading nations were warned of this retaliatory action before the invasion was undertaken. Bulganin, of course, was something more than a prophet. He was an agent as well as a prophet though he was mistaken in the third of his predictions which was that the Arab world would proclaim a holy war. This was beyond the scope of his agency.

There are differences of opinion on these matters, but may we not all arrive at the conclusion that there is no sure reliance on the active use of armed force in the modern world for bringing peace to a troubled area? The existence of that force in the background is, however, an effective factor in negotiations. Its active employment under such conditions as face the world in the Mid-East is something else.

In appearance the United Nations emergency force was an armed force but it was an army with a difference. It was not large enough to engage the Egyptian Army, the Israeli Army, or the combined invasion forces of Great Britain and France. Its intervention was significantly effective but that effectiveness did not arise from its military strength, which was indeed feeble. Its effectiveness lay in being the symbol of a worldwide will for a peace based on justice and freedom. This was animating the United Nations Assembly at the time the force was authorized.

The success to date of this emergency force makes it desirable to consider at this time whether such a force may not usefully be organized as a continuing instrument of world opinion.

Any proposal to this end raises numerous puzzling questions. Among them are: Where shall such a force be based? By what means shall its missions be formulated and assigned? What are the criteria which should determine the wisdom of assigning a mission?

These are some of the difficult questions involved, but they need our earnest study at this moment in time, since the force is in being and its useful possibilities are now evident.

It is for the purpose of bringing this matter under constructive discussion that a number of us are offering a concurrent resolution which will be sent to the desk at the conclusion of my remarks. This concurrent resolution I now read:

Whereas the United Nations emergency force, created pursuant to resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly has made a contribution to international peace and a step toward the maintenance of international peace and security; and

Whereas the need for a force of this character appears likely to continue; and

Whereas we believe that such a force could be useful in other situations now, or in the future; and

Whereas a United Nations force could be an important instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security, both in the Middle East and in other areas of the world: therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

(a) a force similar in character to the U. N. emergency force should be made a continuing agency of the United Nations, that it should be expanded and given special training in observation, patrol, guard duty and arms inspection, and that its arms and equipment be confined to what is required for these specific duties;

(b) equipment and expenses of the force should be provided by the United Nations out of its regular budget.

The nature of this concurrent resolution requires that it be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. It is the hope of its sponsors that it will receive the serious attention of that committee, and that hearings on it will be ordered and held. These hearings are of the utmost importance in that they will bring out both the difficulties and the desirabilities of implementing the resolution.

Mr. President, I submit the concurrent resolution for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) favoring the creation of a force similar to the United Nations Emergency Force for the maintenance of international peace and security, submitted by Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WILEY), was received, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)—

Whereas the United Nations emergency force, created pursuant to resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly has made a contribution to international peace and a step toward the maintenance of international peace and security; and

Whereas the need for a force of this character appears likely to continue; and

Whereas we believe that such a force could be useful in other situations now, or in the future; and

Whereas a United Nations force could be an important instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security, both in the Middle East and in other areas of the world: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

(a) a force similar in character to the United Nations emergency force should be made a continuing agency of the United Nations, that it should be expanded and given special training in observation, patrol, guard duty, and arms inspection, and that its arms and equipment be confined to what is required for these specific duties;

(b) equipment and expenses of the force should be provided by the United Nations out of its regular budget.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred, and that it may lie on the table until the end of the session tomorrow, so that any Senator who wishes to do so, may join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COSPONSORSHIP OF RESOLUTION TO EXPLORE CREATION OF A PERMANENT U. N. FORCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the cosponsorship of the draft concurrent resolution, looking toward the possible creation of a permanent U. N. force.

This concurrent resolution, which has been submitted today by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], is, I believe, an important step forward in surveying a most important problem which we must meet head on, sooner later.

The world has noted with gratification the very important constructive contribution which has been made by the U. N. Emergency Force in patrolling the troubled Arab-Israeli border. The force there has not been a complete success but at least it has been a constructive element in the picture.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN DONE AT TIME OF HUNGARIAN REBELLION

A great many persons have thought out loud: "Would it not have been a wonderful thing if, too, there had been available at the time of the Hungarian rebellion a small constabulary-type U. N. force. It might have been quickly flown into Budapest on behalf of the U. N. It might have served there as a symbol of the conscience of the free world."

That historic opportunity has passed. But who knows when a similar opportunity may arise? Who knows when a U. N. Emergency Force may be needed again?

No one knows, too, what crises the Kremlin may hatch tomorrow.

But we do know that it would be a very fine thing if we could at least take the first review-type steps toward setting up a small internationally recruited police force.

MANY COMPLICATIONS FACE US

But now let me state that this is a subject fraught with difficulties and complications.

What, for example, would be our way of making sure that the Kremlin and its satellites would not attempt to misuse membership of any of their nationals in such a force? What would be the costs of the force and who would defray them and how? What type of weapons would be used?

These are but a few of literally dozens of other major policy problems.

Yet I think the very least we can do is to set up some means to analyze this question, so that we will not be caught napping in the event another crisis comes up and a force becomes needed.

RELIEVE UNITED STATES OF PART OF BURDEN

In my judgment, the availability of such a force could conceivably mean that the burden might be relieved somewhat from the United States.

In other words, instead of always having to rely upon United States forces being rushed into a trouble zone, it would be a fine thing if a small U. N. force were available—with the U. N.'s full prestige behind it because of its very nature.

I hope, therefore, that this draft resolution will be considered shortly by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WOMEN'S FEDERATION

I congratulate the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which has been spearheading the effort toward this resolution. I commend, too, the other civic-minded groups which have been participating in the advance review of this problem.

As I indicated at the outset, it is imperative, in the evolutionary development of the United Nations and its charter, that this problem be given the most careful study.

At the same time, let us not lose sight of the fact that our own Armed Forces must ever be on the alert for a Pearl Harbor-like emergency. The responsibility of our defense rests now, as it will always rest, on our own shoulders.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Danger to the U. N. Force," published in the Janesville Daily Gazette of April 22, 1957, and an editorial published in the La Crosse Tribune on the same subject.

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

[From the Janesville Daily Gazette of April 22, 1957]

DANGER TO THE U. N. FORCE

It is generally conceded today that the United Nations emergency force provided the means to save face for Britain, France, and Israel in withdrawing their troops from Egypt. It may also have prevented resumption of the fighting, for Russian volunteers, promised to Egypt, might have led to world war III. For this the world may be thankful.

The greatest potential value of the UNEF lies in its power to prevent wars rather than to extinguish them. To do this, however, it would have to be a permanent force, not an emergency force.

In the near future there is danger to the world in a possible withdrawal of troops from this emergency force. Today we see evidence that domestic, economic and political pressure may cause the 10 nations with troops in the present UNEF to bring the boys home in the next few months.

This would be tragic for the United States and every other nation, for the force already has proved its value. Many nations would like to give the U. N. the authority to set up a permanent force but this cannot be unless the United States State Department supports it.

It is likely that the United States would have to pay a substantial part of the cost, but that would be cheaper than maintaining our own forces in the danger zones.

The State Department will not support such a development unless the American people, through their Congress, show substantial support for the idea. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, for example, is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, both of which are concerned with United States participation in the U. N.

What part shall the United States play in this matter? President Eisenhower made this explicit in his remarkable inaugural address, which expressed the deepest hopes of the American people.

"We recognize," he said, "and accept our own deep involvement in the destiny of men everywhere. We are accordingly pledged to honor and to strive to fortify the authority of the United Nations. For in that body rests the best hope of our age for the assertion of that law by which all nations may live in dignity * * *. There must be law, steadily invoked and respected by all nations, for without law, the world promises only such meager justice as the pity of the strong upon the weak."

Thus, the first and basic element of world peace is world law, for there is no alternative, in an era of atomic force, to peace. And the United Nations is the sole agent capable of administering and supporting justice for the nations under law.

[From the La Crosse Tribune]

WORLD NEED IS U. N. POLICE FORCE

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY long has been recognized as among the stanchest of our Congressional leaders supporting the United Nations in all its aspects.

Wisconsin's senior Senator has been a bulwark solidly behind President Eisenhower's foreign policy and the potential of the United Nations as the world's truest instrument for peace.

A supporter and defender of the United Nations, a leader who has spoken as vigorously as any for the concept it envisions, Senator WILEY is in high position to perform high service in its behalf.

And to perform it before Congress adjourns.

The time is at hand, indeed it is long since past, for establishment of a permanent United Nations police force.

We frankly suggest to Senator WILEY that he initiate it, sponsor it and level his best administrative efforts toward its ultimate achievement in this session of Congress.

The 10-nation emergency force presently on the line between Egypt and Israel is restive, under pressure of their homelands to take leave. A permanent force, initiated by the United States and, to be sure, paid for in part by this country, must be substituted for the current makeshift.

Such a permanent U. N. force would in nowise approximate the strength needed to stand up to full-scale Russian attack. Not that at all.

Rather, it would be a mobile contingent of token strength, ever alert to the trouble spots, and above all, to be a permanent force representing the free world against which Red aggressors would hesitate to move.

The deterrent to Russian attack would be the potential represented in the permanent force—the free nations of the world—not the emissary army itself, dispatched in mere token strength.

A permanent United Nations police force unquestionably would remove part-time, tentative peace seeking as new and ever-emerging crises arise, and establish in its place the machinery of a perpetual world

constabulary, commissioned for peace and determined for life to preserve it.

We believe in this procedure wholeheartedly. We commend it to Senator WILEY to undertake.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

FREE ELECTIONS IN POLAND AND OTHER CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on May 3 the people of Poland celebrated their Constitution Day. I extend my greetings and good wishes to them. I think this is an appropriate time to resubmit my resolution calling for free elections in Poland and other captive nations in Eastern Europe. I therefore submit the resolution, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 133) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas it has been the historic policy of the United States since the founding of the Republic to give all possible support and encouragement to nations seeking to preserve their independence; and

Whereas Poland and the other nations of Eastern Europe were freed from the tyranny of the National Socialist regime by the combined arms of the victorious powers; and

Whereas the nations engaged in fighting against the Nazi war of conquest pledged themselves in the Atlantic Charter, in the United Nations war declaration of January 1942, in the Yalta Conference, and in many other meetings, to restore these liberated nations to full sovereignty by means of prompt, universal, and secret ballot; and

Whereas Marshal Stalin, operating unilaterally contrary to his solemn commitments, refused to permit representatives of the Polish Government-in-exile, which had led the Polish people through the horrors of war and Nazi occupation, to return to Poland or take part in holding the elections; and

Whereas repeated protests were made by Prime Minister Churchill, President Roosevelt, President Truman, and Secretary Byrnes against this violation of a solemn pledge; and

Whereas the present leaders of the Soviet Union have themselves reported in full the cruel, tyrannical, murderous nature of the Stalin regime; and

Whereas the present leaders of the Soviet Union are now repeatedly stating their peace-loving policies, and their desire to enjoy peaceful coexistence with other nations; and

Whereas President Roosevelt said the American people regarded the restoration of full sovereignty through free elections as the test of American-Soviet relations, and President Truman reaffirmed that position, and President Eisenhower solemnly declared that we shall never abandon our pledge to restore to full sovereignty the nations freed by our arms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the American people are still firmly committed to the vigorous use of American diplomacy to achieve fulfillment of our pledge of freedom for the liberated nations.

SEC. 2. The Senate hereby pledges its fullest support of all diplomatic measures undertaken by the executive branch promptly to bring about in the liberated European countries free elections, with universal secret ballot, held in the presence of diplomatic representatives of the victorious powers, and of members of the press of all nations.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 134), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

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

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following resolutions, which were placed on the calendar:

S. Res. 135. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Lula B. Green; and

S. Res. 136. Resolution to print the 59th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1956, as a Senate document.

(See the above resolutions printed in full, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

MICHELLE PATRICIA HILL (PATRICIA ADACHI)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi). I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2010) for the relief of Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi), introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, 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, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Sgt. and Mrs. Carl L. Hill, citizens of the United States.

COMPUTATION OF BASIC PAY FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers, and for other purposes.

The bill is based upon the findings of the Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation, commonly known as the Cordiner committee, because the chairman is Ralph J. Cordiner, president of the General Electric Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2014) to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an able and informed article entitled "Efforts Under Way To Rescue Cordiner Report on Military Pay," written by Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 4, 1957.

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

EFFORTS UNDER WAY TO RESCUE CORDINER REPORT ON MILITARY PAY—BUDGET BUREAU CHANGES IN PROPOSALS ARE CONTRARY TO STUDY GROUP'S AIMS TO MODERNIZE PAY STRUCTURE.

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U. S. Army (retired))

WASHINGTON, May 3.—In an effort to rescue the Cordiner committee's Report on Manpower Management and Compensation in the Armed Forces from the Bureau of the Budget and to get it before the Congress, John P. Henebry, president of the Air Force Association, in a statement released Tuesday, declared: "It seems a shame that the Congress will not get a chance to give the Cordiner proposals the benefit of analysis."

Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson pointed out, Henebry said, that in his opinion the report could stand up under searching Congressional analysis.

The Cordiner committee, named after its chairman, Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric Co., has spent 10 months investigating the loss of men with critical technical skills in the Armed Forces. It has recommended far-reaching changes in the system of manpower management and compensation in the Armed Forces.

CITES POSSIBLE SAVINGS

If the committee's recommendations were adopted, Cordiner said, savings in defense costs of $5 billion a year by 1962, or earlier, would be effected.

The committee warned the Secretary of Defense, Cordiner declared in a statement March 26, that to achieve such results the Defense Department "could not content itself with simply applying a few patches to the antiquated structure of military compensation which has been inflated but not substantially changed since it was originally adapted from the British Navy in 1912."

Legislation to put the Cordiner committee recommendations into effect was prepared in the Defense Department and submitted to the Bureau of the Budget with a strong endorsement from Wilson.

He declared that the need was urgent and that if the legislation were made effective January 1, 1958, the Defense Department would absorb within its present budget any immediate additional cost.

WILSON URGES APPROVAL

Wilson informed the Bureau of the Budget that the legislative proposals had been worked out carefully after discussions and communications with the President, that it had the unanimous approval of the service Secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff and that in their opinion the proposals were an essential step toward improving the balance of personnel skills and experience in the Armed Forces.

In spite of such urgent recommendations, the Budget Bureau declared the legislation to be inflationary.

This had been answered in advance by Cordiner in his statement of March 26. He said then: "We must begin somewhere to halt and reverse the inflationary trend toward ever higher cost of government, and here, for a small initial investment, is a promising place to start * * * our recommendation contemplates savings and deflationary influence."

BUDGET BUREAU ACTION

As a result of action in the Bureau of the Budget, the legislation now to be proposed will be precisely what Cordiner warned against, namely, application of a few patches to the antiquated structure of military compensation.

Because the legislation did propose increased pay for certain critical technical skills in the armed services, with the object of stopping the 90 percent loss of personnel with such skills as their enlistments expire, it is probable that the Bureau of the Budget feared this would lead to demands for a general pay increase throughout the Government.

In the Defense Department it is felt that this action kills a hopeful business approach toward instituting a modern system of manpower management and compensation in the Armed Forces. It is hard for Defense officials to understand why the administration has disowned the recommendations of its business-oriented committee and its big-business man Secretary of Defense.

The committee was established May 10, 1956, with Cordiner as chairman and Carter L. Burgess, then Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel and now president of Trans-World Airlines, as vice chairman.

Other members were Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University; Charles R. Hook, chairman of the board of Armco Steel Corp., and H. Lee White, a member of the law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft of New York.

The Assistant Secretaries of Manpower and Personnel of the three services also were included in the committee as well as Maj. Gen. H. R. Maddux as staff director. Four retired officers, one from each service, constituted the military members.

The committee's investigations brought out the fact that 500,000 men had to be kept constantly in training to maintain a flow of skilled men to keep intact an effective combat and support force of about 2,300,000.

REASON FOR TRAINING LOAD

The enormous training load is due to the loss of skilled personnel upon completion of the first enlistment or service period. Only 10 percent of the expensive-to-train skills reenlisted. Oddly enough, the lesser skills such as cooks, truck drivers and military police, reenlisted at a rate of about 20 percent after their first enlistment.

As a test for the difference in performance between the average unit today and a unit composed almost wholly of experienced men, the Navy staffed one carrier antisubmarine squadron with experienced personnel.

"Compared with similar squadrons," Cordiner declared, "which had the normal mixture of men at various levels of training and efficiency, the fully trained squadron turned in a performance that was rated 30 percent better. The level of aircraft availability, utilization and air crew efficiency was outstanding. This squadron had no aircraft accidents during its deployment to the Mediterranean as contrasted to nine accidents resulting in complete losses suffered by other squadrons of this same type during the same period.

COST OF ACCIDENTS

The committee noted that the Navy and Air Force calculated that accidents cost them $2 million a day in materiel alone during fiscal year 1956.

"In the Strategic Air Command," Cordiner declared, "the retention of skilled manpower now being lost would increase aircraft-in-commission rates to produce an increased capability equivalent to 6½ combat-ready B-47 wings—an increase in effectiveness of 20 percent."

Gen. Curtis LeMay, commander of SAC, has said he could get along with 10 percent fewer personnel and operate at higher efficiency if the Cordiner committee recommendations were enacted into law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator from Missouri mind if I joined him in sponsoring the bill he has just introduced?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would be honored to have the able Senator from Arizona, a distinguished Reservist, join as a sponsor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL BANK ACT, RELATING TO LIMIT OF AMOUNT PAYABLE IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to limit to $5,000 the amount payable to any producer in any one year for participation in the acreage-reserve program, and to place a similar limit on payments made under the conservation reserve program. Maximum amount payable to any individual under these two programs would thus be $10,000.

Mr. President, let me explain briefly the need for this proposed legislation. At present, by regulation rather than by law, the amount payable to any producer in any 1 year for participation in the conservation-reserve program is limited to $5,000. There is no limitation, either by law or regulation, on the amount payable under the acreage-reserve program.

As a result, big farmers are receiving huge Government payments, while the little farmers are receiving small benefits from the program. Last year 11 recipients of soil-bank payments received, altogether, almost half a million dollars. The payments to them averaged $39,199. Here are the names of the 11 big operators and the amounts received:

Garvey Farms, Colby, Kans	$61,354.50
Adams Bros. & Co., Odebolt, Iowa	49,278.00
George G. Chance, route 4, Bryan, Tex	48,093.00
J. W. B. Farms, Liberal, Kans	45,817.77
Tom Moore, Navasota, Tex	40,793.40
J. E. Shepard, South Windsor, Conn	40,162.55
Dunward Harper, Alvin, Tex	30,737.22
Harry H. Moore, Navasota, Tex	30,282.00
Kupchunos Bros., Inc., Wapping, Conn	29,829.51
McCarthy & Hildebrand, 225 Sill Building, Bakersfield, Calif	29,723.53
W. T. Waggoner Trust Estate, Box 2130, Vernon, Tex	25,113.73

As one result of unlimited payments, nonfarmers are buying farms for the purpose of renting them to the Government.

As of March 15, the Department of Agriculture had executed 56,587 soil-bank contracts, and in about one-fifth of the cases—more than 11,000—all the eligible land on the farms under contract was put in the conservation reserve, the acreage reserve, or a combination of the two.

Complaints from Montana indicate that nonfarmers are buying some farms to put into the soil bank as an investment, while large farmers are buying farms to put into the reserves for a time, but ultimately to add to their agricultural operations.

As a byproduct of the soil bank, we are undermining the American pattern of owner-operated family farming. A reasonable limitation on soil-bank payments, whether conservation reserve or acreage reserve, would help to stop this trend. It may be necessary later to limit payments to actual farm operators if a constitutional way can be found to do so.

A limitation, however, is clearly a first step to halt the further drift of land away from family farmers resulting from the soil-bank scheme.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] joins me as a cosponsor of this proposed legislation. Our colleagues from Montana in the House of Representatives, Representatives LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON, are introducing a companion measure in that body.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following these remarks, an editorial entitled "Soil Bank Grab," which appeared in the April 15 issue of Western Farm Life.

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

The bill (S. 2015) to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to limit the amount payable to any producer in any one year for participation in the acreage reserve program and the conservation reserve program, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The editorial presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

SOIL BANK GRAB

A recent Washington, D. C., announcement reveals a Kansas enterprise received a check for $61,000 for placing 10,000 acres of Colorado wheatland in the soil bank. This was the largest payment made under the soil bank in 1956.

This transaction represents the basic fault of the Government program. We would like to see some Washington official try to explain how this $61,000 payment is aiding the so-called family-sized farm we heard so much about during election campaigns. The fact that the money was paid to a Kansas enterprise for Colorado wheatland is proof that the money did not go to a farm family in need; a family unable to make a living from the soil they till.

It is one thing to be taxed to give agricultural "charity" in the form of soil bank payments to a man who could not make enough money to feed his family. It is something quite different to give $61,000 worth of

"charity" to someone who isn't even living on the land.

We wonder just how long our city cousins will hold still for this sort of thing; how long will it be before the city clerk or office worker making $4,000 to $5,000 per year demands that his legislator stop voting for taxes which gave a "poor" wheat farmer $61,000.

Isn't it time for a limit on payments? Wouldn't this $61,000 have done a lot more good for agriculture in Colorado if 12 farmers had got $5,000 each instead of 1 farmer getting $61,000? Why should any farmer or anyone else be guaranteed more than the average family income, which is about $5,000? Some may even question the latter figure.

Payments to people who actually lived in Colorado ranged from a low of $20 to a high of $13,068 in 1956. The average payment was $669. The average number of acres placed in the reserve in Colorado was 140 acres.

It's time farmers and ranchers demand some system for placing a ceiling on farm payments. If farmers, ranchers, and their organizations don't do it themselves, their city cousins are going to wake up one of these days and do it for them. Whom do you think will give agriculture a better deal?

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937 AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill which I am about to introduce on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been prepared by the Railroad Retirement Board. It contains technical and administrative amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. The bill is being introduced at the request of the Association of American Railroads and the Railway Labor Executives Association. These two associations have approved the Board's proposals, and are in agreement that the bill will not add cost to the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference the bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from G. E. Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives Association, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a general explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2020) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. HILL are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 26, 1957.*

The Honorable LISTER HILL
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: The Railroad Retirement Board prepared the enclosed draft bill containing technical and administrative amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and has discussed the proposed amendments with the Association of American Railroads and the Railway Labor Executives Association. These two associations have approved the Board's proposals and are in agreement that the bill would not add cost to the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems and that it is essential to have it enacted because it would authorize several needed improvements in the administration of both.

The enclosed statement entitled "General Explanation of the Technical Bill" describes briefly the several amendments which the bill would make in the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Since this is a noncontroversial proposal, jointly requested by railroad management and railroad labor we hope that you can arrange for its early introduction and enactment.

We are writing a similar letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Sincerely yours,

G. E. LEIGHTY,
Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association.

W. T. FARICY,
President, Association of American Railroads.

GENERAL EXPLANATION OF THE TECHNICAL BILL

The bill would provide for rounding out to the next lower multiple of a dollar the average monthly compensation and the average monthly remuneration on which annuities are based, but would round to the next higher 10 cents the amount of any annuity. This change would facilitate the construction of tables for computing annuities and would have no material effect on the amount of the annuity.

The bill would transfer from the Social Security Administration to the Railroad Retirement Board the authority to make determinations, for the purpose of applying section 3 (e) of the Railroad Retirement Act (the overall social-security minimum as to amounts payable under the Railroad Retirement Act), of "periods of disability" (within the meaning of the Social Security Act) for career railroad employees (those with 10 or more years of railroad service). This would make possible the exclusion of such periods in determining eligibility for, as well as the amount of, benefits. (At the present time the Social Security Administration makes such determinations for the Board.) This transfer of authority would facilitate administration because, among other things, no special applications for such determinations would be required (applications for disability annuities would be deemed also applications for such determinations) and the Railroad Retirement Board would be authorized to rely for such determinations on evidence obtained in establishing disability for annuity purposes, or obtained for other purposes, such as for sickness benefits.

The bill would clarify the provisions for the payment of annuities, or other amounts due under the act, which had accrued but were unpaid at the time of the annuitant's or other beneficiary's death. If payment in any such case (or in the case of any death benefit) is to be made to a widow or widower, the "living with" requirements would have to be met by such widow or widower. Further, the bill would list more specifically the persons to whom the "residual" benefit of section 5 (f) (2) would be payable, and would limit payment of the "insurance" lump sum of section 5 (f) (1) to the widow or widower of the deceased "employee" or, in the absence of such a survivor, to the person equitably entitled to reimbursement for paying the burial expenses of the deceased employee.

The bill would permit the payment of retirement and spouse annuities in a lump sum on a commuted value basis, if less than $5 a month, just as is now the case of survivor annuities.

Under the bill, the maximum monthly benefits payable to the family of a deceased employee would be calculated after, instead of before, taking into account the deductions required to be made because of the employment of a member-beneficiary of the family; and deductions now required in some cases from a survivor's benefit would no longer be made.

The bill would clarify the provisions for crediting, for survivor benefit purposes, wages covered by the Social Security Act; would simplify the calculation of the average monthly remuneration in determining the amount of survivor benefits; would consider an employee as insured for survivor benefit purposes if he would be insured under the Social Security Act were his railroad service after 1936 deemed to be social security employment; and would provide for the payment into the railroad retirement account (as is provided for the railroad unemployment insurance account in enforcing the provisions of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act) of fines and penalties imposed by the courts in enforcing the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

The bill would also amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act in several respects. Canadian railroad employees would be treated the same as American employees with regard to their rights to unemployment, sickness, and maternity benefits. Of 2 successive days of employment for which only 1 day's remuneration is paid, the bill would consider the first of such days as a day of employment. A day on which no more than $3 is earned would be treated, under certain circumstances, as a day for which no remuneration was payable and, therefore, as a compensable day of unemployment. Finally, the bill would permit the amounts in the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund to earn interest and would consider such amounts as part of the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account for purposes of fixing contribution rates.

With respect to internal administration the bill would authorize the Board to establish a certain number of grades above GS-15; and would authorize the payment of the tuition, expenses, and salaries of employees selected by the Board to attend training courses.[1]

REDUCTION OF INTEREST RATES ON STATE AND MUNICIPAL REVENUE BONDS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes.

The bill, it is hoped, will result in some reduction in the interest rates which States and municipalities are now having to pay on revenue bonds. At the present time, commercial banks may

[1] A provision which would make inapplicable to the Board, under certain circumstances, the restriction in general law on the number of employees in the Board engaged in personnel work, was eliminated from the final draft.

deal in general obligation bonds—that is, bonds which are secured by the general resources of the issuing State or locality—but are barred from dealing in bonds which are backed only by the earnings from governmental enterprises.

At the present time, a limited number of investment dealers have a monopoly on the underwriting of revenue bond issues. As a consequence, a large share of the capital market is not now being tapped. The bill would open up the field to wider competition by bringing in commercial banks, which have been very helpful in the marketing of general obligation bonds. The result would be lower interest rates, which are highly important to the success of public projects in this period of tight money.

The bill is backed by the American Municipal Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, and many State municipal organizations, including the Pennsylvania League of Cities.

Revenue bonds are an increasingly important share of the total of State and local government borrowings. They are being used to finance toll highways, bridges, tunnels, waterworks, sewage disposal systems, electric power systems, ferries, gas works, port development, and, most recently, school building authorities. In recent years, nongeneral obligation financing has amounted to about one-third of the total.

In the last 3 years alone, State and local governments have undertaken 438 issues of revenue bonds, amounting to $4.1 billion. Pennsylvania had the largest number of issues, with 71, amounting to $334 million. Only New York exceeded Pennsylvania in the total dollars involved.

Commercial banks would be limited in their underwriting operations to obligations which are of the same quality as those the banks are authorized, under existing law, to purchase for their own accounts. The present limitations on the amount which the banks may invest in such obligations would not be affected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the amounts of State and local government revenue bonds issued in 1954, 1955, and 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2021) to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The table presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

State, State agency, and local government revenue bonds issued in 1954, 1955, and 1956 which are acceptable for bank investment and would have been eligible for bank underwriting under the proposed amendment of sec. 5136

[In thousands]

	1954		1955		1956		Total	
	Number of issues	Amount	Number of issues	Amount	Number of issues	Amount	Number of issues	Amount
Alabama	3	$14,000	3	$18,250	6	$26,500	12	$58,750
Arizona	2	8,110					2	8,110
Arkansas					1	4,000	1	4,000
California	7	58,550	9	109,300	7	61,295	23	229,145
Colorado	1	10,000			2	9,100	3	19,100
Connecticut	1	100,000	1	1,200	2	154,000	4	255,200
Delaware					1	2,150	1	2,150
Florida	13	84,314	14	83,224	17	66,170	44	233,708
Georgia	5	47,462	9	58,093	6	30,975	20	136,530
Idaho								
Illinois	2	6,235	2	4,450	8	45,150	12	55,835
Indiana	9	47,006	7	20,730	4	8,670	20	76,406
Iowa	2	2,000					2	2,000
Kansas	2	5,000					2	5,000
Kentucky	4	15,425	7	16,690	5	9,425	16	41,540
Louisiana	6	14,850	2	13,900	6	34,425	14	63,170
Maine	1	1,300					1	1,305
Maryland	4	207,590	6	52,851	3	31,567	13	292,008
Massachusetts			2	4,000			2	4,000
Michigan	7	25,922	9	23,690	12	92,525	28	142,137
Minnesota								
Mississippi			1	5,159	1	1,200	2	6,359
Missouri	2	25,000	2	12,627	4	20,900	8	58,527
Montana					1	1,000	1	1,000
Nebraska	3	20,250	2	6,500	4	22,650	9	49,400
Nevada								
New Hampshire			1	2,100			1	2,100
New Jersey	2	49,200	5	84,050			7	133,250
New Mexico			2	9,879	1	5,000	3	14,879
New York [1]	5	745,000	4	79,600	6	71,050	15	895,650
North Carolina	2	2,235					2	2,235
North Dakota					1	2,100	1	2,100
Ohio	5	44,450	3	62,400	7	102,755	15	209,605
Oklahoma	2	9,200					2	9,200
Oregon								
Pennsylvania	12	98,430	22	90,377	37	145,428	71	334,235
Rhode Island			1	3,100			1	3,100
South Carolina	1	1,600			1	3,000	2	4,600
South Dakota								
Tennessee	4	12,200	4	7,500	4	171,745	12	191,445
Texas	10	69,322	12	29,665	14	46,953	36	145,940
Utah	2	7,800					2	7,800
Vermont								
Virginia	1	8,200	1	1,800	1	20,000	3	30,000
Washington	3	14,600	5	54,655	7	238,180	15	307,435
West Virginia	2	4,276			2	3,300	4	7,576
Wisconsin	1	1,250			2	5,450	3	6,700
Wyoming								
Puerto Rico	1	12,500			1	22,000	2	34,500
Hawaii					1	12,500	1	12,500
Total	127	1,773,277	136	855,790	175	1,471,163	438	4,100,230

[1] Includes Port of New York Authority:

	1954		1955		1956		Total	
	Number of issues	Amount	Number of issues	Amount	Number of issues	Amount	Number of issues	Amount
Bistate, New York and New Jersey	1	$20,000	2	$46,000	2	$55,000	5	$121,000

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], a bill to amend section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

In conjunction with the bill, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a significant news article and column which appeared in the Wilmington Morning News of Monday, November 26, 1956, by William P. Frank, a columnist, that explains the background for the necessity of offering this bill.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation would exempt homeworkers engaged in the making of natural holly wreaths from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

For the information of the Senate, I desire to point out that Representative HASKELL, of Delaware, and Representative MILLER of Maryland are today introducing identical bills in the House.

Mr. President, I ask that this proposed legislation be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article and column will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2022) to amend section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide an exemption from the minimum wages, maximum hours, and child labor provisions of such act with respect to homeworkers engaged in the making of natural holly, pine, cedar, or other evergreen wreaths, introduced by Mr. FREAR (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. BUTLER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The article and column are as follows:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of November 26, 1956]

HOLLY-WREATH WORK IN SUSSEX FEARED WRECKED BY RULING

(By William P. Frank)

Washington bureaucracy has hacked away a good chunk of the traditional natural holly wreath business in Sussex County.

And at the same time, it looks like a mighty slim Christmas for about 1,000 families in the Sussex area that have depended upon the interstate holly-wreath business for the needed extra dollars around this time of the year.

The United States Department of Labor has ruled that these folks who make holly wreaths in their homes—after they themselves have gathered the holly—are subject to the $1 an hour minimum wage from the wholesale distributors who must also keep detailed and minute records of each member of each family, just as if they were crocheting infants' wear at home and selling the clothing to interstate distributors.

Leroy B. Truitt, of Bridgeville, whose family has been in the holly-wreath business for more than half a century, says that these provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as applied this year to wreath making, has put him and others out of business for two principal reasons:

1. They don't feel they can pay the required $1 an hour minimum wage for holly wreaths made at home, without pricing the product out of the market.

2. It is impossible for them to keep the necessary detailed records of the hours worked by the families—and they couldn't ever swear that children in the homes didn't help in making of the wreaths.

Mr. Truitt explains:

"We had always presumed that harvesting holly in the Sussex woodlands and making Christmas wreaths came under the category of agricultural products—and thus was exempted from the wages-and-hours provision. Now we learn to our dismay that this is not agricultural but in the same category as clothing, jewelry, dolls, and so forth, made at home and sold to distributors."

Mr. Truitt already has a fat file of letters, appeals, replies, and counterreplies—all adding up to the same answer from the United States Department of Labor:

"We are sorry, but you are governed by a court decision in a home knitting industry case."

APPEALED TO PRESIDENT

Even a direct appeal to President Eisenhower, on the part of Mr. Truitt, has failed to make a dent in the Department of Labor's attitude.

"And so we are out of business," Mr. Truitt concludes.

Beaten at every turn and baffled every time he made an appeal from one official to another in the United States Department of Labor, Mr. Truitt has sent out word to the families expecting to sell him holly wreathes, that his drivers will not be picking up the wreaths this year.

However, before he did this, Mr. Truitt went to Washington 10 days ago and made a last ditch appeal in person to Newell Brown, Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor. He presented Mr. Brown with every imaginable alternative that might satisfy the Government and still permit him to remain in business.

But when it was all said and discussed, Mr. Truitt says he got the same answer: "We are very sorry. This phase of the Wage and Hour section of the Fair Labor Standards Act may be inequitable as far as you are concerned but there is nothing we can do now."

About 125 families in the Bridgeville area have been making and selling natural holly wreaths to Mr. Truitt for years.

Another 300 have been delivering wreaths to a neighbor of Mr. Truitt—Layton and Owens, of Bridgeville.

Also affected are another 400 families who have been making wreaths for two dealers in the nearby town of Federalsburg, Md. They are Raymond O. Dean and John N. Wright, Jr., both of whom have been handling wreaths since the early 1920's.

And it is figured that another 175 or 200 families sprinkled through Sussex and nearby Eastern Shore areas shop around from dealer to dealer, selling their homemade wreaths.

CAN'T DO BUSINESS

With Mr. Truitt as their spokesman, none of these dealers see how they can handle these homemade wreaths—keep the necessary records, pay the $1 an hour minimum wage and still make any kind of a profit for themselves.

As for the families who had been banking on the natural holly wreath business this year, it's up to them to decide what they want to do—either find some other way of earning Christmas money or try to get their product into the Delaware retail market; however, few of them know anything about distributing such products in a highly competitive market.

It is learned that 1 or 2 of the holly wreath distributors may try to set up plants in their buildings and get members of the families to come in and make the wreaths there—and thus will be solved the question of keeping records. But even then, the $1 an hour minimum presents a problem of how to get even a small profit on the wreaths.

"Our main difficulty," Mr. Truitt said on behalf of the distributors who depended on the homemade wreaths, "is that we can't ever tell how many hours the various members of the families worked, from the time they left home to gather the holly until the time our drivers picked up the finished product."

"Nor can we ever tell if any children helped with the making of the wreaths at home.

"All that we know is that we supply the artificial berries along about this time of the year, and soon after Thanksgiving Day our drivers begin picking up the wreaths at the homes."

PAY PER WREATH

"We pay the families so much per wreath and we also pay the drivers so much for collecting the wreaths.

"In turn we take care of the costs of grading, packing, and shipping. A few years ago we shipped wreaths into 36 States of the Union plus parts of Canada and Central America. Sussex County holly wreaths have always been considered the best.

"I have now canceled buying orders for shipping cartons and some other supplies, but, unfortunately, I've been caught with a lot of artificial berries on hand. I'm also informing my customers that I've been forced out of business."

Mr. Truitt joined his father, the late William Truitt, of Bridgeville, in the natural holly wreath business in 1927. His father had already been in it since 1905.

During the depression of the 1930's it was the heavy holly growth in Sussex County that kept many a family in money around Christmas time, for no matter how bad the times were, there were always people willing to spend a few nickels for natural holly wreaths.

At first the industry in Sussex depended upon the natural berry, but in the 1920's it was found that artificial berries served the purpose better.

In the early days of the industry the wreaths were shipped in wooden boxes. But during World War II it was found that heavy paper cartons would do just as well and they have been used ever since.

FAMILY PROJECT

Along about this time of the year, in preparation for the business, hundreds of the low income rural and farm families in Sussex County would begin cutting switches in the woods for 9-inch hoops, the base of the wreath.

Then they would commence gathering in the holly and often the whole family would sit around in kitchens day and night making the wreaths, according to a standard 14-inch overall size.

Some would also make special oversized wreaths of holly and wreaths of pine and cedar and what is known as crow's foot.

Late this summer Mr. Truitt put in his stock of artificial berries and was about to get his shipping cartons when, on September 10, he met a wreath competitor at a bank.

Mr. Truitt said to him casually, "I guess it'll soon be time to get going on holly wreaths."

The competitor smiled and said, "Roy, you may not know it, but I'm afraid you're out of business."

That was news to Mr. Truitt.

Gradually it was unfolded to him. He had presumed all along that natural holly came

under the exemptions provided for agricultural products.

He was soon to learn how wrong he was. His competitor had learned about it from an inspector for the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor.

Homemade holly wreaths, intended for interstate shipment come under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, recently amended to carry with it a $1 an hour minimum.

SEES SENATOR WILLIAMS

Mr. Truitt began to make inquiries. Here is a sample of the answers he got:

From United States Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS (whose son-in-law, Raymond Baker, Jr., of Millsboro, has also been in the wreath business and is now adversely affected by the Labor Department ruling):

"The Department of Labor has ruled that the makers of holly wreaths in the home, as well as the work done at the plant are all subject to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act."

* * * * *

Senator WILLIAMS continued:

"I pointed out to the Department that it was not so much the question of cost involved as it was the almost impossibility of maintaining wage records of the makers in the homes and the impossibility for the buyer to be able to certify that no child under the age of 16 in the home had assisted in the making of the wreaths."

But Senator WILLIAMS got the same adamant position of the Department of Labor that was later to be given Mr. Truitt:

REVIEWED PROBLEM

"I have reviewed the entire subject of whether the people who enter into arrangements with dealers to make holly wreaths for them are doing this work as employees of the dealers under the Fair Labor Standards Act. I have secured the legal advice of the Solicitor of Labor on the matter.

"The conclusion is that this situation falls squarely within the broad scope of the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the case of *Durkin* v. *Wagner*. The persons engaged in making holly wreaths for the dealers are therefore employes of the dealers and no minimum wage exemption under the act is available for this work.

"The dealers must be held responsible for compliance with the act with respect to all those with whom this type of arrangement is made.

"I recognize fully the difficulties that this entails for the holly wreath makers but can reach no other conclusion in the light of the facts and the legal situation under the ruling decision of the Court of Appeals."

United States Representative Harris B. McDowell, Jr., referred the case late in September to GRAHAM A. BARDEN, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BARDEN made a strong appeal to Administrator Brown for an exception in the case of the holly wreath dealers and makers.

Congresseman BARDEN wrote: "Farmers have been making holly wreaths on their farms since the time of the Pilgrims. Such policies as these (of the United States Department of Labor) are contemptuous of the clear congressional intent to exempt agriculture in all its branches from this law."

But Administrator Brown was not moved. He gave the Congressman virtually the same answer he had given Mr. Truitt and his associates in Sussex County.

In the meantime, the National Chamber of Commerce has been interested in this particular case, since it involves small business and Mr. Truitt has been getting inquiries from all parts of the country, particularly from representatives of other little businesses that claim to have been hampered by a strict construction of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

There is one hope for the holly wreath business: An amendment to the law but that couldn't come until next year—if at all.

"I suspect," Mr. Truitt said, "that the lawyers for the Department of Labor will object even though they are told by everyone that the law is operating inequitably against us."

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of November 26, 1956]

FRANKLY SPEAKING

(By Bill Frank)

A Negro woman who lives on the Laurel Road near Bridgeville, is in for a shock, that is, if she hasn't already gotten the shock.

The United States Government which she, in her own way, presumes is geared to protect her, has given her a foul blow.

And the chances are she doesn't understand what it's all about, except that she's got on hand 1,000 hoops, made of switches, which she had expected to mean extra Christmas money for her.

I use the word "extra" too loosely. I should have said just plain "money."

Details of this story are to be found on page 1 of today's Morning News. It's a story about how the redtape of Washington bureaucracy is snarling up a good portion of the Sussex County holly wreath business into a terrible mess, and the redtape, believe me, is no part of the Yuletide decorations.

When I heard this story from Leroy Truitt, of Bridgeville, I couldn't believe it.

I met him in Bridgeville about a week ago and as he unrolled his yarn I kept saying to myself:

"This is the balmiest story I've heard in my life."

But if you know Leroy Truitt, you know then that he's an extremely practical man, that he's not given to handing out balmy stories, and that when he tells you something he's dead serious about it.

It wasn't until I went through the batch of correspondence he had had from Washington and the letters he has sent out—even to President Eisenhower—that I realized that this Government interference with the holly wreath business in Sussex County and on the nearby Eastern Shore is just about the craziest thing I've ever heard of—bar nothing.

Now, how does all this affect the Negro woman on the Laurel Road?

Here's the story—a sort of a footnote to this morning's page 1 story about the withered holly wreath business:

For the past month or so, this woman has been going out into the fields and cutting switches from saplings.

Then she's been going home and, through the evenings and on weekends, has been tying them into hoops, 9 inches in diameter.

She's been expecting a driver from Mr. Truitt ever since the middle of November to deliver to her a lot of artificial berries attached to green stems.

Then, she's go out into the woods and cut a heap of holly. And she'd begin to work—either by herself or with the rest of her family—on holly wreaths for the Christmas trade.

She'd turn out scores of holly wreaths—about 14 inches overall diameter, with these artificial berries sprinkled through the leaves.

Then, along about this time, Mr. Truitt's driver would come along, pick up the wreaths, and pay her so much per wreath.

She'd make money. The driver would make some extra money.

Mr. Truitt would then ship these wreaths to all parts of the United States, into Canada, and even some sections of South America where the Sussex holly wreath is admired.

So he'd make some money.

The retailers in those far away places would make money. And so the whole gamut, all along the line—from the Negro woman on the Laurel Road to the retailer in let's say, Fort Wayne, Ind., would make money.

But all this has been killed by a ruling of the Wages and Hours Division of the United States Department of Labor.

Mr. Truitt has been informed—as you perhaps have already noted in today's story—that this Negro woman comes under the protection of the minimum hours and wages section of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

She must get a minimum of $1 an hour. She herself must keep records as to the hours she's worked on these wreaths.

Mr. Truitt must keep records. Records, and more records, and more records.

It almost seems to me that the philosophy is:

"To hell with business, as long as we keep those blasted records."

And, yes; get this, even if Mr. Truitt could keep such records, even if the Negro woman on the Laurel Road could keep records, and even if Mr. Truitt could pay her a $1 an hour minimum, even then, if someone could prove that a kid below 16 years of age so much as fixed one solitary berry to a wreath, Mr. Truitt would be in a first class pickle.

So, he's out of the wreath business this year—and it's the first time the Truitts have not been in it for half a century.

As for the Negro woman on the Laurel Road—she's either got to find some other outlet for her wreaths, with or without berries, or she's got to dump those 1,000 sapling hoops in the fire.

And, of course, no money from wreaths this Christmas.

As the page 1 story notes, this governmental redtape stems from the fact that the Washington bureaucrats say that this Negro woman and the hundreds of others in Sussex who, like her, have been making wreaths at home, are in the same category as the women who have been sewing and crocheting at home.

There seems to be a United States court of appeals decision in such a home-sewing case.

But let us suppose that Mr. Truitt would like to keep records of this Negro woman's work—how in the world is he going to do it?

Let's say that it is her man who gets the holly in from the woods. All right, he starts out in the morning and says he's going to cut some holly. While out in the woods, he hopes to get a shot at a rabbit or two.

So he hunts a while, and cuts holly for a time, and loafs a while, and then cuts more holly, etc.

You try to figure out the time he spends in collecting holly and you're all set for a top desk job in one of the top bureaus of Washington.

And then try to figure out how much time the woman spends at home making the wreaths—in between cooking, making the beds, just sitting around talking, and making more wreaths.

It's just sheer nonsense—this attitude of the United States Department of Labor.

What the Government fails to realize is this: This Negro woman—and there are hundreds of others like her—is in reality a small manufacturer.

She or her man gathers the raw material from the woods, processes the material into wreaths, and sells them to whomever she pleases. She doesn't have to sell them to Mr. Truitt—even if he has supplied the artificial berries.

She's an independent operator and a free enterpriser in a very basic sense of the word.

But that great big wonderful world called Washington, D. C., is out to "protect" her rights under the Fair Labor Standards Act—even if it means no Christmas money for her.

That's right considerate of Washington, wouldn't you say?

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, RELATING TO ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ESCAPEES

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators IVES, JAVITS, COOPER, SMITH of New Jersey, such other Senators as may care to join as sponsors, and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would permit the paroling of a reasonable number of Jewish refugees from Egypt into the United States. It would accomplish this by amending the President's refugee proposals, which deal only with escapees from Communist countries, in order to permit entry of not more than 5,000 escapees who fled from areas other than Communist, Communist dominated or occupied.

The Department of State has approved this proposal, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter confirming this fact written to me by Assistant Secretary of State Robert C. Hill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I applaud the Department's strong endorsement of the purposes of this bill. In part, it is to me recognition of the fact that in the world there are explosive situations which are outside the Communist sphere, and that it would be in our national interest to accept refugees from certain of these areas.

The outbreak of racial or religious persecution would always be a matter of utmost concern to Americans.

The 5,000 escapees a year who could be permitted entry under our bill would come out of the approximately 68,000 escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, including Hungarians, who would be benefited by the President's proposals.

Prior to the Mid-East hostilities last fall, there were some 50,000 Jews in Egypt, many of Egyptian nationality. Reports we have received indicate that from October 1, 1956, until April 1, 1957, 15,000 Jews left Egypt. Of this number, 8,000 have gone to Israel; the rest, chiefly to England, France, and Italy.

There are reports that some 22,000 more will leave or be driven from Egypt in the next 7 or 8 months. Of these, it is believed 13,000 will find refuge in Israel, and the remaining 9,000 in Europe. The United States, it seems to us, should do its reasonable share in holding out a measure of hope for these escapees, some of whom have close relatives here. Our legislation is, of course, not confined to Jewish deportees alone.

As the President's proposals form an immigration pool for present and future victims of Communist repression, our amendment deals in a modest way with the recognition of oppression, regardless of source.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD following the letter from Assistant Secretary Hill, to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2023) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide for the admission into the United States of certain escapees who, because of persecution, have fled from any Communist-dominated, Communist-occupied area, or from any other area, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk until midnight tomorrow, in order that any other Senators, who may wish to join as cosponsors, may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter and bill are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 3, 1957.

The Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Thank you so much for your letter of April 22, signed also by Senator IRVING M. IVES and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, and the attached copies of correspondence pertaining to refugee legislation.

Although the language in the President's proposal as embodied in S. 1006 limits help to escapees from Communist or Communist-dominated countries, I am sure we all recognize the imminent problems of escapees from dictatorship of any kind. To allow the flexibility desired by the administration, I feel your suggestion to permit admission of not more than 5,000 persons from areas other than those Communist-dominated or controlled is indeed a worthy one. The Department of State supports such a recommendation.

May I also thank you for your part in supporting much needed legislation on the problem of refugees and escapees and for your continued interest in all matters pertaining to the Department of State.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.
(For the Secretary of State).

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) paragraph (5) of subsection (d) of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended (1) by inserting "(A)" after "(5)" at the beginning of such paragraph and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following subparagraphs:

"(B) Whenever the President shall find that a situation has arisen causing the creation of a class or classes of aliens who fall within the meaning of the term escapee as defined in this paragraph and that it would be in the interests of the United States to permit the prompt entry into the United States of escapees, he may by proclamation, and within the numerical limits specified in paragraph (10) of this subsection, direct the Attorney General to parole into the United States escapees selected by the Secretary of State, who are within the limits of any country which is not Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside.

"(C) (i) As used in this paragraph, the term 'escapee' means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion has fled or shall flee (1) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, or (2) from any other area, and who cannot return to any such area on account of race, religion, or political opinion; except that the number of escapees who may be paroled into the United States after having fled from any area other than a Communist, Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied area shall not exceed 5,000 in any fiscal year."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 212 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(9) (A) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act or any other law, any alien who is or has been paroled into the United States by the Attorney General under the authority of paragraph (5) of this subsection and has not otherwise acquired permanent residence status in the United States may apply to the Attorney General for adjustment of his status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(B) If it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the alien has remained in the United States for at least 2 years, is a person of good moral character, and that such action would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security, the Attorney General, in his discretion, may record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States. A complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such adjustment of status. Such reports shall be submitted on the 1st and 15th day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the adjustment of status of such alien, the Attorney General shall thereupon require the departure of such alien in the manner provided by law. If neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives passes such a resolution within the time above specified, the alien shall be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival in the United States.

"(10) The number of aliens who may be granted the status of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence pursuant to paragraph (9) of this subsection, shall not, unless otherwise specified by a joint resolution of the Congress, exceed in any fiscal year the average number of aliens authorized to be admitted to the United States for permanent residence each fiscal year since June 25, 1948, by any special acts of Congress enacted on or after that date."

PERFORMANCE OF LABOR AS A CONDITION FOR HOLDING CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor, which proposes to amend title 30, United States Code, section 28.

This section of Federal mining laws has gone unchanged since May of 1872, when it was first enacted into law, and it now states that $100 in labor or improvements shall be required each year, on each mining claim, in order that the prospector or owner can hold title to the claim.

The word "labor" has been defined by various States and Federal courts through the years. However, a great deal of confusion exists when modern

methods of exploration, developed in recent years, have been used for this required work. The definition has, in most cases, failed to include developments or claim work which now are considered standard practice by larger mining companies and by many small operators.

The substance of my amendment is the recognition of geological, geochemical, or geophysical surveys, exploratory drilling, or other recognized means of determining the existence, extent of concentration, or accessibility of minerals on the claim, and making these forms of exploration and development applicable to the $100 yearly labor requirement of the original law.

The Canadian Government has had such a law in action for some time, and the great advances made recently by the Canadian mining industry may partially be attributed to this progressive law.

The big advantage is that it encourages the small miner to better explore his claims with what are now considered standard geological-geophysical methods, when ordinarily he cannot afford such services.

Surely this modern type of assessment work will result in more discoveries than the old method of deepening small prospect pits every year. Geological mapping and geophysical surveys will, even if no discoveries result, at least develop a more accurate picture of the deposits and will facilitate more efficient mining.

In late years, throughout the Western States, it has been the practice of many miners simply to move in a bulldozer and move earth on the claims, as a method of completing assessment work. These excavations are unsightly and tend to cause serious erosion of the area, while often accomplishing little in the way of actual determination of the ore body.

Some States have been more liberal in their determination of the Federal law as to methods used for holding claims; however, many States have not taken modern methods into consideration.

My amendment will not change the mining law in any respect, but will merely define and clarify the term "labor," so as to include methods of exploration developed since the law was enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2039) to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would increase from $9,000 to $65,000 the authorization of the amount which may be appropriated to meet annual contributions of the United States to the International Council of Scientific Unions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received, and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 85) to amend the act of Congress approved August 7, 1935 (Public Law 253), concerning United States contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and certain associated unions, introduced by Mr. GREEN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this increase has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing the proposed legislation in order that there may be a specific joint resolution to which the public and Members of the Senate may direct their attention and comments.

I think I should reserve my right to support or oppose this joint resolution, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the letter from the Secretary of State to the Vice President in regard to it, and a supporting statement by the Department of State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator repeat the statement as to the amount of money required by the proposed legislation?

Mr. GREEN. $65,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is an increase from $9,000 to $65,000?

Mr. GREEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is requested by the Secretary of State?

Mr. GREEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the item in the budget?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator will find out before his committee takes any action on any such increase. While we are very anxious that the State Department have all the money necessary to carry out a wise foreign policy, we are conscious of the attitude in the country to hold spending at a level. We do wish to know whether the item is in the budget or not.

Mr. GREEN. There is a supporting statement by the Department of State, which I do not have with me.

I have here the letter from the Secretary of State to the Vice President about this matter. I would be glad to read it. I do not think I can do it within the time limit. If the time is extended I should be glad to read the letter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] be permitted to include the letter in the RECORD at this point.

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

Senate Joint Resolution 85

Resolved, etc., That Public Law 255, 74th Congress, is hereby amended by striking out the figure $9,000 in the section dealing with the International Council of Scientific Unions and inserting in lieu thereof the figure $65,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 23, 1957.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I submit herewith a proposed draft amendment to Public Law 253, 74th Congress, to increase to $65,000 the authorization of the amount which may be appropriated to meet annual contributions of the United States to the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) and certain associated unions. A more detailed statement in support of this request is enclosed.

Since 1950, the current statutory limit of $9,000 has been insufficient to meet the increased obligations resulting from the increased activities of the International Council of Scientific Unions and the increased number of its associated unions.

At the time of the original legislation was adopted in 1935, there were only six unions affiliated with the council. Presumably the $9,000 figure was considered adequate for a foreseeable future. It did indeed prove adequate for some 15 years which, however, included the period of World War II, when the normal growth of the unions was arrested.

The United States has been a leading member of the ICSU structure. Its delegates have been numerous and active. Their scientific and policy contributions have been of high caliber. An American scientist was elected president of ICSU in 1955 for the period to 1958. Americans have built up a prestige for this country in ICSU that commands the respect of other nations. It is, I believe, in our national interest to preserve this prestige and, in the current state of international affairs, to strengthen it.

Accordingly, it is hoped that it will be possible for the Congress to take action on this request during the current session.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

(Enclosures: 1. Joint resolution; 2. Supporting statement.)

Mr. GREEN. In addition to having the letter printed in the RECORD, I am perfectly willing to have printed the statement in support of the request to increase the statutory ceiling on United States contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and certain associate unions. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed.

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

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST TO INCREASE THE STATUTORY CEILING ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS (ICSU) AND CERTAIN ASSOCIATED UNIONS

The Department of State has reached the decision to request the Congress to enact a suitable amendment to Public Law 253 (74th Cong., 1935), concerned with the payment of United States membership dues to the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) and its constituent unions, in order that the ceiling provided therein be raised to a realistic level.

The National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, as the adhering body to ICSU and its unions on behalf of

this Government and the scientists of the Nation, urges that this proposal be given favorable consideration. The Department is supported by the Academy-Research Council in requesting this legislation as the Federal agency responsible for this aspect of our international scientific relations.

Since 1935, a maximum sum of $9,000 per year has been authorized by Congress to enable the Department to pay the annual United States share of contributions to ICSU and the unions. In recent years, the United States share has turned out to be in excess of the authorized amount. Up to the present, the National Academy, which has been the American adhering member of the ICSU since 1919, has made up the difference in these amounts by appeal to private sources. It has now informed the Department, however, that it is no longer able to shoulder this burden.

At the time that the existing legislation was adopted there were only six unions affiliated with the Council. Presumably the $9,000 figure, established during a period of economic depression, was considered adequate for a foreseeable future. It did indeed prove adequate for some 15 years which, however, included the period of World War II, when the normal growth of the unions was arrested.

Since 1950, $9,000 has been inadequate to meet current needs. Recently, ICSU has assumed new and greater responsibilities. There are today more than twice as many constituent unions as there were in 1935. The sphere of their activity has been greatly expanded to meet the evergrowing need for international collaboration. New unions in such important fields as radio, biochemistry, theoretical and applied mechanics, and the physiological sciences have been established. The creation of other new unions in the future is under consideration, thus providing the possibility of added advantages to the United States through participation.

The Department is of the opinion that, simlar to the procedure followed in 1935, the new legislation should make provision not only for the present but also for the known and calculable future needs, so that it would be unnecessary to request action by the Congress again in the immediate future. The known sum needed for 1957, some $26,000 is practically three times the present authorization. The anticipated needs for 1958 are higher yet ($33,000), as decisions already formulated take effect. Approximate needs for 1960 would be more than $40,000; $65,000 represents the best calculation available for 1965. The Department recommends that the new ceiling be established at this figure, i. e., $65,000, effective as of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957.

Percentagewise, the United States' average share of the present dues structure is approximately 11.5 percent. For some individual unions, the percentage is only 5 percent; in others as much as 19 percent. Prior to the recent increase from $196 annually to $7,800 in United States membership dues to ICSU itself, the percentage for the council was less than 1 percent. It now becomes approximately 16 percent. On the basis of studies made, the Department believes that subsequent to the institution of dues revisions and adjustments authorized and contemplated by ICSU and the unions, the United States' share of the total membership dues will probably be between 15 and 20 percent.

ICSU and its associated scientific unions together constitute a nongovernmental world organization of scientists, such as astronomers, mathematicians, physicists, geophysicists, and biologists. Their objectives are scientific and nonpolitical. Nevertheless, science develops within the framework of national traditions and social institutions, and inside the scope of intergovernmental relations. The administrative policies of ICSU and its associated unions must therefore be formulated within these limitations.

These limitations, however, are flexible. Scientific developments affect national traditions, social institutions, and intergovernmental relations; and changes in national attitudes and international policies affect the development of science.

The obvious reciprocal connection between science and foreign relations has been stressed by the Office of the Acting Science Adviser of the Department in the following terms: "Department support of the scientific unions is more imperative now than before. Scientific activities are more and more effecting our foreign relations and the conduct of our foreign relations is increasingly influencing scientific progress."

Because of this mutual connection between science and intergovernmental relations, the activities of a world scientific organization must be associated with those of governments. This fact of mutual influence was discerned even at the inception of ICSU for its constitution provided for national membership as well as scientific membership. That is, government interest as well as scientific interest was to be reflected in the formulation of its administrative policies.

Under the ICSU constitution, national membership may be assumed either by a government directly, or indirectly through an adhering body representing the interests of the government. The United States, as most other countries, has elected to exercise its membership in ICSU through the national Academy of Sciences (NAS). The NAS is a nongovernment, nonprofit body chartered by the United States Congress in 1863 to serve at once as a learned society and as a scientific counselor to the United States Government. In this quasi-governmental capacity, the NAS represents in ICSU and its associated unions the interests both of the United States Government and of United States scientists.

The United States Congress in 1935 authorized the United States to participate in ICSU and its associated unions. Because of the mutual connections between scientific activities and foreign relations, the Congress stipulated that membership dues to these organizations be paid by the Secretary of State. In order to effect this participation, the Department of State has appointed annually since 1935, on nomination by the NAS, the United States Official Delegates to the general assemblies (where administrative policies are determined), of ICSU and its associated unions and has paid as far as practicable the travel costs of these delegates.

The United States has been a leading member in the ICSU structure. Its delegates have been numerous and active. Their scientific and policy contributions have been of high caliber. An American scientist was elected President of ICSU in 1955 for the period to 1958. Americans have built up a prestige for this country in ICSU that commands the respect of other nations. It is in our national interest to preserve this prestige and, in the current stage of international affairs, to strengthen it.

Aside from the high reputation for the United States that our scientist-delegates have developed, this Government and its people derive a tangible benefit from participation in ICSU and its scientific unions. ICSU and its scientific unions engage in basic research. It is through this effort that order is brought into the technological aspects of such realism as international travel, communication, trade and health. Weathermen, navigators, radio engineers, merchants, health officials, and indeed all individuals could not carry out their normal everyday activities nor could the relationships of one government with other governments proceed in an orderly relation were it not for the basic work performed by ICSU scientists.

But there is another benefit more closely related to international affairs. The delegates appointed by the Department of State indeed have reflected the interest of the United States Government at the general assemblies. They have usually been briefed in the Department before attending the meetings. Position papers have typically been prepared by the Department for their guidance in discussing at ICSU meetings significant agenda items affecting foreign relations. They have accordingly helped in formulating ICSU policy on the International Geophysical Year, admission of new ICSU members, conduct of an international study on the effects of radiation, scientific activities on the Continental Shelf, to name a few instances. The Department has thus benefited directly through an alliance with scientific delegates in channeling particular ICSU activities along courses that help achieve the objectives of our foreign policy.

The Department has made a careful study of this entire matter and has consulted the opinion and advice of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, which adheres to the International Council and its unions on behalf of the United States, so as to be in a position to make appropriate recommendations to the legislature. This procedure has been followed in accordance with the Congressional charter of the academy, which provides that the academy shall serve the Government in this fashion when so requested.

The Academy-Research Council has sought the advice of its Committee on International Scientific Unions, composed of the chairmen of the United States national committees for the 13 unions. The policy committee of the Academy's Office of International Relations was also consulted.

Both the Governing Board of the Academy-Research Council and the special committees whose opinion it has requested consider this matter as urgent and vital because of the importance of the ICSU and its unions to the United States and of the service that they render to this country and to its scientific institutions.

The Department concurs in the strong recommendations made by the President of the Academy that the present ceiling must be raised as proposed above at the earliest possible moment, so that the United States may shoulder its appropriate share of the responsibility which is inescapable.

The following is a list of the scientific unions associated with the International Scientific Council and the year in which the United States first adhered to these unions:

1919 International Astronomical Union (IAU).

1919 International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (IUGG).

1919 International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC).

1920 International Scientific Radio Union (ISRU).

1923 International Union of Pure and Applied Physics (IUPAP).

1928 International Geographical Union (IGU).

1935 International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS).

1947 International Union of Crystallography (IUCr).

1947 International Union of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics (IUTAM).

1948 International Union of the History of Science (IUHS).

1951 International Mathematical Union (IMU).

1953 International Union of Physiological Sciences (IUPS).

1954 International Union of Biochemistry (IUB).

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FREEDOM AUTHORITY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Friday, May 3, was Polish Constitution Day. This is an important day for the freedom-loving people of Poland, because they are justly proud that on May 3, 1791, Poland enacted one of the first truly democratic constitutions in Europe. It is an important day, too, for Americans who watch Poland in her present unhappy plight under a Communist regime which could not hold power for 24 hours without the threat of the Russian Army.

All Americans wish that Poland could again be free and independent of Moscow control. Since the birth of our Nation we have maintained the warmest bonds of friendship with the people of Poland. The destinies of the two countries have been forged in great struggles for freedom which mark their histories. The characters of the people of both countries have much in common. No Communist regime or any other tyrant can long keep the people of Poland apart from their traditional association and friendly interchange with the people of the United States.

For well on to 10 years, the Government of the United States has carried on a number of programs with the objective of ultimately bringing about a return of freedom to Poland and all the other nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. We have made it clear that the Russian Communists violated every understanding with the Western Powers when they annexed by force the once-independent nations of central and eastern Europe. We have taken the position that so long as Moscow continues to occupy those countries against the will of the people, a just and lasting peace is impossible. In doing this we have recognized the basic right of these peoples to self-determination, but we have also cared well for our enlightened self-interest. Even so the American people have made great sacrifices to make those programs to aid freedom possible.

In the year just past there were encouraging signs that our hard work over the past 10 years was beginning to bear fruit. At Poznan the workers rose in open revolt against the exploitation by the Communists. Moscow did not move against those workers in her usual despotic manner for fear of what the entire Polish nation might do.

Then there were other reports of similar acts of defiance against the Communist regimes in Georgia, Ukraine, and other regions of the U. S. S. R.

The rules in the Kremlin openly admitted that Stalin was guilty of a long list of crimes against humanity.

People became so restive within the Communist empire that the regime was forced to promise fundamental changes and improved living conditions. It became unmistakably evident that something had to give behind the Iron Curtain, and it was certain that it would not be the oppressed people. They had already been pressed beyond the point of human endurance.

The Hungarian Freedom Revolution was the answer of an exploited people who found life so intolerable that revolt was the only course open to them. That revolution was a mortal blow for the Communists. It served notice that love for freedom cannot be killed—it can only be temporarily contained and then only by maintaining the total police state which characterizes communism.

In the past few days new reports of riots and mutinies in Poland testify that the urge for freedom cannot be stilled.

All these events give us new hopes that freedom and independence can in various ways be restored to the many nations behind the Iron Curtain, and that a war—with its threat of total destruction—may be avoided. The opportunities immediately before us are great, perhaps the best we have had since the cold war began almost 10 years ago.

There can be little doubt that the Kremlin needs a breathing spell—and needs it badly. Only a few days ago, Mikoyan, when in Vienna, Austria, stated that the Communists had enough problems within their empire to keep them occupied for three generations. You and I know that their real problems are human ones, problems that arise from a police state attempting to impose a ruthless tyranny upon a people.

Our enlightened self-interest tells us that now is the time to press forward, now is the time to pluck the fruit of the many years of hard work and sacrifice on the part of many peoples, including our own, in support of the cause of human freedom. It is a fact of life that over 60 percent of our tax dollar goes for what are generally accepted as programs in the national defense. The threat of Communist aggression against all free nations has required us to establish and maintain these defense programs. If we ever expect to make any substantial cut in taxes, such cuts will only come when we can safely reduce the funds authorized for the national defense programs. We can only make those sharp reductions when the Communist threat against all free people is removed or reduced to a state of ineffectiveness.

There are some signs that we, as a people, may be growing tired of the heavy burdens we have carried during these past years. We may falter in taking advantage of the many new opportunities which are ours to bring peace and justice to our troubled world. If we falter, we will give the Communists the breathing spell they so desperately need. This would mean the hope of millions for freedom deferred, an increase in the prospects of war, and little chance in the foreseeable future for substantial tax reductions.

To help avoid this, I am today introducing a joint resolution to create a Freedom Authority, to be directly responsible to the President, and composed of Americans with special talents for keeping the spirit of freedom strong in those parts of the world where communism has seized control of affairs.

The joint resolution would establish the Freedom Authority as an independent agency for two very good reasons. To place in the State Department which must conduct relations with many of those enslaved nations a new operation aimed at undermining the tyranny there, might tend to confuse or embarrass the other on-going operations of that same Department. Or to avoid such confusion the new Freedom Authority, if placed under the State Department, might be placed under such restraints as to be ineffective.

The placing of the Authority under Central Intelligence seems equally inappropriate, since that is an information and not an operating agency. The independent status of the new Authority thus seems clearly to be preferred.

The joint resolution provides for the appointment of an Administrator with general overall authority, and 11 deputy administrators, each assigned to direct the work of a particular captive country or area.

Appropriations of $20 million a year are authorized.

Grants would be authorized after consultation with the Secretary of State and Director of Central Intelligence, and with the concurrence of a majority of the deputy administrators, to private, nonprofit organizations engaged in broadcasting, publishing, corresponding or otherwise acting to keep the spirit and hope of freedom alive in Communist-dominated countries.

It is not possible to foresee all of the ways in which such an authority would carry out its basic purposes. But the following are some that readily come to mind:

(a) The publication of timely information, both about the Free World and about developments in the captive countries, and the distribution of this material behind the Iron Curtain;

(b) The provision of mobile, short-wave, radio transmitters to facilitate broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain and avoid the systematic "jamming" of foreign broadcasts by the Communists;

(c) The importation into captive countries of increased numbers of small, inexpensive radio broadcast receivers;

(d) The presentation by radio of additional folk-programs for the peoples of each captive country to keep fresh the memory of historic, national traditions and the love of spiritual values, and to reveal the cultural freedom in the non-Communist world;

(e) The provision of special training opportunities for persons participating in exchange programs with captive countries, to enable them to observe and report more helpfully the conditions both in the Free World and behind the Iron Curtain;

(f) The timely arrangement and spreading of programs of noncooperation with the Communist regimes and economic slowdowns that may assist the drives for freedom;

(g) The publication in the free world of works of literature by refugee authors

and poets to help keep distinctive, national cultures alive and developing, despite efforts in the Iron Curtain countries to obliterate such cultures;

(h) The gathering and publication of eyewitness accounts of refugees from Iron Curtain countries exposing the conduct of Communist tyranny there, and so forth.

I, of course, exclude from the intended objectives or activities of such a freedom authority any premature incitements of revolts. This will take careful doing: to keep the hope and will to freedom active and ready, but to help it operate within limits that do not bring down upon it the crushing might of Soviet Russian arms and retaliation. Freedom must carry on the struggle for men's minds and hearts, but seek carefully not to provoke excessive acts that lead to the useless extermination of men's wills and bodies by tyranny. The selection of Deputy Administrators with special knowledge of each captive country and descended from those peoples, will help to make the administration of this program aware of the urgency of action for freedom and yet sensitive to the dangers to kin and friends behind the Iron Curtain.

This freedom authority would direct its efforts at keeping the Communist dictators on the defensive and the forces for freedom on the offensive. It would call into play talents among our people which to date have been too largely overlooked or ignored. In brief, such an authority would lead us to fruits of our efforts over the past 10 years and away from the tragic prospects of war.

I have chosen today as an appropriate time to introduce this measure because it is the first opportunity for legislative steps since Polish Constitution Day. The return of democratic, constitutional government to Poland and all the other enslaved nations is long overdue. It is in our interest and theirs to hasten that happy day. I believe the freedom authority which I propose will contribute materially to that objective.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 87) to provide for the creation of a Freedom Authority, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreifn Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) it is the declared policy of the Congress to resist the spread of communism. The issue between the free and the slave world is essentially whether freedom shall survive. The struggle to preserve freedom, however, is not to be won solely by further resistance to enslavement, but also by keeping alive in the hearts of enslaved people the spirit and hope of freedom. It is the purpose of this act to advance the cause of freedom by providing aid and support to those groups which are actively engaged in maintaining, inspiring, and instilling that spirit and hope.

(b) (1) There is hereby created an agency under the name "Freedom Authority" (hereinafter referred to as the "Authority"), which shall be under the general direction and supervision of the President and shall not be affiliated with or be a part of any other agency or department of the Federal Government. The principal office of the Authority shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the Authority may establish offices in such other places as may be determined by the Administrator of the Authority.

(2) The management of the Authority shall be vested in an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. There shall also be appointed to the Authority, by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 11 deputy administrators who shall each be paid at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Deputy Administrators shall be outstanding citizens of the United States, each with special knowledge of the problems of the country to which he is assigned, 1 of whom shall be of German descent, 1 of Polish descent, 1 of Lithuanian descent, 1 of Latvian descent, 1 of Estonian descent, 1 of Czechoslovakian descent, 1 of Ukrainian descent, 1 of Hungarian descent, 1 of Bulgarian descent, 1 of Rumanian descent, and 1 without regard to national descent to deal with the problems of the other nations within the Communist empire.

(c) The Authority shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a seal which shall be judicially noticed. The Administrator is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The Authority, with the consent of any department or agency of the Government, may avail itself on a reimbursable basis of the services, facilities, and personnel of any such department or agency.

(d) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this act, the Authority—

(1) may sue and be sued;

(2) may adopt, amend, and repeal rules regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and its powers exercised;

(3) may make and carry out such contracts and other arrangements as are necessary or advisable in carrying out its functions;

(4) may determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

(5) take such other action as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(e) (1) the Administrator is authorized to make grants for specific purposes and under specified conditions to any private or semi-private nonprofit organization, committee, or group which is actively engaged in broadcasting, publishing, corresponding, or other activities designed to keep alive the spirit and hope of freedom, and the will to resist enslavement, in persons residing in Communist or Communist-dominated countries.

(2) In making any grant under this act, the Administrator shall advise and consult with the Secretary of State and the Director of Central Intelligence, and no such grant shall be made except with the concurrence of a majority of the deputy administrators of the Authority.

(f) (1) There shall be established in the Treasury Department a special fund which shall be available without fiscal-year limitation for financing the operation and expenses of the Authority. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such fund for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1958, the sum of $20 million.

(2) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the United States shall, with the approval of the President, be made available to the Authority for the purpose of making any grant authorized by this act.

(g) The Administrator shall submit to the President for transmission to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress an annual report of its operations under this act.

(h) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 846), is amended by inserting after "St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation"; the words "Freedom Authority;".

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO DEDUCTION OF CERTAIN TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1951) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by certain physically handicapped individuals for transportation to and from work, and to provide an additional exemption for a taxpayer, or his spouse or dependent, who is permanently physically or mentally incapacitated, and for other purposes, introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], for himself and other Senators, on May 1, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for 1957, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services on May 1, be printed in the RECORD. The report is unusually informative. It deals with one of the great service institutions of our country.

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

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, 1957

THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, 1957—APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Peyton Anderson, publisher, Macon Telegraph and Macon News, Macon, Ga.; Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C. S. C., president, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.; Mr. David S. H. Howard, vice president and director, Charles Millar & Sons Co., Utica, N. Y.; Dr. Deane W. Malott, president, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.; Mr. William G. Saltonstall, principal, the Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H.; and Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling, president, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

APPOINTED BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky; Senator CHARLES E. POTTER, of Michigan; and Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia.

APPOINTED BY THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Representative RICHARD E. LANKFORD, 5th District of Maryland; Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA, 2d District of Minnesota; Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, 39th District of New York; and Representative JOHN J. RILEY, 2d District of South Carolina.

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE BOARD [1]

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,[2] of Massachusetts, and Representative CARL T. DURHAM [3] 6th District of North Carolina.

ANNAPOLIS, MD., *March 15, 1957.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

SIR: The Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy convened at Annapolis on Monday, March 11, 1957, at 10:30 a. m. It was called to order by Mr. Peyton Anderson, publisher, The Macon Telegraph and Macon News, Macon, Ga., who acted as temporary chairman for the purpose of organization. The Board elected Mr. Anderson permanent chairman, and designated Comdr. R. K. Joslin, United States Navy, as secretary, and Comdr. R. N. Adrian, United States Navy, and Dr. W. S. Shields, as assistant secretaries.

Members of the Board who signed this report were present at one or more meetings of the Board.

To facilitate the work of the Board, the members organized into four committees, whose respective membership and functions were as follows:

Committee I: Representative John J. Riley, Mr. Peyton Anderson, Representative Joseph P. O'Hara. Administration; buildings, grounds, and plant maintenance, including financial features. Midshipmen's quartering, subsistence, and budget.

Committee II: Mr. David S. H. Howard, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C. S. C. Department of Seamanship and Navigation, Department of Electrical Engineering, Department of Foreign Languages, Department of Aviation, including Naval Air Facility.

Committee III: Representative Richard E. Lankford, Dr. Deane W. Malott, Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling. Department of Ordnance and Gunnery, Department of Marine Engineering, Department of Mathematics, Department of English, History, and Government.

Committee IV: Representative Carl T. Durham, Mr. William G. Saltonstall. Morale, Discipline, Ethics, Health, Entrance Requirements. Physical Education and Athletics. Extracurricular Activities. Department of Hygiene, Department of Physical Education, Library, and Museum.

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Visitors attempted to view everything in its visitation against the background of the Naval Academy's important and difficult mission. The Naval Academy is a very complex institution with a multitude of purposes that, at first glance, seem almost impossible of achievement in one institution during the course of 4 years. The midshipman is expected to obtain a basic professional education as a future naval officer. Moreover, he is expected to become knowledgeable in many departments of science and engineering, both from the theoretical and practical point of view. The midshipman is also exposed to the humanistic subjects that are part of the education of the whole man. He is likewise expected to be proficient in a multitude of physical endeavors, and lives under a rigorous disciplinary regime that is geared to moral development. In a word, the Naval Academy is expected to impart simultaneously several different forms of education, any one of which would in itself be considered by most educators to be a substantial task for 4 years' work.

Perhaps the greatest compliment that the Board of Visitors could pay to the superintendent, the staff, faculty, and midshipmen at the Naval Academy is to remark that in large measure these many purposes are being achieved. This is undoubtedly due to the traditional devotedness and spirit of hard work that has long characterized the staff and students at the Naval Academy. The observations and recommendations of the Board in this present report are made in a spirit of facilitating the ever more difficult task at hand, and of improving the facilities, procedures, and policies that bear upon the accomplishment of the Naval Academy's mission of producing naval officers characterized by knowledge, skill, professional competence, and character.

The Board, through its various committees, visited all of the departments of the Naval Academy and inspected all of its facilities. As a result of this inspection, and the discussions that accompanied our visit, we would like to record here a few observations. As a general policy, we have attempted to limit our recommendations, in an effort to highlight what we believe to be most important.

FACULTY

The faculty of the Naval Academy includes both officers and civilians. The Departments of Ordnance and Gunnery, Seamanship and Navigation, and Aviation are staffed entirely with officers. The other departments include a substantial or preponderant complement of civilians.

With regard to civilian faculty the Board offers the following observations and suggestions:

The sound policy of granting sabbatical leave is, in practice, likely to be inoperative unless the Bureau of Naval Personnel makes provision for filling the faculty allowance at the Naval Academy well in advance of the commencement of each academic year. This will require additional naval-officer assignments if there are shortages in the civilian faculty. The current faculty allowance of 475 is considered to be an absolute minimum for effective instruction. Measured by the standards employed in most institutions of education a faculty of 527 would be required at the Naval Academy.

The difficulty of recruiting competent faculty, particularly in the engineering departments, is intensified by the fact that recruitment is becoming more competitive among academic institutions as well as between academic institutions and industry. Funds should be made available at the Academy for the purpose of paying the expenses of selected candidates to visit the Academy, or of Academy faculty members to visit appropriate civilian institutions of higher education for purposes of recruitment.

The Board considers that the Naval Academy should conform to accepted civilian practices and urges strongly that funds be budgeted to make the sabbatical leave policy operative and to enhance the opportunity for successful recruitment of faculty.

The Board also ventures the observation that a program of recruitment for civilian faculty might be more effectively administered if this responsibility were given sharper and more precise focus, for instance by placing it more squarely on the shoulders of the educational adviser to the superintendent.

The Board would also encourage continuation of attention to the supply of travel funds whereby members of the civilian faculty may be able to attend professional meetings.

While the present salaries of civilian faculty members at the Naval Academy would be adequate on a 9-month basis, it is the opinion of the Board that on the current 12-month basis these salaries would need to be increased by 25 percent to be competitive with academic salaries generally.

CURRICULUM

The Board would like to register the fundamental conviction that the curriculum could very fruitfully be subjected to an overall evaluation in the near future. Technical developments in the field of electronics, nuclear engineering, and weaponry are developing at such a rapid rate that continual additions to the ciriculum are rendering it cumbersome and unmanageable. A current overall evaluation might be based upon the total mission of the Naval Academy from an educational point of view: what it expects to produce educationally in its graduates. An evaluation might reconsider the possibility of a basic professional, humanistic and scientific education for the future naval officer, that would leave specialization for special courses after the midshipman is commissioned.

This critical evaluation of the curriculum cannot possibly be made during the few days of annual visitation by the Board of Visitors. The Board might consider such an evaluation after it has been made by competent educators, but the evaluation itself would involve months of intelligent and critical study by the faculty of the Naval Academy and outside educational experts.

ADMISSIONS

It appears that the Naval Academy is able to be increasingly selective in its admissions. We recommend that the highest physical as well as academic standards be fully met. We urge consideration of a limited number of visits to secondary schools each year by a representative from the Naval Academy in order to attract even stronger candidates and in order to familiarize public and private schools with the Naval Academy and its requirements. Further provisions may be necessary to encourage particularly able students to come to the Naval Academy without the necessity of wasteful repetition.

LIBRARY

The shelf space is now virtually all in use, but inventory and analysis may result in the elimination of some unused books and in the acquisition of needed space. Additional microfilm equipment will help on this score. Term papers put an increasing demand on facilities and staff. Branch libraries in the new wings of Bancroft Hall may reduce some pressure. The Naval Academy has an adequate rather than excellent college library. To become excellent it needs more book funds, space, and professional personnel.

HYGIENE

Dispensary and hospital equipment appears to be excellent. The staff has sufficient freedom to attend professional meetings and share its specialized experience with others. Both outpatient and inpatient loads appear appropriate for an institution of this size. The hygiene course serves a good purpose and gives this department adequate opportunity to consult with midshipmen.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The Government-supported program of intramural sports, which includes about 2,400 contests a year, is considered of major importance. Every midshipman, besides his

[1] The Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or their designees, are, by law, ex officio members of the Board.

[2] Senator SALTONSTALL was designated by Senator RUSSELL to serve on this year's Board.

[3] Representative DURHAM was designated by Representative VINSON to serve on this year's Board.

curricular work in physical education, participates in intramural sports at least 3 days a week between 4 and 6:30 p. m. Coaching and refereeing are done by midshipmen except in the case of football coaching. The program of varsity sports is not supported by Government funds but by the Naval Academy Athletic Association.

Completion of new athletic and drill areas—new fields and the superb field house—will provide much needed facilities. Improved lighting for outdoor athletic fields is an absolute necessity to enable the Naval Academy to carry out a comprehensive intramural sports program.

PHYSICAL PLANT

The Board was greatly impressed with the urgent need for the construction of new facilities at the Naval Academy to fulfill its present mission. In order to educate and develop midshipmen into capable junior officers of the fleet, the Board strongly recommends expediting the new construction outlined in the master development plan of the Naval Academy totalling $68,154,000. The Board noted that $11,733,000 of that total has been or is presently being expended for new construction and represents roughly 17 percent of the overall program. The Board feels that the accomplishment of this entire program should be expedited, as these facilities are required now to meet the present-day enrollment of 3,600 midshipmen.

The Board finds that grave deficiencies still exist in the housing of midshipmen and single enlisted personnel; in academic facilities; in administrative and service facilities; and in rehabilitation of utility distribution systems.

THE MOST URGENT NEED

The most important project presently included in the fiscal year 1958 and fiscal year 1959 programs is the construction of two additional wings to Bancroft Hall in order to relieve the grossly overcrowded conditions now existing. With a designed normal capacity of 2,500 midshipmen, Bancroft Hall's facilities are stressed beyond all reasonable limits to handle today's on-board enrollment of 3,600 midshipmen, 1,100 over capacity. It is noted that in the fall of 1956 approximately 3,800 midshipmen were housed in Bancroft Hall.

With the intensity of academic work required of the midshipmen, the housing of more than two to a room is considered detrimental to normal study. If the Navy is to maintain its present average enrollment of midshipmen at the Naval Academy, Bancroft Hall should be enlarged at the earliest possible time.

It was the unanimous opinion of the Board that congressional authorization for the entire project for 2 additional wings to Bancroft Hall should be requested in the fiscal year 1958 program in the total amount of $15,171,000 and that appropriations should be requested in fiscal year 1958 and fiscal year 1959 as needed.

OTHER NEEDED FACILITIES

Academic facilities at the Naval Academy are inadequate, in many respects, to handle 3,650 midshipmen. An additional academic building is required. For example, the department of mathematics is housed at the present time in converted storage buildings. Such an arrangement can be considered satisfactory only on an interim basis.

Regarding academic equipment, it should go without saying that in such departments as engineering where scientific advances proceed rapidly, expenditures for new equipment will need continual approval. Teaching aids are in general well provided and maintained. The outstanding deficiency was noted at the naval air facility. The seaplanes in use for air indoctrination of midshipmen are antiquated, obsolete, and absolutely uninspiring for prospective naval officers in the air age. Incidentally, the absence of any up-to-date air facility might at least be presently compensated by more effective use of carriers during the summer cruise.

The housing of single enlisted personnel, attached to the Naval Academy, aboard U. S. S. *Reina Mercedes* and APL-31, is considered inadequate, unsuitable and far below the standard established by the Secretary of Defense for short-type barracks. Upon completion of the fill project, it is strongly recommended that funds be provided for the construction of suitable barracks to house these personnel ashore.

Administrative and service facilities should be improved. The present Administration Building is overcrowded, poorly arranged and should be air conditioned for summer operation. The Public Works Department has no satisfactory shops or storage facilities. Similarly, the Supply Department has inadequate storage facilities, utilizing for the most part quonset huts and other temporary structures now well past their useful life. The need for permanent and well-designed facilities for these two departments is of growing importance.

The need for major rehabilitation of the utilities systems has long been overlooked because of the requirement for items of more pressing importance. The present age and state of deterioration of the utilities systems, both outside and inside buildings, have convinced the Board of the need for prompt action on this project. The entire operation of the Naval Academy is dependent on the proper operation of these utilities systems.

MAINTENANCE

The Board reviewed in detail the facilities and personnel available at the Academy for maintenance, upkeep and repair. As pointed out previously, a need exists for adequate shop and storage facilities for the Public Works Department. The Board feels that the provision of adequate facilities, consolidated in one general working area, will greatly improve efficiency of operation and may result in a decreased requirement for maintenance personnel. However, pending the construction of adequate facilities, the Board feels that the number of maintenance personnel at the Naval Academy is inadequate to maintain this institution in a condition consonant with its importance. It is noted that the number of personnel available for maintenance purposes at the Academy is actually less than that required to meet navywide standards, as established by the Navy's work-measurement program.

The Board feels strongly that the standard for the Naval Academy should be superior to that expected of the average Navy facility. As pointed out in the report of the 1956 Board of Visitors, during the past 20 years the land area at the Naval Academy has been increased from 202 acres to 478 acres; the building area to be maintained has increased from 2,308,000 square feet to 3,464,377 square feet; and the average enrollment of midshipmen has increased from 2022 to 3684. Yet, at the same time, the number of maintenance employees has decreased from 591 to 585.

This Board finds that a complement of 700 is not only desirable, but is essential in order to maintain properly the buildings and grounds of the Naval Academy. Although strong efforts have been made to obtain additional funds to permit an increase in maintenance complement, the Board finds that the present proposed Naval Academy maintenance and operating budget for fiscal year 1958 is inadequate to permit the necessary personnel additions. This matter should be of serious concern to the Navy Department, for the examples of maintenance set at the Naval Academy for midshipmen influence their ability to measure up to the standards they will be expected to maintain as officers of the fleet. In addition, the Academy is a focal point for foreign visitors of great importance to the Nation as well as for the visiting public.

ATHLETIC FACILITIES

It is noted with pleasure that funds have been provided in the fiscal year 1957 program, and are being requested under the fiscal year 1958 program, to finance the construction of an additional 60.5 acres of land for outdoor athletic purposes. This project, plus the fieldhouse, appropriated for by Congress in the fiscal year 1955 program, will alleviate one of the Academy's major deficiencies, which is lack of indoor and outdoor area for physical development of midshipmen.

The Board was advised that the Naval Academy is presently conducting a campaign to raise funds to construct a suitable stadium from private contributions on land owned by the Naval Academy Athletic Association. This effort is commended. Pending the outcome of this campaign, the Board of Visitors offers no further observation other than to emphasize the great need for the new stadium and the necessity for the early removal of the Thompson Stadium stands.

CONCLUSION

The Board of Visitors wishes to communicate to all of the responsible members of Government the urgency of the task that we have seen in progress at the Naval Academy. As a nation our interest and support have often been directed to the dramatic results of research and development of materials in the interest of national security. However, the Naval Academy is mainly concerned with the development of men who alone can use these new material weapons of defense with intelligence and courage. In the stirring history of our country it is men who have mainly mattered, above and beyond the hardware involved in defense. The Board would, therefore, strongly urge that all legislators and departments involved with appropriations consider the needs of the Naval Academy as belonging to a special category of importance for the future of America.

The Board of Visitors wishes to express its appreciation to the superintendent, Admiral Smedberg, and his associates for their courtesies and for their excellent cooperation.

The Board expresses its appreciation also to Comdr. R. K. Joslin, United States Navy, secretary to the Board, and to the assistant secretaries, Comdr. R. N. Adrian, United States Navy, and Dr. W. S. Shields for their cooperation and assistance.

Respectfully submitted.

J. E. Wallace Sterling, John J. Riley, Deane W. Malott, William G. Saltonstall, David S. H. Howard, Theodore M. Hesburgh, Carl T. Durham, Richard E. Lankford, Peyton Anderson, A. Willis Robertson, Thruston B. Morton, Charles E. Potter, Harold C. Ostertag, Joseph P. O'Hara, R. K. Joslin, commander, United States Navy, Secretary to the Board of Visitors.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, I wish to sign this report with the following qualifications:

I strongly believe in the wisdom of improved maintenance at the Academy and the immediate construction of two wings to Bancroft Hall. These improvements are needed due to the increased Academy enrollment. The other new construction, I believe, should be phased in, in accordance with the overall needs of the Naval Establishment, with other necessary Navy construction.

I wish to call attention to the conclusion of the report. We should certainly consider all of these projects of importance to young men who select the Navy and study for a career in it. I believe these needs are among the many important categories for national security.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY,
Annapolis, Md., March 11, 1957.

STATEMENT TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS SUBMITTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

GENTLEMEN: It is a privilege and a pleasure to welcome you to the Naval Academy. Last spring, before reporting as Superintendent, I had the opportunity to visit the Academy while the Board of Visitors was in session. At that time it was my good fortune to meet some of the members of this year's Board and to sit in on some of the Board's discussions. As a result of that experience I look forward with particular interest to the meeting of the present Board and welcome the occasion to discuss with you the Naval Academy's program and its current and future needs.

The last day of your scheduled visit this year marks for me the completion of a challenging year, as it was on March 15, 1956, that I assumed my present duties as Superintendent of the Naval Academy. My initial enthusiasm for this assignment has increased throughout these short 12 months as I have acquired a more intimate understanding of the Naval Academy's needs and have sought solutions for them.

Some of you are thoroughly familiar with the purpose and program of the Naval Academy, having served as members of previous Boards of Visitors. Others of you may not have considered quite so closely the role of the Naval Academy and the measures employed here to carry out its mission. I am sure that the older members of the Board will bear with me as I delineate briefly the philosophy underlying our program.

The Naval Academy exists for the primary purpose of preparing young men for careers in the line of the Navy. There are other programs in the Navy for the development of various special functions likewise essential to the Navy, in medicine, in supply, in law, in theology, in specialized science and engineering, and many other fields often accomplished in cooperation with civilian universities. The Naval Academy, however, is the institution devoted solely to the education and training of young men for the responsibilities of command of ships and aircraft, the function of the line. A graduate of the Naval Academy should be of immediate usefulness as a junior officer aboard ship; he is given the background in professional subjects for development as a shipboard officer, as well as instruction in the fundamentals of naval aviation. This part of our program is accomplished in the professional courses at the Academy and also through the practical experience of the summer cruises and aviation summer, and with this background the graduate enters the school of experience as a junior officer.

The ships and planes in which our officers serve are at the forefront of our country's technological development. With their complicated machinery and equipment, including such items as electronic and atomic devices, they require a broad background of scientific and engineering knowledge. Accordingly, our curriculum includes a large segment of mathematics, the physical sciences, and engineering subjects. The scope of scientific knowledge and the rapid advance of technology are of such magnitude that anything approaching complete coverage is impossible. It is our conviction, however, that a thorough grounding in the fundamentals of such studies will prepare our graduates to understand the new and ever-changing devices they encounter in the fleet, as well as provide them with the background for postgraduate study.

The demands made upon naval officers in such areas as diplomacy, Government, economics, and human relations require that education at the Naval Academy include a substantial background in the social sciences and the humanities. An officer's need for knowledge in such fields becomes increasingly important throughout his career. The Naval Academy curriculum includes, therefore, courses in the social-humanistic area throughout all 4 years of the program.

The development of character is central to our purpose. Officers who will be responsible for the safety of our country, the lives of our citizens and the custody of Federal funds and equipment must be of unimpeachable honor. We endeavor to instill in the midshipmen the highest standards of personal conduct, honesty, integrity, responsibility, and loyalty. The traditions of the Naval Service and of the Naval Academy, the organization of the brigade, the guidance of the officers in Bancroft Hall, and the emphasis on example by all those concerned with the instruction of midshipmen contribute to the accomplishment of this purpose.

Physically, too, our graduates must be prepared for a naval career. Life in the Navy is rugged by comparison with many another profession. Physical conditioning is a necessary preparation for it. The midshipmen have instruction in physical education all 4 years, participate widely in an intramural sports program, and field teams in almost every major intercollegiate sport.

Perhaps even more important than preparing the midshipmen for their duties is the necessity for motivating them for a career in the line of the Navy. This is a vitally important matter, since we do not want to spend 4 years preparing them for such a career and then have them go into something else. For the past several years we have not been able to make our maximum, and necessary, contribution to the line of the Navy because of the requirement, by law, that 25 percent of each graduating class be allowed to accept commissions in the Air Force. This situation will change, however, with the class graduating in 1959. At that time, the percentage that may go into the Air Force or the Army will be reduced to a maximum of 12½ percent. Furthermore, such transfers will be on a basis agreeable to the Secretaries concerned. Since, for almost half a century, 80 percent of the graduates of the Naval Academy commissioned in the Navy have stayed in the Navy until normal retirement, it is apparent that the Academy has been successful in preparing career officers for the naval service. It makes sense, therefore, from the point of view of economics, specific training, and devotion to career that Naval Academy graduates should not be shunted away from the naval profession. We believe that the termination of the contribution of 25 percent of our graduates to the Air Force will enable us to do a better job of motivating the midshipmen toward a career in the Navy line and that the Naval Academy will be better able to achieve its mission of providing the Navy with more career officers.

In providing an undergraduate education as well as professional preparation for a naval career, the Naval Academy must meet the educational standards of other colleges and universities. This past year the Naval Academy was reevaluated by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, in accordance with that association's policy to review the accredited status of member institutions once every 10 years. It is a pleasure to inform the board that the Naval Academy's accredited status was reaffirmed by the association's commission on institutions of higher education.

CURRICULUM

The curriculum of the Naval Academy is designed to provide a broad and sound basis for the future development of its graduates. The 4-year program is undergraduate in scope. It is characterized by the breadth of its coverage rather than by specialization in any particular branch of study. It contains what we believe to be a highly desirable program of studies for all future naval officers, regardless of what specialization may come later as a result of particular experience and postgraduate study. It reflects the concept that a common basis of understanding is an important ingredient in the preparation of career naval officers. That is one of the reasons the Naval Academy curriculum is a prescribed one for all midshipmen—the only electives being a choice of 1 of 6 foreign languages, and the opportunity to join advanced sections in some departments where they can probe deeper into certain subjects.

The curriculum has a total of 156 semester hours of college work, and leads to a bachelor of science degree. This amount of course work represents about 30 semester hours more than colleges usually require for a bachelor's degree. In addition, the midshipmen have 4 summers of indoctrination and practical instruction including a summer at the Naval Academy prior to the commencement of academic studies in their Plebe (freshman) year, 2 cruises, and 1 aviation summer. All in all, the 4-year program is an exceedingly full one extending into 11 months of each year.

The 156 semester hours of the 4 academic years are devoted to 3 major areas: 50 percent of the curriculum is allotted to the sciences, mathematics, and engineering studies; 25 percent to such fields as history, government, economics, literature and languages; and the other 25 percent is devoted to professional subjects such as ordnance, aviation, and seamanship.

The curriculum is under continuing review by the faculty and administration. Each year the Academic Board reassesses the total 4-year program to determine whether it constitutes the optimum preparation for a career in the naval profession. Such evaluation takes into account the necessity for a broad education in the liberal arts, a fundamental understanding of appropriate engineering studies, and a sound preparation in professional naval subjects. New developments in technology and in the science of warfare render necessary a continual scrutiny of courses in these areas. Within the time limitations of the 4-year program, the Academic Board must compensate for any increase in emphasis in one area of study with a corresponding reduction in emphasis elsewhere in the program.

Recent changes in the curriculum that have been approved by the Academic Board include: A reduction in the time devoted to a course in air operations; shifting the course in fluid mechanics from second class year to third class year in a course titled "Fluid Mechanics and Aerodynamics," with additional time being devoted to aerodynamics; eliminating the course in basic aviation, which was essentially a course in aerodynamics; strengthening the courses in physics and electronics by assigning additional time to them; and introducing accelerated courses in the department of mathematics for the better students in order that they can cover more advanced algebra and differenial equations.

The formal curriculum is supplemented not only by a wide range of extracurricular activities, but also by concert and lecture series. Many of the extracurricular activities, such as the Mathematics Club, the Engineering Club, and the Forensic Activity, provide the midshipmen with an opportunity to satisfy their intellectual curiosity by delving much deeper than the curriculum takes them in subjects of particular interest to them.

Outstanding musicians who participate in the annual concert series contribute significantly to the cultural development of the midshipmen.

In an annual series of lectures by visiting speakers, midshipmen of the first class are privileged to hear important presentations by outstanding officers of the armed services as well as preeminent civilians.

In support of the religious program of the Naval Academy, leading clergymen representing the major denominations are guest preachers at the Naval Academy Chapel on approximately every third Sunday. The Naval Academy Christian Association and the Newman Club, which meet on alternate Sunday evenings, provide a varied program of speakers, religious concerts, and religious films.

SUMMER PROGRAM

Immediately following June week graduation activities the new first and third classes, approximately 1,800 midshipmen, will embark in 1 battleship, 3 cruisers, and 12 destroyers and proceed to Norfolk, Va. There they will be joined by 940 NROTC students, and will participate in the International Naval Review portion of the Jamestown Festival before departing on a 2-month training cruise that will include visits to ports on the east coast of South America, as well as in the Caribbean. In the final phase of their training, gunnery practice will be conducted off Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The second class midshipmen will be given amphibious and aviation training. During the first 2 weeks of the summer the entire class will particpate in the amphibious training exercise, TRAMID. Subsequent to this, the class will be divided into three groups. Each of these groups will be scheduled for a 10-day carrier cruise. Aviation indoctrination will be given to two of these groups at Pensacola and to the other here at Annapolis and in the Norfolk area. This indoctrination will consist of approximately 8 hours of dual flight instruction, one flight in a two-place jet airplane, a static display and fly-by of new fleet aircraft and various demonstrations designed to round out a knowledge of aviation capabilities and limitations.

The new fourth class will enter during the early part of the summer and will be given indoctrination and basic training at the Naval Academy.

BRIGADE OF MIDSHIPMEN

A sponsor program for the fourth classmen was established last fall. Each fourth classman now has an officer or a civilian professor to whom he can turn for help or advice in the friendly atmosphere of a home. It is believed that the informal relationship resulting from this program will be of value socially, educationally and psychologically, and will provide valuable guidance to the midshipmen in their first year at the Naval Academy. The program is on a trial basis this year, but the response of both the midshipmen and the sponsors, as well as the parents of the midshipmen has been generally very favorable and in all probability the program will be continued.

In an attempt to create among the midshipmen an increasing interest and pride in a higher quality of academic performance three new measures have been established. First—the superintendent's list. This corresponds in many respects to the dean's list used in many colleges, except that here the midshipmen are also required to meet certain prescribed standards in conduct and aptitude. About 15 percent of the brigade attain the superintendent's list. Secondly—academic competition has been added to the factors that determine the winner of the intra-brigade competition, the color company. The number of midshipmen that achieve the superintendent's list, and the academic average of each class group within each company form the basis for this part of the competition. Finally—standards of academic proficiency for midshipmen representing the Naval Academy on trips away from Annapolis have been established. The requirements vary with the duration and nature of the trip. If no loss in academic time is involved and the competition is not professional or academic, the midshipmen are required only to have a satisfactory current average in each subject. At the other extreme, a midshipman must have high academic grades, to substantiate his ability creditably to represent the Naval Academy, in order to qualify to make a trip in which he would participate or compete in professional or academic subjects.

As recommended by the Board of Visitors, Congress enacted legislation, effective June 25, 1956, to provide that enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces would not terminate by reason of appointment as a midshipman at the Naval Academy. Accordingly, any ex-enlisted midshipmen who are separated from the Naval Academy for any reason, other than medical discharge or acceptance of a commission, will revert to their previous enlisted status. The time spent at the Academy is credited toward their obligated enlisted service. Resignations from former enlisted men of the armed services have declined from 25 last year to 11 this one. It is believed that this decrease reflects, to some extent at least, the effect of the new legislation.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

During the recent Christmas season, we carried out for the second time the program called Operation Information. This is a method whereby approximately 100 selected first classmen go home on Christmas leave prepared to tell the people of their own hometown areas what their life and work is like at the Naval Academy. The midshipmen make their own arrangements and engagements to speak.

This project has been well received, many midshipmen having made appearances on radio and television, and it is anticipated that Operation Information will be carried out annually in the future.

Another program of informing the public about the Naval Academy has recently been started. This is the television series called Men of Annapolis, a series of 39 half-hour dramatic shows being presented on a nationwide basis. Filmed with the Academy as the background, the series will reach a vast audience and it is hoped that it will prove to be a most effective method of telling the Naval Academy story.

The Naval Academy continues to cooperate with secondary schools throughout the country in their college day programs. Where representatives of the Naval Academy are unable themselves to attend such programs, local naval district commandants and recruiting officers are requested to cooperate. This undertaking, too, has proved to be fruitful and the response gratifying.

ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS

On December 21, 1956, the Navy Department approved a recommendation of the Academic Board that the Naval Academy utilize the scholastic aptitude test and certain achievement tests of the College Entrance Examination Board as its entrance examinations. These will be required in lieu of the specially prepared entrance examinations employed heretofore. The change will be effective with the class to enter in 1958 and it is in keeping with arrangements already in effect at the Military and Air Force Academies. Thus, the three major service Academies will require entrance tests that are generally recognized as the nearest approach to a national standard in the field of testing for entrance to college.

The adoption of College Entrance Examination Board examinations should prove advantageous from the points of view of:

The candidate for appointment—who could use one set of examinations for entry into any of the service Academies in the event that he had multiple appointments (as many candidates have), or for entry into a civilian college if he failed to get into a service Academy.

The Naval Academy and the Navy: Because of the advantages to the candidate outlined above and the fact that less school time would be lost in taking the examinations, there should be more candidates taking the examination and as a result greater selectivity and better students.

The general public: Which recognizes the College Entrance Examination Board tests as proven standards for college level entrance examinations.

With this change we now closely approach the recommendation made in the final report of the Military Education Panel to the Service Academy Board (Stearns-Eisenhower Board) which is quoted as follows:

"Mental examinations should be of college entrance level and should be uniform for all candidates of all academies."

FACULTY

Since the first of October the civilian faculty has been included within the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement System. This represents a considerable improvement over the separate Naval Academy retirement plan which had been in effect for the past 20 years. More flexible and more favorable retirement provisions, and greater protection for dependents are now available to the civilian faculty.

As recommended by last year's Board of Visitors, the Navy Department has granted to the Superintendent the authority to approve travel of faculty members to professional meetings. This will make possible a more expeditious handling of requests for attendance at meetings, as it eliminates the necessity of referring each individual request to the Secretary of the Navy for approval, and it will facilitate both faculty and administrative planning of such attendance throughout the academic year.

Since the meeting of last year's Board, sabbatical leaves have been approved by the Navy Department for the civilian faculty. The plan provides for sabbatical leave at half pay for a full year or at full pay for 6 months. Such leave will not be automatic for any specified period of faculty service but will be granted on the basis of projects submitted and on recomemndation of the Superintendent to the Secretary of the Navy. In its report last year, the Board of Visitors urged the establishment of a sabbatical-leave program at the Naval Academy.

As part of a reorganization of Naval Academy Standing Committees, a Committee on Civilian Faculty Affairs was created this fall. This committee, which will supplement the functions of the Committee on Pay and Promotion, will concern itself with matters relating to the prestige, dignity, morale, obligations, responsibilities, and conditions of employment of the civilian faculty, and will recommend to the Superintendent such changes as are deemed desirable in civilian faculty policies. This new committee is composed of elected representatives of departments having civilian faculty.

The Academic Council has recently completed a thorough study of the instructional and noninstructional duties of the faculty in order to determine the numbers of faculty members required for the various academic departments. The results of the council's study should prove useful in future personnel planning.

For the second consecutive year, new instructors reporting to the Academy participated in an instructor-orientation program held immediately before the opening of the fall semester. Ninety-three new instructors, almost all of them naval officers, attended this year's 2-week program, which consisted of 11 lectures and 17 hours of practice teaching under the guidance of experienced teachers. This course has been enthusiastically received and is considered to be a most worthwhile program.

In addition to the orientation program and the departmental programs for new instruc-

tors, provision has been made this year for the attendance of some 40 officers at graduate courses in direct support of their instructional duties. Such courses have been under extension arrangement or by commutation to nearby universities.

NEW PLANT FACILITIES

The comprehensive program for providing additional plant facilities at the Naval Academy to accommodate properly the present and planned enrollment of 3,650 midshipmen consists of 20 projects, totaling $58,032,000. The 2 major projects in the program, desired in the fiscal year 1959 budget, are (1) 2 additional dormitory wings for Bancroft Hall to house 1,100 midshipmen, and (2) the Naval Academy air facility. It should be noted that this entire program is based on adequately supporting 3,650 midshipmen. This is an average figure for a year. This year we commenced the academic year with 3,799 midshipmen literally stuffed into Bancroft Hall. No major increase in enrollment is expected in the immediate future.

In the fiscal year 1957 military construction program, the Academy received funds for the gain of 60 acres of land by hydraulic fill. Plans and specifications are completed and construction work will start in March 1957. Approximately 2 years will be required for completion.

In the fiscal year 1958 military construction program, now before Congress, is a project for $3,200,000 to provide funds for starting the foundation of the two wings of Bancroft Hall and necessary alterations to the powerplant. If these funds are provided in the summer of 1957, we will save about 21 months in the final completion of this essential $16,782,000 project. Advance planning has been completed, final contract plans and specifications are under preparation and the construction of two prototype rooms in the third wing of Bancroft Hall is underway.

In addition, the project for the John H. Towers Airfield, a Naval Air Station whose mission includes Naval Academy support, is contained in the fiscal year 1958 program at a cost of $4 million. The exact location of this field is still undetermined. The present request for $4 million is to support cost of preparation of plans and specifications, real estate acquisition, rights-of-way and easements.

DORMITORY FACILITIES

Bancroft Hall is designed for a maximum capacity of 2,859 midshipmen and a normal capacity of 2,500 midshipmen. There are 1,328 rooms, of which 1,149 are designed as 2-man rooms. The remainder can accommodate 1, 3, or 4 men each. With an average planned brigade strength of 3,650, it is necessary to assign additional occupants to 60 percent of the 2-, 3-, and 4-man rooms. With the addition of extra bunks, lockers, and desks, there is overcrowding with resultant interference between roommates and detrimental effect upon studies and morale.

Room assignment for academic year 1956–57 with a brigade strength of 3,754:

Type room	Total each type	Number occupied by—					
		1 man	2 men	3 men	4 men	5 men	6 men
1 man	15	5	10	-----	-----	-----	-----
2 men	1,149	-----	332	800	17	-----	-----
3 men	115	-----	-----	95	20	-----	-----
4 men	49	-----	-----	-----	31	15	3

As stated above, the advance planning report concerning construction of the two additional wings to Bancroft Hall has been submitted and funds in the amount of $3,200,000 are being requested for fiscal year 1958 to prepare the plans, specifications, construction of foundation and modification of facilities to provide the additional utilities that will be required.

AIR FACILITY

The ability to conduct an air indoctrination program required in the education and training of career naval officers is increasingly hampered each year by the obsolescence or lack of facilities.

The principal problem is the lack of a modern airfield which can be made an integral part of the Naval Academy. Again this year the Naval Academy has requested provision of airfield facilities upon which a complete summer term and academic year aviation program can be formulated. Meanwhile, the Naval Academy is continuing a year-to-year program incorporating the use of variously available facilities during the second class summer period and the use of the N3N seaplanes during the academic year. During the summer of 1957 the support of the Naval Air Training Command facilities at Pensacola will provide a desired increase in quality and quantity of flight time and other aviation orientation projects.

The Academy has also requested replacement of the N3N aircraft with a modern propeller-type amphibian. It is understood that implementation of replacement plans will be withheld pending further information on Academy airfield plans in the fiscal year 1958 budget.

MAINTENANCE OF PLANT FACILITIES

During the past year, a major effort has been devoted to improving the maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation of structures, and utility distribution systems, most of which are over 50 years old. During the present fiscal year, work of a repair or rehabilitation nature totaling $455,000 has been accomplished. However, in spite of this major expenditure, the backlog of deferred maintenance has not been overcome because of the lack of sufficient maintenance personnel to keep abreast of day-to-day maintenance. In the utility field alone, needed major rehabilitation of distribution systems, both underground and within buildings, totals $1,768,000. The 1956 Board of Visitors recommended that the present maintenance force be increased from 585 to 664 maintenance employees, with a desirable complement of 700. Budget requests have been submitted by the Academy to the Navy Department justifying the need for 700 employees in the fiscal year 1958 budget. Navy Department approval was obtained, but the final outcome still depends on Department of Defense and Bureau of the Budget review, and action by Congress. It is very doubtful that the final action will provide for any significant improvement.

In addition to the needed increase in maintenance personnel and to the above-mentioned rehabilitation projects for the utility systems, additional rehabilitation projects totalling $1,128,000 were submitted separately as special projects in the fiscal year 1958 budget for financing under maintenance and operation funds.

STADIUM

The southwest stands of the present stadium were initially constructed in 1912 with contributions from private persons. The northeast stands were added in 1924, giving a seating capacity of about 16,000. At present, parking facilities available in the vicinity of the stadium are extremely limited and entirely unsatisfactory.

The location of Thompson Stadium is such that the front of the new gymnasium will be immediately adjacent to the rear of the southwest stands. This fact would detract considerably from the appearance of the building. In addition, the long-range development plans for the Naval Academy call for the construction of two new wings to Bancroft Hall on Farragut Field. One of these wings will be in close proximity to the northeast stands of the stadium. The retention of Thompson Stadium in its present site, in view of current and contemplated new construction, will detract immeasurably from the beauty of the Naval Academy. Further, the land is required for our intramural outdoor athletic program.

In order to alleviate the above unsatisfactory conditions, a survey for the removal of the southwest stands of Thompson Stadium has recently been initiated. In addition, the Naval Academy Athletic Association plans to start construction of a new Navy-Marine Corps Memorial Stadium this spring, financed by nonappropriated funds. The proposed stadium will seat 31,000 spectators, have parking for over 8,000 cars, and will cost approximately $3,100,000. The association has title to the site, 101 acres of land which has been rough graded with storm drains installed, and has $1 million earmarked for this construction. The remaining $2,100,000 will have to be raised from Naval Academy alumni and friends of the Navy and Marine Corps. A drive for these funds was initiated in early January of this year.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

The previously mentioned land reclamation, through the filling in of Santee and Dewey Basins, and the additional area to be made available through the removal of the present football stands, are urgently needed to provide athletic and drill areas. The critical shortage of outdoor space for recreational purposes has been a matter of deep concern at the Naval Academy. The overcrowding of present recreational facilities has been deplored by previous Boards of Visitors.

Funding for adequate lighting facilities for presently existing athletic fields, as well as newly acquired areas, is also a necessity for an adequate physical-education program. Last year's board pointed out the seriousness of this problem.

CONCLUSION

In concluding these remarks, I should like to underline for the members of the Board of Visitors those physical needs of the Naval Academy which I consider of utmost importance to the effective accomplishment of our mission.

First, the addition of two wings to Bancroft Hall to relieve badly overcrowded dormitory facilities.

Second, provision of adequate funds and personnel to accomplish accumulated and current maintenance.

Third, acquisition of additional land for athletics, drill, and recreation through hydraulic fill and the removal of the dilapidated Thompson Stadium.

Fourth, provision of a suitable air facility for the instruction of midshipmen.

W. R. SMEDBERG, III.

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

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

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

Address entitled "The Road Ahead for Business," delivered by him before the annual convention of the Junior Chambers of Commerce of Iowa at Waterloo, Iowa, on May 4.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address delivered by him at the convention of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Blacksmiths, Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, on May 7, 1957.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Address delivered by him at dinner commemorating ninth anniversary of independence of Israel.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

Article entitled "Mrs. Abel, Ex-Senator, Named Mother of 1957," published in the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1957.

JOSEPH R. McCARTHY—A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Joe McCarthy was a great American. He believed, as I do, that any man refusing to take the oath of allegiance to the United States of America or any man who hid behind the fifth amendment when asked if he had ever been disloyal, did not belong on the public payroll.

Mr. President, the censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy by his colleagues in the absence of an allegation that he had ever violated any rule of the United States Senate, was a very dangerous precedent. It was the first tangible move to destroy the investigative power of this great body. It was accomplished under an emotional strain, comparable to a war hysteria.

The precedent could not have been established under normal conditions. It is a dangerous precedent, and if followed hereafter, any Member of this distinguished body can be censured when any other Member can be persuaded to submit a resolution looking to that end, provided the emotion and hysteria of the moment can be aroused to the point of securing the necessary majority vote on this floor.

Mr. President, the whole proceedings relating to the censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy should be expunged from the permanent RECORD; and to that end the senior Senator from Nevada will offer such a resolution, unless the sponsors of the movement in the first instance offer the resolution within a reasonable time.

DEBATE ON RESOLUTION OF CENSURE, NOVEMBER 16, 1954

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on this floor on November 16, 1954, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 16, 1954]

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of Senate Resolution 301, which reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy] failed to cooperate with the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in clearing up matters referred to that subcommittee which concerned his conduct as a Senator and affected the honor of the Senate and, instead, repeatedly abused the subcommittee and its members who were trying to carry out assigned duties, thereby obstructing the constitutional processes of the Senate, and that this conduct of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy] in failing to cooperate with a Senate committee in clearing up matters affecting the honor of the Senate is contrary to senatorial traditions and is hereby condemned.

"SEC. 2. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy] in conducting a senatorial inquiry intemperately abused, and released executive hearings in which he denounced, a witness representing the executive branch of the Government, Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, an officer of the United States Army, for refusing to criticize his superior officers and for respecting official orders and executive directives, thereby tending to destroy the good faith which must be maintained between the executive and legislative branches in our system of government; and the Senate disavows the denunciation of General Zwicker by Senator McCarthy as chairman of a Senate subcommittee and censures him for that action."

LETTER TO THE CHAIRMAN

Mr. President, on November 15, 1954, a member of the select committee to study censure charges against the junior Senator from Wisconsin addressed a letter to the chairman of the select committee, in which he said:

"UNITED STATES SENATE,
"SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY CENSURE CHARGES PURSUANT TO SENATE ORDER ON SENATE RESOLUTION 301,
"November 15, 1954.

"The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
"Chairman, Select Committee To Study Censure Charges, United States Senate.

"MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The letter which Secretary Stevens wrote late Saturday, and which you delivered to me yesterday (Sunday) afternoon responding to the questions which I asked him at the conference in your office earlier Saturday afternoon, considered with the material in the two letters which he brought to your office, together with the prior evidence in the matter, convinces me that it would be wrong to censure Senator McCarthy on the second count—the Zwicker affair.

"Therefore, I shall not vote for it."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the part of the letter to the chairman from the distinguished Sentaor from South Dakota which I have marked in the margin be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

"You recall that after reading the McCarthy letter which Secretary Stevens brought in Saturday, I asked: 'When was the letter actually received?' and 'What consideration was given to it?'

"After the conference, I reread not only the testimony before our committee on the Zwicker matter but also the original Peress testimony before Senator McCarthy in New York City. That hearing ended in New York City at noon on Saturday, January 30, on a quiet and sort of incidental question by Senator McCarthy, 'You haven't been asked to resign, have you?'

"A short exchange apparently alerted both parties and then a foot race began—by Peress on Monday, February 1, to get immediate action on his discharge, by McCarthy to get a court-martial instituted before Peress got out of the jurisdiction of the Army.

"Secretary Stevens gives the first positive evidence as far as I know that Senator McCarthy's letter of February 1, was delivered to his office by messenger that same Monday, and made known 'to the responsible Army staff.'

"Further, that it was reviewed—presumably against the information which General Zwicker relayed through his immediate superior, Chief of Staff, First Army, New York, the same Monday that Peress had asked for immediate discharge instead of the previously agreed upon date.

"Mr. Stevens' reply to my second question is that the McCarthy letter was then reviewed and that 'it was concluded that there was no additional evidence to require modification of the prior determination of the Peress case * * * and that the best interests of the United States would be served by his prompt separation.'

"So, the discharge was executed and Peress was released Tuesday afternoon, February 2. Mr. Stevens arrived in Washington on his trip back from Japan late on the afternoon of February 3.

"This proof that an Army staff at the Pentagon did decide to let Peress slip out of their grasp after the issue was directly and timely raised throws into new focus a whole set of dates and events prior to the Zwicker hearing. It goes far toward explaining Senator McCarthy's conduct on February 18, when Brigadier General Zwicker, the representative supplied by the Army under wraps was unable to pinpoint the persons responsible for giving more consideration to a request from a false-swearing Communist seeking to flee from the Army's jurisdiction than to a suggestion from the chairman of a Senate investigating committee that court-martial proceeding be immediately instituted."

PROVISION FOR CENSURE OR EXPULSION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States, in article I, section 5, provides that "each House may determine the rules of its procedure, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member."

Mr. President, that is the only reference the Senator from Nevada is able to find in the Constitution of the United States relative to the censure or expulsion of a Member.

Mr. President, other than the charge relating to the "Zwicker affair" designated by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], there is left only the charge of abusing the subcommittee "and its members who were trying to carry out assigned duties, thereby obstructing the constitutional processes of the Senate, and that this conduct of the Senator from Wisconsin in failing to cooperate with a Senate committee in clearing up matters affecting the honor of the Senate, is contrary to senatorial traditions and is hereby condemned."

Mr. President, I find no provision in the Constitution of the United States or in the rules of the Senate for any such procedure, granting, however, that the Senate, no doubt, by the required number of votes, can do anything it decides to do to a Member.

On November 8, 1954, at the beginning of this debate, the Senator from Nevada said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 12, page 15848, in a debate with the majority leader of the Senate:

"The Senator to whom the censure is directed is only a whipping boy. The objective is and has been to destroy the investigative power of the Senate."

A WHIPPING BOY

Mr. President, on November 12 the Senator from Nevada further stated in a debate with the distinguished majority leader, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 12, page 15983:

"The senior Senator from Nevada feels that the junior Senator from Wisconsin is merely the whipping boy in this procedure. He feels that the real objective from the very beginning has been to destroy the investigative power of this body.

"ESTABLISH THE PRINCIPLE—WHO IS NEXT

"By pinning the spotlight on a personality the public can be divided. You could not so easily divide public opinion on the principle involved.

"The present procedure or the next accusation, once the principle is established, could be the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES] or the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. JENNER] or the distinguished majority leader."

Mr. President, if we are stepping out and beyond the Constitution of the United States and the rules of the Senate to censure conduct that does not seem proper to some Member of the Senate, it will be a very wide field, I promise the President of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD portions of the debate between the distinguished majority leader and the senior Senator from Nevada.

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

"Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

"Mr. MALONE. I would state at this point that we are following the procedure of legislative bodies wherever dictatorships have been established.

"We are nibbling at the investigative power of the Senate by censuring any Senator who seeks to investigate any procedure or act, asking questions distasteful to a witness.

"NO ALLEGATION OF VIOLATION OF A SENATE RULE

"If the distinguished Senator from California will further yield, I will say that I have heard no accusation made on the floor of the Senate, or at the hearings, or at the time the allegations were filed, that the Senator on trial ever violated a rule of the Senate.

"I understand that the Senate is the judge of its own Members, and can decide whom it will seat in the Senate. The Senate could expel the senior Senator from California or the senior Senator from Nevada, if it so desired, if it had the votes with which to do it, regardless of the nature of the charges.

"NO CENSURE UNLESS A SENATE RULE VIOLATED

"However, the Senate has yet—over a period of 175 years—to set a precedent of censuring a Senator unless he has violated a rule of the Senate.

"Senators have been tried and censured—and they have faced expulsion, but no Senator has ever been censured except on an allegation and conviction that he violated an established rule of the Senate.

"Therefore, if we proceed in the matter before the Senate on the theory that we will later adopt a rule which the Senator in question would have violated if it had been a rule of the Senate at the time of the commission of the alleged act, that is quite another matter.

"There will be, I may say to the distinguished majority leader, some serious debate before any such proposed rule will be adopted in any case."

OUTSIDE CONSTITUTIONAL JURISDICTION OF THE SENATE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the select committee has recommended action by the Senate which, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, is clearly outside the constitutional jurisdiction of this body.

NO PUBLIC SENTIMENT IN WASHINGTON

Understand, Mr. President, that I have no feeling for or against the select committee. I believe it made a mistake, and I believe the Senate made a mistake in directing the committee by not specifying that the members of the committee should go home for a few weeks before holding hearings in Washington, because I believe, and have so stated on the Senate floor and elsewhere, that this is the most dangerous town in the United States of America to the United States of America, because there is no public opinion in Washington—there is no one here except the people who work for the Government or works for someone who works for the Government or the folks who sell something to someone who works for the Government.

So that if we are here more than three consecutive months without going home or associating with the producers of the Nation we think that what we are hearing is public sentiment.

There is no public sentiment in Washington. So that if the committee is to be censured for its action, the Senate must shoulder some of the blame for not specifying that they must go home for a few weeks and get their feet on the ground, thereby regaining their balance by association with the people who still revere and depend upon the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, and who still believe in the dignity and the integrity of the United States Senate.

Typical of the wires and mail that I am receiving from my constituents in my State of Nevada is the wire received today from Avery Stitser, publisher of the daily Humboldt Star at Winnemucca, Nev.:

"Re your letter November 13. Continue your fight for the enforcement of the cloture rule of the United States Senate. In this present debate, in my opinion, the Senate is working toward its own destruction. Am behind you in your endeavors to halt such destruction."

Mrs. Avery D. Stitser is a typical independent American editor of a newspaper in a farming, livestock, and mining area—her job is to inform the residents of Humboldt County, Nev., on local, national, and international affairs, and that she does in a very independent and thorough manner.

Avery Stitser is a typical editor of my State—she prints the news of the day, taking orders from no one.

CENSURE REPREHENSIBLE CONDUCT

The committee's conclusion in its consideration of category V, the Zwicker allegation, is that "the conduct of Senator McCARTHY toward General Zwicker was reprehensible."

It adds that "for this conduct he should be censured by the Senate."

What kind of conduct? Why, "reprehensible conduct," and reprehensible only.

Dictatorship may punish legislators for conduct which dictators consider reprehensible, but there is no provision in the Constitution of the United States that grants anyone that power.

The Constitution of the United States is specific on what ground either House may punish a Member. Article I, section 5, states that each House may punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and that is the only constitutional ground on which they can be punished by their colleagues.

NO FINDING OF DISORDERLY BEHAVIOR

The select committee made no allegation of disorderly behavior against Senator McCarthy. It made no finding of disorderly behavior. It said, on the other hand, that in its opinion, the conduct of the junior Senator from Wisconsin in the Zwicker affair was "reprehensible" and that it was "not proper."

That is the allegation from which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has now withdrawn his support; and I would not be surprised, if he went home for a little while, with the good people of South Dakota that he might take a different view of stifling the investigative power of the United States Senate.

I said a few days ago on this floor that even if some of us fail to express ourselves properly sometimes or fail to arrive at a proper conclusion on a national or international basis, or if we do not care to exercise our power on a particular subject, we ought to preserve that power for our successors, just as it has been handed down to us over a period of 175 years. It has never been impaired. Let us not be the first to destroy it.

Mr. President, nowhere is there any charge that the junior Senator from Wisconsin was guilty of "disorderly behavior," the only constitutional ground on which this body can punish a fellow Member.

I think I should amend that statement by saying that if we have the necessary votes we can expel any Member of the Senate, even the distinguished majority leader or the distinguished minority leader .

CANNOT BE RETROACTIVE

Conceivably, if the precedent is once set, that might even be done, because I understand there is a committee working on the rules of the Senate that would make practically every Senator the judge of a breach of a personal-conduct rule by any other Senator. If we pass such a rule, and I greatly doubt we shall, because nearly everyone will go home before we come back in January and possibly rearrange his perspective—and even if we should use the poor judgment to pass such a rule, thus further destroying the investigative power of the Senate, there is nothing in the law or in the Constitution or in the rules of the Senate that would allow any such rule to be retroactive.

Mr. President, if we should set such a precedent, we shall have gone a long way toward a new concept, a Prussian concept, a Praetorian Guard concept, a totalitarian concept, in which Senators must speak softly, obsequiously, and servilely, must bootlick, if you please, any officer of high rank from whom information is sought in performance of our legislative functions.

We shall have abdicated our legislative independence to the military. I do not believe that even the great bulk of our fine military officers want that. They do not want to be coddled, either, unless the officers in the military have changed a great deal since World War I, when the senior Senator from Nevada enlisted as a private and finally was made an officer and was given men to command. We did not ask for quarter, nor did we give much. At that time, if we violated a rule, if we violated a military concept, there was prompt retribution. There was no time to do anything about it. Those were the days when a sergeant came up from the ranks because he ought to be a sergeant, because men respected him for his power or understanding of personality, not because he had passed an examination somewhere.

The report of the select committee cites testimony that General Zwicker used the expression "You s. o. b.," with reference to Senator McCarthy—and I do not think, Mr. President, from the context, that he meant Senate Office Building.

There is other evidence in the report that General Zwicker was antagonistic to the junior Senator from Wisconsin long in advance of the hearings to which he was called. The select committee does not however, find this reprehensible. Its only criticism is against Senator McCarthy.

On the basis of the select committee's own findings, there is no constitutional warrant whatsoever for censure of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, who has violated no law or rule of the Senate, and who certainly has not been guilty or charged with being guilty of disorderly behavior.

MOVE TO TABLE

Mr. President, if an agreement can be had with the majority leader that the Senate might meet on Saturday morning next, at that time, whenever the senior Senator from Nevada can obtain the floor, he will move to table Senate Resolution 301. If it is not possible to reach an agreement to have the Senate meet on Saturday morning, then at any time on Friday when the senior Senator from Nevada can obtain the floor, he will move to table Senate Resolution 301.

EDITORIALS—THE CHARACTER AND WORK OF JOE M'CARTHY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Valiant Warrior," which was published in the New York Journal-American of May 3, 1957, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

VALIANT WARRIOR

In the death of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy the forces of freedom in the United States have lost a fierce and valiant fighter.

He was a saber-slashing warrior. Riding the steed of dedication he sounded the alarm and pressed the battle against Communists, fellow travelers, and anti-anti-Communists wherever it led.

Neither prestige nor influence deterred Joe McCarthy, neither slander nor scorn swerved him. Where he saw his duty, he did not parry; he charged.

In this era no other man was more admired or more vilified. There were times when his saber swings were misdirected. But these few occasions were inevitable in a nature so intensely committed to the anti-Communist cause, and to a man of his burning patriotism.

His enemies coined the word "McCarthyism"—straight out of the Communist propaganda machine—as a brand name of disrepute. Joe McCarthy seized it and turned it against them.

His enemies sought to pervert and disgrace his motives. The warrior from Wisconsin had only one motive and he never deviated from it.

It was to smash the Communist conspiracy.

We on this newspaper have lost a friend. His country has lost a champion of liberty.

He served it well.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Senate Must Act On Joe," written 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:

SENATE MUST ACT ON JOE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON.—The United States Senate, solemnly assembled to pay honor in death to the man it so malignantly slandered 3 short years ago, must now more calmly face the obligation to itself under which it rests of undoing the wrong it did to Joseph R. McCarthy, by expunging from its journal the resolution of condemnation it adopted in a wave of blind hysteria in 1954.

There is, in the history of the Senate itself, a shining precedent for such contrition.

The Senate may rest assured, moreover, that the friends of Joe McCarthy, the lovers of their country, and the enemies of communism, will never rest until this act of justice has been taken, this wrong has been righted.

McCarthy was "condemned"—not "censured" as had been the original intention of the Watkins committee which "tried" him—on two counts, neither of which went to the heart of the real issue in the controversy.

That issue was the Communist conspiracy against the United States, but that wasn't mentioned.

The vote of condemnation, 67 to 22, has left the Senate in an absurd position.

For here was the Senate, then as now, pouring out billions of American tax money to combat world communism everywhere on earth, while at the same time repudiating the Senator who, above all others in Congress, had done most to expose to the people the Red peril which menaced the Nation.

The methods McCarthy had used as chairman of an investigating committee had brought down upon him a storm of opprobrium from every skulking Communist in the country, from every fellow traveler, from every crackpot and nitwit, and every left-wing columnist in Washington.

But McCarthy was not fighting an honorable antagonist. He was encountering a rattlesnake, which defied the committee, defied the Congress, defied the flag. He hit the vicious reptile with everything he had.

A parade of contemptuous witnesses before the committee took the fifth amendment. Some even sunk so low they refused to say whether, in the event of war between the United States and Soviet Russia, they would fight for their own country, on the ground that their answer might tend to incriminate them.

This committee is not the only Senate committee to encounter the fifth amendment pleader. Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, who once in a huff resigned from the McCarthy committee, is now having fifth amendment troubles of his own as chairman of another investigating committee, and some of his comments to recalcitrant witnesses has been as bitter and stinging as any Joe ever made.

It is a crying pity that a majority of the Senate should have succumbed to the organized propaganda of the leftwing hatemongers who were out to get McCarthy—and who have now, to their shame, finally got him.

The precedent for expunging a Senate resolution adopted in hatred and anger is historic.

In 1833, during the memorable battle over the United States Bank, the Senate censured President Jackson for removing the Secretary of the Treasury, and appointing another in his place, as an unconstitutional act.

Four years later Senator Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri, on January 16, 1837, offered a resolution to expunge that resolution from the manuscript of the Senate's Journal, and 4 days later, after a stormy debate, it was adopted.

Solemnly the Secretary of the Senate advanced to the rostrum, took up the Journal, drew a black line around the resolution of censure, and wrote beneath it: "Expunged by order of the Senate."

The day will surely come when McCarthy's name shall be cleared in the same honorable way. It is too late to make amends to Joe. But there is time for the Senate to rehabilitate itself in its own and the public's esteem.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Joe's Only Interest Was His Country," written by George E. Sokolsky, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JOE'S ONLY INTEREST WAS HIS COUNTRY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Much has been written and said about Senator Joe McCarthy during the past several days while he lay dying and when he finally went to his Maker.

I knew Joe intimately and favorably. No matter how men may differ about him, I always knew that Joe McCarthy had no interest other than the welfare of his country. He firmly believed that all Communists had to be traitors and he set out to find them. He was successful in some measure, but he also suffered from a sense of failure because he knew that agencies of government and high officials protected men and women whom they should have despised. He sought for motives and often reached the conclusion that many men were fearful that their own mistakes would be exposed; he felt that fear and vanity rather than ideological positions played a great part in determining men's attitudes toward him and his work.

We often discussed the brutal force of the opposition to him and this he never understood, because he could not believe that some of his opponents wanted to protect Communists. He never understood the Army fight upon him because he held that it was the Army's first duty to protect this country from Communists and traitors.

FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE

I was present at the notorious luncheon in New York when McCarthy, Secretary of the Army Robert Stevens and his counsel, John Adams, lunched and drank and cavorted throughout an afternoon. What came out at the McCarthy-Army hearings was never the whole story nor had the various versions of the Cohn-Schine episodes anything to do with the situation at all. And I can say, from first-hand knowledge, that Bob Stevens had little or nothing to do with the effort to destroy McCarthy.

This was a political maneuver to eliminate McCarthy's importance, to kill his influence as an American citizen, to make his name abhorrent and to frighten off any Senator, journalist or radio commentator who chose to support him or his cause. So far as Joe McCarthy was concerned, the maneuver succeeded to a startling degree.

Those who engaged in it—and their names came out during the hearings—knew Joe's characteristics; they knew that he was gentle and aggressive; rough in the fight and forgiving immediately afterwards; humble in his heart but giving the impression of cantankerousness. They also knew that while he appeared to be hale and even physically powerful, he was not a strong man, suffering physical pain, sometimes so much pain that he had to give way to it.

They knew all his weaknesses, for some of them had, since he came to the Senate, acted as though they were his close personal friends. They left him bitter, disillusioned, hurt. He was hounded to death by those who would not forget and could not forgive. He was a lonely man among his associates and he often wondered who were his friends.

BELIEVED HE WOULD WIN

He and his Jeannie adopted a little girl and that brought Joe a happiness which he had not ever known before. There can be no question that he regarded the 1958 Election as a problem because he realized the forces that would be pitted against him. He believed that he would ultimately win that election and he said that he did not fear his opponent, Walter Kohler, but there can be no question that he recognized that he would have to take on the entire Eisenhower Administration, the Modern Republicans, the Committee for an Effective Congress, the money that would be raised against him in New York by the mysterious Arthur Goldsmith, the Communists, their fellow travelers and dupes. It meant a fight—a terrific fight and his health was ebbing away.

It is often said that you can only really know a man if you live with him. I did not live with Joe under one roof, but there were times when we saw much of each other and when I was intimately concerned with his effort to drive the Communists from American life. As an American, as a Jew, as an anti-Communist, I can proudly say that Joe McCarthy was my friend and that I have never encountered an opponent of his who equalled him in patriotism and courage. God bless his soul and forgive those who sent him to his death.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Freedom's Watchman," published in the Longview (Tex.) Daily News of May 7, 1957, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FREEDOM'S WATCHMAN

The Honorable Joseph R. McCarthy, United States Senator from Wisconsin—a fearless watchman on the ramparts of freedom—has passed to his reward. In death, as in his

busy life, he was the target of attacks and slights from both private and public figures, for there are many who seek to wreck and destroy as well as the few who strive to strengthen and secure the citadel of human freedom.

Methodist clergyman and Senate chaplain Dr. Frederick Brown Harris spoke literally for the pages of history Monday when in solemn Senate services he declared: "This fallen warrier through death speaketh, calling a nation of free men to be delivered from the complacency of a false security and from regarding those who loudly sound the trumpets of vigilance and alarm as mere disturbers of the peace."

In similar eulogy at a high pontifical funeral Mass, Msgr. John J. Cartwright spoke for the records of time when he said of Senator McCarthy and his anti-Communist role: "No greater service could have been rendered to our country than was rendered by this watchman of the citadel who insisted upon a clear understanding by our people of the nature of this enemy and of its power not only to attack but to undermine our institutions of freedom."

Senator McCarthy leaves bright pages in the undying history of freemen. In the critical postwar period after he returned from service in the Pacific, he became America's No. 1 Communist-hunter and exposer of spies and pinkos in Government, in the armed services, and in defense plants. The vigor of this vital service to the Nation aroused criticism and opposition that extended into the highest circles of officialdom. One of the sorriest pages ever written into the record was his snub by the White House, for it in effect gave aid and comfort to Joe Stalin and his ilk. We were sorry to see evidence that the old palace guard such as Hoffman and company still holds sway, for the White House had only an aid among the mourners.

While Senator McCarthy stood on the ramparts of freedom, there stood with him to plug the dikes against communism such stalwart patriots as the Mundts, Malones, Martins, Dirksens, Butlers, Magnusons, and Knowlands. But while these and a few others like them stood guard at the gates, the attack was being waged behind the scenes or openly by such as the Flanders-Tydings-Eleanor Roosevelt-Anna Rosenberg-Marshall-Acheson-Truman crowd and others of their kind. There will be less record in the pages of history for most of them.

One would have only to go into the hills of Wisconsin today to find out what the people there thought of Senator McCarthy who boldly and fearlessly battled the enemies without as well as the sympathizers within. He had the ability to recognize their stripes for the rattlesnakes they were, regardless of the cloak they sported. We confidently expect Senator WILEY, who thinks it "too early" to tell what McCarthy's place in history will be, will get the word from the folks back home on his next visit.

We had the keen personal pleasure to have known and worked with Joe McCarthy. While the writer is not a Catholic (and right here may we observe that many of his enemies were old "He Ku-Kluxers" who hated him on account of his religion) but a Protestant, we were happy to fight along with him under the same flag, for Senator McCarthy's flag was the Stars and Stripes and he never grew tired of holding it aloft to encourage free men everywhere. It was no hammer and sickle for him, and no waving of the pink bunting of sympathy for the Reds or their helpers.

As for unexpressed fears of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, who said he hoped the difficulties which beset McCarthy on earth "will not be there to face him when he goes to meet his maker," we can reassure you, Senator MANSFIELD; the forces of communism are the forces of anti-God and they will not be inside the gates when this gallant warrior is received. And as for the Communists, their agents, their sympathizers, and the pinkos, we predict the 400-page Alger Hiss book published Monday—nor even 4,000 pages by such as Hiss, or the Julius Rosenbergs or the Martin Sobels or the David Greenglasses and their kind—will be to no avail in covering up the dirty trails they have spread across the face of America.

As it was with Gen. Robert E. Lee, Senator McCarthy can "pass over the river and rest under the shade of the trees"—for the battle for free men is now behind him and he can rest among friends. The forces of anti-God will not be around in heaven to bark and bite. Joe is now comfortably bivouacked with his good marine buddies who earlier fell in defense of their country at Iwo Jima, Peleliu, Saipan, Tinian, Okinawa, and elsewhere.

We salute in admiring memory the Joseph McCarthy whom we knew—a true mid-20th century embodiment of Patrick Henry and Paul Revere of old and as bold a patriot and stanch a fighter for freedom and country as America has ever produced. Goodbye, Joe; may your spirit rest in peace as your name will be preserved in honor.

CARL L. ESTES.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a column by John O'Donnell, special writer on the New York News, as a part of my remarks.

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

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, May 5.—"Judica me, Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancta;

"Ab homine iniquo et doloso erue me."

Thus the opening invocation of the centuries-old liturgy for the dead, which will be intoned over the remains of Wisconsin's Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in St. Matthew's Cathedral by Washington's Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle at the beginning of the solemn requiem Mass tomorrow morning.

"Give judgment for me, O God, and decide my cause against an unholy people.

"From unjust and deceitful men deliver me."

When the mass is over and the funeral oration has been delivered, the archbishop will utter the same Latin prayer said over every Catholic buried:

"O God, whose nature is always to have mercy and to spare, we humbly beseech you for the soul of Thy servant, Joseph McCarthy * * * that Thou wouldst not deliver him into the hands of the enemy, nor forget him forever."

And so ends, so far as national politics is concerned, five furious years of the Wisconsin Senator's turbulent warfare against communism in our National Government. His followers will remain loyal; his enemies embittered; the cowards and weaklings as usual talk out of both sides of their mouths and the sanctimonious hypocrites will piously roll their eyes and murmur something about "de mortuis, nihil nisi bonum."

It will certainly be 25 years, probably a half century, before the American people will be able to get an honest count on the McCarthy Senate war against communism. Certainly, there will come out earlier the complete story of the bleeding-heart columnists at a swanky dinner party in Georgetown who gaily pledged that they would put the epithet McCarthyism in the dictionaries as a dirty word.

It will take more time to pluck out the reasons for this panicky joy—how many of these, back in the thirties were uncomfortably close to communism or were actually card-carrying members, or had relatives or persons who later became their husbands or wives who had been card-carrying Commies and now wanted to silence the mouth that might reveal all this.

How long will it take to get the full minutes of the White House conference where it was plotted to frame McCarthy on the Major Peress promotion issue? We figure years and years. And what diaries and post mortem records do we have to wait for until the American people get the details on the White House pressure (and the pressure of Commies and frightened New Deal pinkos) to put across the Senate censure resolution only 2½ years ago?

WHO PROMOTED PERESS?

Quite a number of distinguished members of the Government must die before that story can be safely released. And by the way, who promoted Peress?

And on the issue of personal relations, what addle-pated professor of protocol in the White House sent out that message of condolence an hour after McCarthy's death to his widow, forgetting that she, alone of all the Senate wives, had been deliberately snubbed by Mrs. Eisenhower a few weeks after her husband had been pointedly ignored by the President?

Both McCarthy and later his wife were dropped—and the White House made a point of announcing it—from strictly formal and utterly impersonal White House functions paid for by taxpayers.

This was bad manners in public. But to send, hard on the heels of this evidence of dislike, expressions of sympathy to a grieving widow was an example of callous boorishness not seen in the White House in living memory. It's inconceivable that the President or Mrs. Eisenhower could be guilty of such rudeness. But just the same, it happened, the most sour note in this performance.

COLLEAGUES RELIEVED BY DEATH

Commenting on a McCarthy characteristic—his uncanny ability to bring out the worst of both friend and foe—the sagacious Chicago News correspondent Edwin A. Lahey put a significant finger on one aspect of the ceremonies in the Capitol when he spoke of "the pious hypocrisy of McCarthy's senatorial colleagues who breathed a sigh of relief when the death bulletin was flashed out of Bethesda Naval Hospital."

Aside from the personal tragedy of McCarthy—death at 48 for a man who for 5 years was the national symbol of unrelenting war against Communist-tainted Americans is a real tragedy—his departure from the political scene leaves an unclear picture of the future.

There will be a special election in Wisconsin to select a new Senator. McCarthy's successor will in all probability be a Republican. What it does mean is that the anti-Eisenhower Republicans have lost a onetime powerful warrior but one who, because of failing health for at least a year, and the studied campaign of silence imposed by the propinko Capitol reporters and press, had been drained of his political power.

McCarthy belonged to the Senate group of old-line Taft Republicans, the group which still holds Senate GOP control and can defeat the so-called Eisenhower modern Republicans on any rollcall. But he was closely identified with the smaller, tough, diehard anti-White House, anti-Dulles, anti-Red, and anti-Reds disguised as New-Deal Socialists and one-worlders. This group included such Senators as JENNER of Indiana, DWORSHAK, of Idaho, MALONE, of Nevada, REVERCOMB, of West Virginia, and others whose sentiments are summed up by Idaho's former Senator Welker, who delivered the choking tribute:

"That fighting Irish marine would give the shirt off his back to anyone who needs

it—except a dirty, lying, stinking Communist. That guy he'd kill."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent that an editorial entitled "The McCarthy Heritage," published on May 6, 1957, in Senator McCarthy's hometown newspaper, the Appleton Post-Crescent, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE MCCARTHY HERITAGE

It is always difficult to assess the career of a famous man when the impact of his personality still strongly influences our thinking. Twelve years after the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, for example, attempts to evaluate his accomplishments still spark heated debate. Without question, the same will apply for many years to discussion of the career of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

Yet we believe there exists ground on which both those who loved Joe McCarthy, and most of those who hated him, can meet and find agreement about the real meaning of his career. In order to find this ground it is necessary to delve beyond his fascinating and distracting personality. True, it may be as difficult to do this now as it was when he was alive; it was the force of his extraordinary personality during his lifetime that caused many people to lose sight of what he was trying to do or at least thought he was trying to do, that obscured the real issues between him and his opponents, that caused otherwise intelligent people to forget the fundamental problems of the day and concentrate instead on extreme laudation or extreme vilification of McCarthy the man or McCarthy the symbol. Indeed, it often seemed that McCarthy's personality encroached so much upon current debate as to defeat the very ends McCarthy was trying to reach.

In order to truly assess the meaning of McCarthy and what undoubtedly will come to be called the McCarthy era, it is necessary to rid ourselves so far as is possible of the influence of his personality and ask some fundamental questions. Why did McCarthy suddenly become so famous? Why did his charges about Communist infiltration cause such a tremendous uproar? Why did the people, not only in this country but abroad, become so excited about these charges, develop such passion regarding them?

The answer, we believe, is to be found in the state of the American mind in that fall of 1950 when McCarthy suddenly began making his charges that Communists had infiltrated the agencies of our Government. There was nothing really so extraordinary about these charges, nor were they new. Others had made them before, often in language more extreme than that McCarthy employed. It was, rather, a matter of timing—McCarthy's accusations broke upon the American public at a time when it was just beginning to realize the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, when the complete perfidy and ruthlessness of Communists everywhere was becoming apparent to free men, when the terrible danger under which we had been living for years was beginning to dawn on the public consciousness. The fog in which we had been living during the period of tragic self-delusion regarding world communism had lifted, and while the people were by no means unanimous on what should be done, they were extremely worried, excitable, upset; they were ready to hang on the words of anyone who discussed the problem with any show of honesty and fearlessness.

The truly important thing that took place during this "McCarthy era," therefore, is that the American people finally realized the true nature of that terrible conspiracy for world conquest that is miscalled communism. There are those who will say that McCarthy brought this realization about or at least helped mightily in giving it life; others of course will insist that it was something that was happening anyway and that McCarthy actually delayed its fruition by distracting and exciting the people. But that argument is really not important; what is important is the fact that today Americans in all walks of life—Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, workers, farmers, businessmen, students, housewives, intellectuals, and all the rest—are at last fully aware of the need to fight the Red conspiracy every day, everywhere, on every level of government, in foreign policy, in domestic agencies, in our private organizations and in our daily lives.

Even if the most extreme assertions of McCarthy's enemies were to be accepted—that his methods were outrageous, that he recklessly ruined individual reputations and even endangered freedom itself with the fervency of his onslaught—the fact remains that now that he is gone communism must still be fought, and that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to protect the Nation from the weevils that would infest our institutions and eat away at them until they are brought tumbling down from within. This newspaper is among those who believe that there are those who can do the job better than McCarthy did, that there are methods much better than his for doing it. But the fact remains that the job must still be done, and that if it is not done history might yet come to regard McCarthy as the last sentinel to shout vain warnings from the battlements of freedom.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is the personal opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada that the work of Senator McCarthy will gain greater recognition as time goes on.

Mr. President, the record is clear throughout history that the limiting and curtailment of the investigative power of the legislative body is the first move of potential dictators. This record should not be allowed to stand.

It could well be that the late junior Senator from Wisconsin will be greater in death than in life, as has been the case so many times in the history of this Nation.

Mr. President, this statement would not be complete without the mention of one of the greatest young women whom it has been my privilege to know—Jean McCarthy. She is one of the most loyal and devoted women I have ever known. She was outstanding in her devotion to her late husband and to his work.

STEADY DETERIORATION OF THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for some time many of us on the Senate Agriculture Committee have become increasingly worried about the increasing deterioration of the farm program under this administration.

Steadily more of the taxpayers' money is being expended, with steadily less results.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from a letter from the presiding judge of the great county of Buchanan, Missouri.

The significance of these remarks is that Judge Fred Culver, who is one of the outstanding farm leaders of our State, was a successful engineer in business before going heavily into farming, and is known throughout Missouri for his intelligence and high character.

At the beginning of Secretary Benson's regime as head of the Department of Agriculture, Judge Culver was a supporter of most of his ideas.

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

Of course I have been following the record very closely. Believe it or not, I read also the transcript of the hearings on drought disaster relief, corn program, and agricultural situation, and farm programs. This information, together with press and radio reports have forced me to a reluctant acceptance of the fact that never before in my experience have we had a Secretary of Agriculture who did such an abysmally poor job as does the present incumbent.

What a spectacle. The man who is charged with the duty and responsibility of looking after the interests of farmers uses the publicity mediums to hammer away at two topics; first, that farmers aren't really in bad shape, they just think they are because so many of them are going broke; and second, that our Federal Government is doing far too much for them anyway, and any assistance now given them should be curtailed. In order to bolster his arguments he distorts figures and employs every device known to the bureaucratic doubletalker. I can explain it in no other way than that the policymakers in the Department picture the ordinary farmer as a tricky mendicant who should be made to go into some honest line of work.

Surely in the last 4 years at least he has had an opportunity to meet with and talk to some ordinary farmers, the kind you and I know all over Missouri. Generally speaking, they run to calloused hands, ruddy complexions, and slowness of speech. I think they are men who are caught in an economic squeeze which warrants a lot of consideration and a great deal of assistance until such time as they are getting a return on their labor which is adequate to raise a family, say two-thirds as much as ordinary labor gets. Apparently Secretary Benson and his aids regard these friends of ours as annoying anachronisms, one-third of whom should be liquidated as soon as possible. Another year on what must be the Department's 5-year plan will see this almost accomplished.

SAVINGS IN THE MILITARY SERVICES WITHOUT AFFECTING EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, all of us are interested in savings in the military services which would not reduce the efficiency and effectiveness of our national defense. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a talk I made last night in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

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

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR SYMINGTON AT WILKES-BARRE, PA.

It is clear where this administration can save billions of dollars annually in the Federal budget if it is really sincere in its desire to make these reductions.

People indirectly connected with the administration believe that even under the

present structural conditions of the Pentagon Building, billions can be saved by improvements in the manpower picture alone.

One of the Nation's great industrialists, Ralph Cordiner, president of the General Electric Co., who heads a committee appointed more than a years ago to analyze the manpower problems of the Department of Defense, has announced that there would be ultimate savings of up to $5 billion a year, plus a 15 percent improvement in combat capability, if the manpower recommendations of his Committee were adopted.

According to one of our outstanding military associations, the Air Force Association, the Bureau of the Budget has turned back as unsatisfactory the Defense Department's draft of legislation designed to put the Cordiner proposals into operation.

This action was taken, according to Mr. John P. Henebry, president of that association, in the face of assurances by Secretary Wilson that the proposed legislation would require no increase in the defense budget already submitted to Congress.

Further, the proposed legislation was rejected with the knowledge that it represented the unanimous opinion of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the three military departments, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as an essential contribution to the Nation's defense.

Let me emphasize that this is not a problem of the Air Force alone—but one which impacts equally upon the combat effectiveness of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines.

I for one am not averse to manpower management suggestions from one of the world's greatest industrial experts, designed to save $5 billion, with no decrease whatever in our military strength; and at this session I intend to introduce legislation to that end. In fact, I already have such legislation in draft status.

We owe it to ourselves and to the Nation to countenance no further delays in carrying out a program for maximum utilization of military manpower at minimum cost.

THE AMERICAN WEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the article The American West: Perpetual Mirage, appearing in the June issue of Harper's magazine, has created considerable discussion throughout the West. Walter Prescott Webb's concept of the West, what it is and why it is, has brought many westerners to the defense of their heritage.

Several of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate have taken exception to many of Professor Webb's findings, and more recently one of Montana's most capable weekly newspaper editors, Dan Whetstone, of Cut Bank, Mont., has come forcefully to the defense of Montana in the editorial columns of the Cut Bank Pioneer Press.

Mr. Whetstone, a historian of the West in his own right, provides ample proof in his editorial columns that Montana should not be included among the desert States. He cites Montana's record as one of the Nation's top producers of the high quality grains, livestock, and enormous timber supplies, in addition to its vast natural resources.

I believe that Mr. Whetstone's concluding phrase is deserving of considerable thought in appraising the value of the Harper's article, Growth-of-the-Soil Statistics Disprove It, insofar as the Treasure State is concerned.

The May 4 issue of the Great Falls Tribune also takes Walter Prescott Webb to task for maligning the character and culture of the people of the 17 Western States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Professor Dogmatically Defines the Western Desert," published in the May 2, 1957, Cut Bank Pioneer Press, of Cut Bank, Mont., and an editorial entitled "Ridiculous Maligning of West," published in the Great Falls Tribune, of Great Falls, Mont., on May 4, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at the concluison of my remarks.

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

[From the Cut Bank (Mont.) Pioneer Press of May 2, 1957]

THE PROFESSOR DOGMATICALLY DEFINES THE WESTERN DESERT

When, back in the early twenties, Garret Garrett wrote that long-to-be-remembered article, "The Pain in the Northwest," it pertained only to a portion of Montana, what's usually called the Triangle belt in northern Montana, roughly with Cut Bank-to-Havre as the base and Great Falls as the apex.

The story, appearing in the Saturday Evening Post, was hotly resented by civic and commercial bodies, newspapers within and without the area, but publications in the Midwest and East leaped upon it gleefully, as supporting their contentions that people who left these sections were tricked by slicky promotional publicity to come to this section to file on homesteads and make their homes here. Later Garrett somewhat modified his slashing appraisal of this section of the State.

In the May issue of Harper's magazine, Walter Prescott Webb, a professor of history at the University of Texas, authored an article titled "The American West, Perpetual Mirage." For savage sweep and unrelenting condemnation it makes the Garrett report of long years ago look puerile and puny and it embraces not one locale but a vast region of the plains and prairies West.

In a paragraph in reference to the article Harper's introduces the writer as "the West's leading historian." Well, maybe. The fact that I have never before heard of him may have little or no significance, but "Who's Who," a tome that supposedly prints the biographies of eminent Americans, does not include the Texas savant.

Righteous indignation is no substitute for fact and logic. Let us do a little dissecting of Webb's analyses and conclusions:

His report is accompanied by a map outlining the places he designates as the desert States: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and the rim States, like North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas on the east of the desert, California, Oregon, and Washington on the west.

In his dogmatic detailing of dismal landscapes, relentless drought, a struggling and losing battle to realize a secure economy in the area which he treats, there's a note of hopelessness that is unrelieved; the great American desert always was and always will be and all the plans of venturesome, reckless men to change it have ended and will end in futility and disaster. Only in oases here and there on its expansive bosom will it be possible to prosper in any degree.

In several spots, I feel, his rhetoric runs away and leaves the realities far behind: "There it (the desert) lies around us in all its terror and desolate beauty, its sands shimmering in the distance, its mirages playing tricks with our vision, its mountains edged against the sky, a crosscut saw with some teeth knocked out * * * this is the best of the desert, the worst of the West." What does he mean by that closing observation?

Further on: "The West has no long background, no depth of slow development * * * it has not yet produced a great statesman; 86 people have been voted into the Hall of Fame, but not a single westerner among them * * * in Montana Charlie Russell is better than Titian and Frederick Remington is better than Michelangelo * * * Custer, who blundered to his death, taking better men with him, found a place in every saloon."

The Mormons in Utah produced a good society, says the man, "a rejected people, a bizarre religion, with their symbol, the bees, created a hivelike industry, something admirable."

The other society, that of Nevada, took a different direction; no State has less to recommend it. It is all desert, hardly enough people to maintain State government. It solved its problem by creating an oasis of iniquity; it provided a haven in the desert to which all could come who want to gamble, divorce, and have it quick and legal; it has created the most bizarre society in the Nation.

Anyone who has made his home in dust-blown Texas in recent years might be expected to suffer from a myopia (doctor's term for a distorted vision). I think the professor must be seeing deserts in his sleep.

I only agree to be counsel for the defense so far as Montana is concerned; let the other States named take on the Texas man of the cloister, but in passing I'd designate only New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, and Utah, the areas outside its reclamation projects, as properly to be termed desert States.

From R. A. Lightman, climatologist stationed at Helena, I have been courteously supplied with some pertinent data which seems to supply ample proof that Montana ought not to be listed among the desert States. It belies the thoughtless generalities of Professor Webb, any fair and reasoning person will concede:

In 1955 Montana ranked second in the Nation in the production of wheat (other grains in comparison that year), a total of 109,350,000 bushels. Kansas was first with a production of 128 million bushels.

But this was not the biggest wheat production year in Montana: In 1953 statistics show that Montana produced 114,232,000 bushels, with a value of approximately $250 million. Incidentally, the wheat produced on Montana's dryland areas has a high protein content and is eagerly sought by the milling industry.

We are aware that east of the Continental Divide there are adverse cycles occurring around periods of 7 years. Such adverse periods occurred from 1916 to 1937, the worst being in the early twenties. New types of mechanization, strip farming, contour cultivation on the slopes to conserve rain and snowfall now makes possible fair to good harvests, in below normal moisture years, not possible in earlier years.

A brief look at livestock production: In 1955 Montana ranked 5th in sheep and lambs, 14th in cattle numbers.

As to climatic conditions: Says Webb: "The desert States barely escape the true desert mark of 10 inches." Montana records since 1895 show an overall annual rainfall for Montana of 14.59 inches in the crop-growing months—so important to successful production.

As to commercial timberlands: "Practically all the timber of consequence grows in East Texas, Oklahoma, and the three Pacific States." Wrong, again, Professor Webb. In Flathead, Lincoln and Missoula counties in western Montana are large and commercially desirable timberlands, contributing materially to our natural resources.

"The desert shortened the grass before destroying it," allows the professor. Montana's buffalo grass, short but highly nutritious, fattens Montana cattle and the beef is of blue-chip variety.

There is a western desert but Montana isn't a part of it. Growth-of-the-soil statistics disprove it.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 4, 1957]

RIDICULOUS MALIGNING OF WEST

It would be easy for westerners of an area covering 17 States to become deeply incensed over an article appearing in the current issue of Harpers magazine. It will probably create no great furor, however, because—while deeply maligning the character and culture of the people of 17 States—it attempts to tie together an assortment of elements in which the author becomes hopelessly entangled in his own combination of statistics and erudite posturing.

The title of the article is "The American West—Perpetual Mirage." Harper's bills the author, Walter Prescott Webb, as "the West's leading historian." That, we are sure, is a gross exaggeration, though Webb is by no means unknown in the literary field. He is a history professor at the University of Texas.

The theme he follows in a tortuous manner is that the desert is the major force in the American West and that as a result the vast region has produced comparatively few important men and little interesting history.

He defines the West as "that area west of a line drawn north from the southern tip of Texas."

He divides the 17 States within that region into 8 "desert States" in the center, and 9 desert rim States. In the center, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. On the eastern rim, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota; on the western rim California, Oregon, and Washington.

This area he finds a place where history is brief and bizarre. Where there are few important men—where the people have developed a talent for taking something small and blowing it up to a giant size, as a photographer blows up a photograph.

This attack is ridiculous rather than disturbing. The area he has chosen for his target is too extensive, varied, and imposing in the accomplishments of its people as well as in resources to need defense from his literary popgun.

The written history of the West, we will agree, is neither as extensive nor as fully presented as it should be.

We could do with some more good western historians, with information, ability, and appreciation of the West to properly portray it. The late Joseph Kinsley Howard was such a writer.

Webb was born in the West, now lives there, and has spent considerable time in the region about which he writes. But he has apparently isolated himself from its people and their great accomplishments.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thoughtful editorial from the Oregon Journal of Portland, of April 29, 1957, entitled "Conflicting Views on the West."

This editorial should serve to supplement the effective answers already voiced on the Senate floor by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], in replying to the article in the current issue of Harper's magazine by Walter Prescott Webb which belittles the prestige and influence of the American West.

I am pleased that the author of the Journal editorial has emphasized the fact that one of the greatest writers ever to contribute to Harper's magazine, the late Bernard DeVoto, told many times how the basic problems of the West were often due to the looting and exploiting of the West by absentee eastern capital and corporations.

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

CONFLICTING VIEWS ON THE WEST

Harper's magazine this month publishes an article which says the American West produces comparatively few important men, has little interesting history, and, by some standards, is a depressed region.

The author, Walter Prescott Webb, described by Harper's as the West's leading historian, says this situation results from the fact that the West has been shaped historically and economically by the great desert at its heart.

And he says everyone may as well stop trying to pretend this isn't so.

Just to keep things in proper perspective, we might suggest to historian Webb and to Harper's editors that they reread an article by the late Bernard DeVoto, a gentleman who, if we recall correctly, had something to do with Harper's magazine and, though he may not have had Harper's rating as the West's leading historian, did know something of the West.

The article to which we refer is entitled "The West Against Itself" and appeared in Harper's magazine in January 1947.

Here is the last sentence of DeVoto's opening paragraph: "Economically the West has always been a province of the East and it has always been plundered."

Later he continues in similar vein: "The East has always held a mortgage on the permanent West, channeling its wealth eastward, maintaining it in a debtor status and confining its economic function to that of a mercantilist province."

DeVoto said he lacked space to describe "the system by which the East maintains the West as an economic fief," and we do too.

But we can note, as DeVoto did, the freight rates which were devised so that the East has a favorable rate for the carrying of western raw materials, but the West pays dearly in rates on manufactured goods shipped from the East.

Or of the financial control which allowed the East, in DeVoto's words, "to dictate to it (Western business) or absolutely destroy it."

The great American desert undoubtedly has been a powerful force for the West both historically and economically, but let us not forget that forces other than nature can create an economic desert and, to use Dr. Webb's words, "everybody may as well stop trying to pretend this isn't so."

As the title of DeVoto's article suggests, he lays some of the blame for the situation on what he calls the split personality of westerners themselves, and this charge has considerable merit. Still, the victim of a confidence man, although he may have some larceny in his soul, is not as culpable as the con man himself.

In Dr. Webb's article the unkindest cut is reserved for our cowboys. He says westerners have developed a talent for taking something small and blowing it up to giant size, as a photographer blows up a photograph.

Westerners write of cowboys, says Dr. Webb, "as if they were noble knights and the cowmen kings * * *." Dr. Webb comes from Texas, so perhaps we should let him speak for his State, but there is more to the West than Texas.

There are grains of truth in Dr. Webb's article, but he takes these grains and, to use his own words, blows them up to giant size. We suspect that much of his article was written with tongue in cheek—quite a feat for a Texan, incidentally—but when DeVoto wrote of the plundering of the West, which he did not once but many times, he meant every word of it.

Mr. BIBLE subsequently said: Mr. President, on April 29, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] placed in the RECORD an article entitled "The American West, Perpetual Mirage," which has appeared in a national magazine. The article was written by a purported historian, Walter Prescott Webb. Several other distinguished Senators have already made appropriate comments on the article.

While I do not wish to elaborate on the article at length, I should like to extend an open invitation to Mr. Webb to visit the great State of Nevada. I feel that in his position as a professor of history in one of our great State universities, he should continue his search for true facts; and I am sure that if Mr. Webb would accept an invitation to visit Nevada and other great Western States, he would wish to correct his article, which certainly was not one of factual reporting.

I would feel remiss if I did not extend this invitation, for certainly a person who has the responsibility of molding the minds of the youth of America today, should obtain all the knowledge he possibly can, in order that he may instruct and teach with genuine and truthful perspective.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three editorials from Nevada newspapers, the Ely Daily Times, the Las Vegas Review-Journal, and the Elko Free Press, all of which include appropriate comments on Mr. Webb's recent article.

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

[From the Ely Daily Times of May 1, 1957]

SHOCKER

Harper's magazine is due to come out today with its May issue containing what its editors seem to feel is a real shocker, telling the truth about "The American West—Perpetual Mirage—the one overwhelming fact which 17 States have been trying to hide for the last century."

Speaking of what is close to home here, the article says that a "talent for making the most of little has produced two strange western societies, one good and one bad. The good society is that of the Mormons in Utah, a rejected people with a bizarre religion who sought peace in the desert, took the bee as their symbol, and created by their hive-like industry something admirable.

"The other society of more recent vintage sprang up in a similar desert, but took a different direction. No State has less to recommend it than Nevada. It is all desert and, once its minerals were depleted, it had little chance of prosperity and hardly enough people to maintain a State government. It

solved its problem by creating an oasis of iniquity and license in a sea of moral inhibitions. It provided a haven in the desert to which all could come who wanted to gamble, divorce, or fornicate and have it quick and legal. Then it found it could have a monopoly only on the first two, and so substituted for the third the abolition of State income tax to attract the millionaires who make good customers at the casinos. Nevada was revolutionized, its population shortly doubled, and it has the highest income per capita of any State in the Union. Nevada is what it is today because of what it did not have yesterday. In compensating for what the desert denied it, it has created the most bizarre society in the Nation."

This is not, however, the main point of the article, which is that all the 17 States of the West are either desert or desert rim dominated by desert influences and handicaps, and that the American West produces comparatively few important men, has little interesting history, by some standards is a depressed region, and, we gather between the lines, might just as well be written off as a failure. The article is by Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, University of Texas history professor.

Reason given is that the West has been shaped, historically, and economically, by the great desert at its heart. Dr. Webb says everybody may as well stop trying to pretend it isn't so—thereby accusing westerners of deceit in that they have been trying to deny the existence of the Great American Desert ever since the name was stricken from the maps when settlement began after the Civil War. "It has hardly been mentioned in polite western society since, and never by the chambers of commerce," he adds.

It is hard to tell just what motivates Dr. Webb, for he seems to advance his idea with a certain bitterness as though the West had done something to him for which he seeks revenge. Much of what he writes is the truth, and surely few westerners would deny that we suffer from shortage of moisture, but what he is driving at beyond the facts is difficult to tell. He seems to imply that the West is not worth the trouble taken with it—hence, perhaps, the Federal Government should not spend money on reclamation in the West and should give little if any consideration to western industries, and the people in the East should ignore the West even more completely than they do now, while the people of the West should probably give up the fight and move to the East. He says:

"The farmers with the help of the wind destroyed the soil, the cattle the grass, and the miners removed an irreplaceable resource. The natural wonders, in which the West abounds, have produced annually an increased crop of tourists, whose emblem is the desert water bag. They may prove the West's most dependable asset."

We, of course, agree that tourists are of great importance in the future of the West, of Nevada, of White Pine County. But we do not agree that all else is doomed, for the fact is that western industry is growing, that mineral production is increasing, and that western agriculture is certainly far from insignificant. The more we think about the situation, the more Dr. Gerald Wendt's statement to the local Knife and Fork Club a few weeks ago makes sense to us—that the West is ideally suited for industry and the homes of the people, because of its pleasant and healthful climate, and that the Nation would be well advised to leave the thick soil and ample rainfall of the East and South for agriculture, while encouraging industry to move westward, for climatically speaking the East is best suited for farms and the West for pleasant living.

We suggest the Harper's writer put this in his pipe and smoke it for a while, and see if he can't come up with an article that makes practical sense instead of spreading sectional bitterness and trying to promote frustration.

[From the Las Vegas Review-Journal of May 1, 1957]

THE AMERICAN WEST

A man named Walter Prescott Webb, who claims to be an author and seeks to prove it in an article in Harper's magazine entitled "The American West, Perpetual Mirage," tells his readers that there is nothing whatever to recommend the West in any degree.

Webb does not disguise his dislike for anything west of the Mississippi River, which he says is just desert country, beginning with the second tier of States beyond the big river. The west coast and the border States on the east are desert rim States, Webb adds.

Nevada he holds up as a horrible example.

"No State has less to recommend it," he says. "Since its materials were depleted it had little chance of prosperity and hardly enough people to maintain a State government.

"It turned to sin to solve its problems; Nevada is what it is today because of what it did not have yesterday. In compensation for what the desert denied it, it has created the most bizarre society in the Nation."

It is quite interesting that Webb, who apparently was reared in the concrete jungles of New York City and never bothered to crack a geography book, should speak so knowingly about something of which he has not the slightest information.

Webb claims that the trouble with Nevada is that it is what it is because of what it did not have yesterday. All the so-called author would have had to do was to consult history books to determine that the State of Nevada saved the Union during the Civil War, built a couple of railroads, and laid the foundation for one of the largest corporations in Webb's own New York City. Perhaps we didn't have much in the State of Nevada yesterday, but if what we had yesterday was nothing, then New York City has less now.

He spurns the West and declares that "they make the best of what little they do have."

Perhaps Webb is correct, but we wonder if he has ever seen the sunset on a western hill, or has seen the sun breaking through the clouds just after a rainstorm, or whether he has ever breathed the good, clean air of the desert. We may have little, out here on the desert, but what we do have was built by God and is not the handiwork of man, as is Webb's New York City.

Webb says that when the West is stripped of its mountains there is nothing left. So what—strip New York City of its skyscrapers and what will you have left?

He has little but criticism of the manner in which people live in this western country, declaring that "saloons become art museums," that "cowboys are described as if they were noble knights, and the cowmen kings," and that "Boot Hill becomes a shrine for pilgrims."

We would like to ask Webb just what the history books have to say about old "Commodore" Vanderbilt, the Rockefeller clan and the Carnegie crew. We certainly will stack most of our cowboys and a majority of our cattle barons up against the best the East has to offer and give them a few handicaps, such as loaded dice and marked cards.

For Webb's information, a majority of the people living in the West would not trade their freedom or their outdoor living for all of the skyscrapers, sidewalks, and subways in New York City. The people of the West get a lot closer to God than any resident of New York City and most of the rest of the East. And, after all, that compensates for a lot of "lack" we might have here in the West.

[From the Elko Free Press of Friday, May 3, 1957]

HE SPURNS THE WEST, PARTICULARLY NEVADA

Walter Prescott Webb, writing in a national magazine, spurns the West and points a finger of scorn at Nevada saying "No State has less to recommend it than Nevada."

Scornfully he continues: "It is all desert and, once its minerals were depleted, it has little chance of prosperity and hardly enough people to maintain a State government. It solved its problems by creating an oasis of iniquity and license in a sea of moral inhibitions. It proved a haven in the desert to which all could come who wanted to gamble, divorce or fornicate and have it quick and legal.

"Then it found it could have a monopoly only on the first two, and so substituted for the third the abolition of State income tax to attract the millionaires who make good customers of casinos.

"Nevada was revolutionized, its population shortly doubled, and it has the highest income per capita of any State in the Union. Nevada is what it is today because of what it did not have yesterday. In compensating for what the desert denied it, it has created the most bizarre society in the Nation."

So speaks this self-styled historian who makes no bones about his dislike for anything west of the Mississippi. But his facts are all about as reliable as this one; where he claims the rainmakers are called in with magic, dynamite, and prayer, and later with a chemical calculated to make a dry cloud give water. Even he should know the simple fact that rainmakers claim they can only coax additional moisture from a cloud which already has moisture. But if we cannot rely upon him for simple facts, how can we hold any respect for him?

We will admit that prayer is often used to allay drought. And east of the Mississippi, it is probably turned to as the only means to stop the floods.

While spurning the West he says, "They make the best of what they do have." That we do not deny, but we have more to make the best of than this man who lives in the concrete canyons of New York City will ever know.

He says if the West was stripped of its mountains nothing would be left. And may we ask: If the skyscrapers were taken from New York what would it have?

This great historian, who probably has not been west of the Mississippi River, says nothing about the silver of Nevada which saved the Union; he says nothing about the experiments in this atomic age made upon the Nevada desert for the protection of the millions who live within the great State of New York. He has never seen a Nevada sunset in all its reverent beauty.

He knows nothing of the rugged mountains of Nevada, with their awe-inspiring sights. What he needs is to get closer to God, so he can understand some of the things which he condemns.

All is criticism. Our saloons are art museums and "cowboys are described as if they were noble knights, and the cowman king."

We have been in Webb's New York City, and we'd sooner live in Elko, Nev. Shortcomings we do have, but the filth of a New York slum shelters more misery than can be found in the entire State of Nevada. Give us the freedom of the West, where a man's own eye can see as far as he can with a telescope back East. Give us Nevada, where the people are friendly, where our ranches are great, where our highways are smooth and wide, where the accomplishments of our pioneers will always be an inspiration to the adventurous. Webb can have what he holds so dear. Too bad that he could not have taken the time to come West, into the great American desert area, and see its great growth

and industry. Too bad that he has not taken the time to learn something about the great churches which have been built here, and, most of all, it is too bad that he has not come into this great country so that he could grow in character. But the skyscrapers in New York dim a man's vision, as is readily discernible in his analysis of The American West.—C.

NATIONAL RADIO WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this week the Nation is observing National Radio Week, saluting one of our most vital means of communication.

Those of us in public life are more aware of the great services provided by radio than any other group of people since we know it as the means of communication and information between the people and its Government. Radio is constantly on the job, informing the people.

There are 3,600 AM and FM stations serving the public, and Americans own nearly 150 million radio sets. In fact there are more radios in our homes than any other modern appliance.

Radio has grown tremendously since the first commercially licensed radio station went on the air in 1920. It operates freely under our American system, bringing to the public what it wants—music, news, religion, politics, drama, sports, or entertainment. The public is its censor.

Radio is an integral part of our system of free enterprise, principally as an advertising medium, helping to move goods and services from the producers to the consuming public. The history of radio is filled with dramatic episodes—advance warnings, evacuation bulletins, emergency announcements, pleas for help, and round-the-clock broadcasting.

Since Americans are so inclined to take for granted such things as radio—National Radio Week is set aside to pay tribute to this great medium of communication.

THE BUDGET

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, with each passing day it becomes increasingly apparent that Congress is placed in a very difficult position with respect to the budget. We are being requested to act on conflicting advice, and we are being told that either course we take will injure our country.

We all remember the events at the beginning of the year. Late January there was sent to Congress a budget of $71,800,000,000, the largest peacetime spending budget in the history of the Nation.

We were then invited publicly to cut that budget, and we were told by the Secretary of the Treasury that we would have a hair-curling depression if we failed to do so.

Now we witness a parade of Cabinet officers coming to the Senate Appropriations Committee and asking that the Senate restore the cuts which have already been made by the House of Representatives. And only a few minutes ago we were told that the Postmaster General is going to have to have some extra money, and that he will ask for it during the afternoon.

I have no way of knowing whether Postmaster General Summerfield's request is justified. He has yet to specify the amount or the need. But neither do I have any way of knowing which course represents the policy of the administration.

This morning, the President, I understand, after conferring with the distinguished leaders of the minority, announced he will make 2 television appearances to defend his budget. I did not say the minority budget. I said the President's budget.

At the same time the President tells us there are no differences between him and his "hair-curling" Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. President, I cannot avoid the feeling that this is something like the old shell game—"now you see it, now you don't." We cannot cut the budget without cutting spending, and we cannot adopt one course in January and another course in May.

The Senate, of course, will have to listen to all the facts and make its decision according to the best judgment it has. But the country should know that we are not being helped at all in this enterprise by those who are cutters when it comes to the budget but spenders when it comes to appropriations.

Although the Senate Appropriations Committee is going to be delayed perhaps for a number of days in reporting appropriation bills, I want the Senate to know that, in my opinion, this delay is justified; that the committee should not recommend one thin dime which has not been justified beyond the peradventure of a doubt; and that when an appropriation bill comes to the floor of the Senate, the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member will be able to stand up and defend it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This morning I happened to see on the ticker a statement which I believe was issued by the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], one of the Republican leaders, to the effect that the administration was considering sending to the Congress a new mutual security proposal, which will provide for $500 million less than the $4.4 billion requested earlier this year. If the administration can cut a half billion dollars off the foreign-aid bill, it would indicate that there was something wrong in their reasoning and figuring in the beginning. I am wondering why it might not perhaps be possible to bring about a consolidation of some of the numerous Government agencies, such as the USIA and the ICA, put them in the State Department, where they belong, and in that way do away with some duplication and overlapping, and bring, under this "businessman's" administration, greater efficiency and cohesion in the administration of the affairs of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion. I hope we can effect some consolidation which will result in economy. I know nothing about the administration's new proposals in the field of foreign aid. A bipartisan meeting has been called for tomorrow. I expect an announcement in the newspapers today, something that is usually done when a bipartisan conference is called.

I say to the Senator from Montana I cannot attest to the accuracy of the report that the administration has been able to save $500 million in the foreign-aid item since it sent the budget to the Congress, but I hope the report is true. I am of the opinion the Congress is not only going to save that much in foreign aid, but may increase the reduction.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator may be recognized on his own time. The Senate is operating under limited time, and I am limited in the time I have.

PROTECTION OF HUMANITY FROM ILL EFFECTS OF RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as all of us know, the world is confronted with crucial decisions on the matter of the effect of radiation on the human race.

As yet, far too little is known of the immediate, as well as the ultimate, effects which radiation may have.

While we are thinking about sustaining or reducing the budget, we should also be thinking in terms of whether or not humanity will be obliterated. That can be done if we cut the budget to a point where the Kremlin thinks it then is time to attack us. According to information submitted by the Army, the third world war will bring about the loss of 70 million American lives.

So great are the dangers of radioactive fallout that I believe we must stimulate authoritative research into this field.

As we recall, in 1955 the United Nations created a Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. This Committee met for the first time in Geneva in April 1957, and discussed the genetic effects of radiation and measurements of radioactive fallout, particularly of strontium 90. Although the committee has not yet conducted any extensive research, it is agreed that radiation is harmful to humans. The fallout danger is especially high in countries like the United States, the United Kingdom, and Sweden, where the population has already been subjected to a considerable amount of radiation through medical practices.

As we know, hearings are scheduled by a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to begin May 27 and to extend through June 7. The hearings are expected to cover the fallout cycle from its inception in the detonation of nuclear weapons, through its dissemination in the atmosphere and descent to the earth, and finally to its uptake and effects on human beings, animals, and vegetation.

In this highly technical field, of course, we must rely heavily upon the findings of our scientists. However, we must also attempt to correlate their conclusions and then formulate protective programs

and policies in the interests of our people.

The Sunday Star published an informative article entitled "The Debate of the Scientists," on the pros and cons—in lay language—of this vital issue.

Believing we can all benefit from this simplification of factors to be considered on the atomic issue, I request unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE DEBATE OF THE SCIENTISTS

ACTUAL RISK IS SMALL

(By Willard F. Libby, member, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission)

Ever since its nuclear testing activities began, the United States Atomic Energy Commission has been aware of the importance of investigating the possible effects of radioactive fallout and of determining how much fallout radioactivity has been produced by nuclear tests.

Particularly in recent years, a great amount of information has been amassed by the Commission's studies. Literally hundreds of thousands of dust samples, and thousands of samples of soil, plants, milk, other food products, and bones have been collected in this country and in other parts of the world, and have been analyzed for radioactivity.

As a result, good information is available on the amounts of radioactivity which have been deposited as fallout, the uptake of fallout radioactivity into plants, animals, and human beings, and the rate of descent of the radioactive particles from the stratosphere.

There is less certainty about the magnitude of the biological effects which might be expected from test fallout, and probably this cannot be stated in precise numerical terms at this time. Nevertheless, among those scientists who have studied the question, there is general agreement that fallout radiation exposures at the present rate of testing are far too small to result in observable effects among the population.

The two hazards

There are two possible hazards from fallout radioactivity. One is the genetic hazard due to radiation of the reproductive organs by penetrating gamma radiation. The other is the hazard to health due to irradiation of the bones by strontium 90 taken up in food and deposited in the skeleton. The magnitude of both these possible effects depends upon the amount of radiation exposure.

The conclusion that the actual risk from test fallout is small is based upon the following principal reasons:

1. The radiation exposures from test fallout are very small compared with the radiation exposures which living things receive, and always have received, from cosmic rays from outer space, and from the radioactive materials naturally present in the soil, air, water, plants, and animals, and even in our own bodies.

2. The radiation exposures from test fallout are far below the permissible amounts of radiation which have been recommended by the most authoritative scientific groups in this country and other countries for exposure of the public.

Natural radiation exposure is called the radiation background. Background levels differ from place to place. They are above normal in areas where uranium or thorium minerals are close to the surface. They also increase with altitude, because of an increased effect of cosmic rays. These differences in natural exposure from locality to locality range up to amounts 100 times greater than the exposures which have resulted from test fallout.

Some comparisons

To be more specific, present strontium-90 levels produce a dosage to new bone, such as that formed in children, about the same as the additional dosage which a resident at sea level would receive from cosmic rays if he moved from a beach to the top of a hill a few hundred feet high. The external dosages from fallout, that is, those which might cause genetic effects, have been about 0.7 to about 3 percent of the dosages from natural radiation.

In certain parts of the world, brick or concrete-block houses may contain enough radioactive material to expose residents to considerably more radiation than persons living in wooden houses. These additional dosages may range from 8 to 100 times the dosage due to test fallout.

What about future nuclear tests? Without going into detail, it can be demonstrated that, even if tests were to continue at the present rate for decades, the exposures from fallout still would be small in comparison with the exposures from natural radioactivity.

No scientist maintains that there is no risk at all from test fallout. What the data show is that the risk is extremely small compared with other risks which are a part of everyday life. We must weigh this risk against the risk to ourselves, our freedoms, and the safety of the whole free world should we abandon tests before achieving an effective system of safeguarded disarmament.

THE CAUTIOUS SIDE

(By John M. Fowler and Norman Goldberg, assistant professors of physics at Washington University (St. Louis) and the University of Pennsylvania)

The striking fact which emerges from an examination of scientific attitudes toward the hazards of fallout radiation is the widely divergent interpretations of the present meager experimental data.

This divergence of viewpoint is perhaps best illustrated by the recent conflicting statements of Dr. Albert Schweitzer and Dr. Libby.

The fact is, the divergence reflects an uncertainty on the part of the scientists. It is our opinion that an evaluation of the hazard, and decisions based on this evaluaiton, must recognize that it is not possible to measure precisely the dangers on the basis of present knowledge.

There are two general questions which must be asked, and the exactness with which these can be answered, should govern the certainty with which statements about the hazard are made: (1) "How much is safe?" and (2) "How much will we get?"

The first question is one to which radiologists have directed a great deal of attention. They have attempted to set a "best guess" as to a "maximum permissible whole body" dose.

If one looks at the history of this "maximum permissible whole body" dose, one finds that it has been reduced, in successive reevaluations, to one-twelfth of the value first set in 1931. New information has almost always shown important low intensity effects which had been overlooked before.

Fallout radiation gives rise to both genetic effects, which harm our offspring, and pathological effects, which harm the person receiving the radiation. The most hazardous fallout component, in regard to pathological effects, is strontium-90, a bone-seeking substance of long-lasting activity.

Uncertainty is the problem

The "maximum permissible concentration" for strontium-90 has the same sources of uncertainty that are found in other safe standards. It is based upon very meager experimental information, derived as it was largely from experience in less than 100 cases of radium poisoning, all of whom were adults. The extrapolation from radium to strontium-90 is also a source of uncertainty. Moreover, children are likely to be more sensitive to radiation than adults.

There is a strong possibility, based again on a few difficult experiments, that any amount of strontium-90 can cause serious damage—leukemia or bone tumors. Many scientists strongly suspect that any radiation which takes us appreciably above the existing natural level of radiation, which is due to cosmic rays, natural radioactivity in the soil, etc., is dangerous. We do not know what amount of damage is being done by these natural radiations and so cannot safely evaluate the effect of adding to them.

Attempts to answer the second question, "How much radiation will we get?" are also fraught with uncertainties.

Estimates are possible

From balloon sampling of the stratosphere, from soil samples, from sampling food, and actual human bones for strontium-90 content, we can make rather good estimates of the amount of strontium-90 the average child, growing up in this strontium-90 containing environment, will build into his bones. This figure is expected to be about 2 or 3 percent of the MPC established for the general population. This amounts to about a 5-percent increase over the world natural average level.

An increase of this amount may not cause detectable effects, but here again we are faced with uncertainties when we consider fluctuations from the average. We must ask how many people will be, for some biological, dietary, or environmental reason, unaverage and perhaps store 10 or 30 times the average amount in their system.

This then is the problem which faces us. We are applying a safe level, which varies from individual to individual, and which in itself contains sources of uncertainty, to a situation in which the accretion of radioactive material is widely variable.

If the fallout were only a possible menace to the testing nations, it would be proper for them to make a judgment about the relative risks of fallout versus cessation of bomb testing, and act accordingly. Since, in fact, the testing powers are subjecting the entire world to fallout radiation, the testing powers face heavy responsibility to err only on the cautious side.

EFFECT OF CREDIT POLICY UPON FARMERS OF IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, most of us are aware that the farmers of the country are mercilessly squeezed between the declining prices received for the products they grow, and the increasing costs of the goods and services they must buy. One of these spiraling costs is credit, and no distortion of the facts can conceal from the farmer that the tight money policy being pursued by this administration is adding to the farmers' burden.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by a farmer, who is one of the outstanding citizens of Idaho, Mr. Howard Hechtner, president of the Nez Perce National Farm Loan Association, showing the consequences to the farmers of Idaho, in the increased cost of both long- and short-term credit, resulting from this administration's hard money policy.

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

STATE OF IDAHO,
STATE SENATE,
Boise, April 25, 1957.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: You no doubt are aware of the increased interest rates which are having an undesirable effect on the farmers' economy. I am president of the Nez Perce National Farm Loan Association which makes and services Federal Land Bank loans in Lewis, Nez Perce, and Clearwater Counties in Idaho, and Asotin County in Washington.

On June 1, 1956, it became necessary for the Federal Land Bank of Spokane to increase our contract interest rate on loans from 4 percent to 4½ percent. Previously, the 4-percent rate had been effective since prior to 1940. On November 19, 1956, an increase to 5 percent became necessary. There is now talk that we may have to increase the rate to farmers to 5½ percent. These increases are a result of the larger interest rate that Federal farm loan bonds are bringing when being sold on the open market. Recent bonds sold for 4 percent and 3⅞ percent and a larger bond issue is coming up for sale this fall. These maturing bonds which now draw less than 2 percent will probably be refinanced at a cost exceeding 4 percent. The Federal Land Bank has over $100 million of mortgages outstanding at a 4 percent contract rate. This means that new loans at a higher rate will be the only source of income available to continue this service to the farmer, not only of this area but of the Nation as well.

Like 300 members of this association, I am a farmer and these increasing costs of money make it more difficult to successfully run a farm. You are aware that our income is down, and the costs of labor and farming equipment continually increase. This is a critical matter and I am bringing it to your attention with the hope that an investigation will be made. I feel that such an investigation will show that the increased cost of money is a result of the hard money policy which the banks and insurance companies have enjoyed during the past 4 years. I would be very happy to give you additional information regarding interest rates on long-term loans.

I am also a member of the Production Credit Association, and their interest rate on short-term loans is now 6½ percent. It is probable that this may be increased to 7 percent when new loans are made this fall. I know that you are interested in the conditions which now confront the farmer, and we would appreciate your assistance in this matter. A similar letter has been written to Representative GRACIE PFOST.

Sincerely,

HOWARD D. HECHTNER, *President.*

PULITZER PRIZE AWARD TO SENATOR KENNEDY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senate was honored recently when one of its members was awarded the 1957 Pulitzer prize for outstanding biography.

The award to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was recognition of the excellence of his book Profiles in Courage, published by Harpers & Bros., which tells the story of political independence and courage of great American political leaders.

The Pulitzer awards were started in 1917 under the will of the late Joseph Pulitzer, publisher of the New York World. They are made by the trustees of Columbia University, acting on the recommendations of an advisory board. The Pulitzer awards in the fields of letters and music are the outstanding awards to American authors for their cultural achievements.

Senator KENNEDY has distinguished himself as a Member of Congress, both in the House of Representatives and the Senate. We all are proud of this further recognition which has come to him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the biography of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, which appeared in the New York Times of May 7, 1957, in connection with his Pulitzer award for distinguished biography.

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

JOHN F. KENNEDY

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, a Representative at 29 years of age and a Senator at 36, became a Pulitzer prize author at 39.

Sandy-haired Senator KENNEDY picked off the prize for biography with his second book, Profiles in Courage. It was a study of political integrity as personified by selected American politicians, some well known, some obscure.

Senator KENNEDY, who will be 40 years old on May 29, already has achieved fame on a national level. He just missed being nominated for Vice President by the 1956 Democratic National Convention. The nomination went to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Mr. KENNEDY has represented Massachusetts since 1947 as a Representative from the Cambridge area until 1953, and in the Senate thereafter.

Known as "Jack" to his associates, he has poise, polish, education, and money. He is the son of Joseph P. Kennedy, former Wall Street banker and Ambassador to Great Britain. (A younger brother, Robert Kennedy, is counsel for the Senate Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations)

The Senator was born at Brookline, Mass., in 1917. He studied at the London School of Economics and received a bachelor of science cum laude from Harvard in 1940. He holds honorary doctor of laws degrees from Notre Dame University and Tufts College.

As a correspondent for International News Service, he covered the San Francisco United Nations Conference, the British election and the Potsdam meeting in 1945. He served with the Navy as a P. T. boat commander in the South Pacific.

His first book, While England Slept, published in 1940, was based on observations while with his father during the latter's period as Ambassador. Profiles in Courage was written during a year's convalescence from World War II injuries.

The Senator married the former Jacqueline Lee Bouvier in 1954.

THE BUDGET

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, evidently certain segments of the Republican Party have still in supply some of the same irresponsible arguments used against Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. Rather than throw away the blank forms, they are now being employed by Republicans against President Eisenhower. Perhaps these persons have forgotten that the White House changed hands in 1952.

I have before me a manifesto from the Douglas County Young Republican Club, of Omaha, Nebr., dated May 2, 1957. The manifesto advises me that the administration budget is appropriating "$196,713,698 per day to support a sprawling, expanding bureaucracy." I also am told by this Republican group that my home city of Portland, Oreg., is being assessed $489,452 a day to sustain this "sprawling, expanding bureaucracy."

Republicans in Omaha, let me add, have one thing in common with Republicans in Portland, Oreg. They are the ones attacking President Eisenhower's budget. Democrats seem to have a greater sense of responsibility. They are not willing to risk wholesale losses in social-welfare programs, in care for war veterans, in the defense of our country, in aid for schools, in natural resource development, in cancer and heart research—merely to score a political point against "a sprawling, expanding bureaucracy," even one under Republican leadership.

Mr. President, on March 29, 1957, I suggested that the President might take the case for the budget directly to the American people, in a series of television broadcasts. I understand that he is now contemplating such a course. But, as Adlai Stevenson said the other day, if he does, the Republicans will no doubt ask for equal time.

Mr. President, I have a suggestion for President Eisenhower. Until 1948 General Eisenhower was not certain to which political party he gave his allegiance. His authorized biographer, Robert J. Donovan, reports that at one time during his Presidency, Mr. Eisenhower actually considered organizing a new political party because of his frustration with rightwing Republicans.

I formally propose that Dwight Eisenhower shift his affiliation to the Democratic Party, because 90 percent of the attacks upon his budget come from Republicans and 90 percent of the defense comes from Democrats.

The President's budget is the instrument for financing the President's program. The two are inseparable. If the President's budget is to be cut, then his program also must be curtailed. There is growing evidence that the program of the President does not conform to views of members of the party which he heads. Furthermore, on rollcall votes in the House of Representatives, a majority of Republicans have voted to slash the President's budget while a majority of Democrats have voted to support the budget.

How long is our President going to remain affiliated with a political party which has originated, planned, and pushed the current effort to emasculate the President's budget and his program? Is Dwight Eisenhower the leader of the Republican Party or is he its No. 1 victim and target?

I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the letter sent by the Douglas County Young Republican Club of Omaha, Nebr.,

to the mayor of the city of Portland, a carbon copy of which was sent to me, be printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

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

DOUGLAS COUNTY
YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB,
Omaha, Nebr., May 2, 1957.

THE MAYOR,
City of Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MAYOR: The single vital organ of a Washington bureaucrat is his checkbook—one that never has to be balanced. Let's see what they are proposing to do to us this year.

A sum of $1.15 per day for every man, woman, and child in the United States is a per capita breakdown of the cost of the newly proposed Federal budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957.

The sum of $196,713,698 per day to support a sprawling, expanding bureaucracy.

In the last analysis every penny of these amounts will be paid by people—your neighbors and ours. According to the 1950 census figures, this will cost the people of your city, the home town of your United States Senator, the Honorable RICHARD LEWIS NEUBERGER, $489,452 per day for every day of the next fiscal year.

Immediately following announcement of the $71,800,000,000 budget, a shocked Nation became aroused and flooded the Washington mailbags with protests. The usual thing is now happening—the citizens' protests are drying up and the pressure groups are moving in—24 hours a day. Demands for a worldwide welfare state are overwhelming and our Senators and Congressmen need our support. Let us rekindle the fire that burned a few weeks ago, and cut out the bureaucrats' vital organ—his checkbook.

We urge you, as we are urging the mayors of the home towns of the other 95 United States Senators, to use your power and prestige to stimulate the people of your city. Urge them to become aroused and vocal on this question. Ask them—can they afford the above figure? We are sure of their answer and we will depend on you to establish a sustained letter-writing campaign on this subject.

Please do all you can, and do it now.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS COUNTY YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB.
DAN MONEN, Jr., *Chairman.*

RAPID TAX AMORTIZATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there are several items which I wish to discuss during the morning hour.

This morning's press reports the Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, as saying that the fast tax writeoff program "adds to inflation, gives favored companies an unfair advantage over competitors, and by holding back revenue postpones the day of tax reduction."

I shall ask to have certain material printed in the RECORD. Before doing so, let me say that I agree with the Secretary of the Treasury that accelerated tax amortization certificates give favored companies unfair advantages over competitors. However, I regret that his own personal financial records do not seem to bear out his advice to the committee.

Thanks to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and his initiative, I can now present to the Senate information of unusual interest in connection with tax amortization and Mr. Humphrey.

The Senator from West Virginia asked the Office of Defense Mobilization to list the rapid tax writeoff certificates granted to companies with which the Secretary's M. A. Hanna Co. is associated directly or by interlocking directorates. The period listed is from the start of the program through April 11, 1957. Mr. Humphrey was a member of the ODM board 4 of these years.

This list shows that 410 certificates totaling $1,021,813,000 were granted these companies.

As the Senate will recall, Secretary Humphrey told the Finance Committee:

My securities, which I expect to retain, consist now and have always consisted almost entirely of common stocks of four companies with whose management I was associated. These are the M. A. Hanna Co., Hanna Coal & Iron Corp., National Steel Corp., and Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. * * * The M. A. Hanna Co., in turn, owns substantial stock interests in National Steel, Pittsburgh Consolidation, Industrial Rayon Corp., Standard Oil of New Jersey, Phelps Dodge Corp., Seaboard Oil Co., Iron Ore Company of Canada, Durez Plastics & Chemicals, Inc., Hanna Coal & Ore Corp., and smaller interests in a few other companies.

A list of all the companies associated with M. A. Hanna interests has been compiled by the Library of Congress for the Senator from West Virginia, and I now present it for the RECORD.

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

Necessity certificates issued from start of program in 1950 through April 11, 1957

[In thousands of dollars]

Number	Name of company	Estimated cost	Certified amount	Amortized amount
3	Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co	2,653	2,539	1,629
15	Republic Aviation Corp	13,177	12,767	8,203
14	Commercial Solvents Corp	31,361	31,167	16,827
7	Hooker Electrochemical Co	7,161	6,535	3,146
71	Union Carbide & Carbon Co	551,358	517,350	305,245
8	Hanna Coal & Ore Corp	18,722	18,484	13,779
1	North Western-Hanna Fuel Co	400	400	200
33	American Can Co	47,607	45,239	17,591
68	General Electric Co	181,863	179,395	113,458
1	National Electric Coil Co	894	864	475
3	Dravo Corp	587	579	295
32	National Steel Corp	165,383	163,869	77,856
1	Phelps Dodge Corp	2,325	2,325	1,511
3	Butler Bros	1,841	1,841	1,183
1	Douglas Mining Co	447	398	298
4	Hanna Iron Ore Co	4,277	4,277	2,769
1	Hanna Nickel Smelting Co	22,000	22,000	18,700
5	Hanna Ore Mining Co	3,318	3,076	1,839
1	Iron Ore Company of Canada	111,250	111,250	83,438
5	Mesaba-Cliffs Mining Co	1,262	1,262	793
2	Morton Ore Co	9,353	3,949	2,466
15	Continental Oil Co	43,777	43,469	29,865
2	Seaboard Oil Company of Delaware	1,120	1,033	684
17	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western RR	45,464	45,430	32,542
76	Pennsylvania RR	434,761	432,303	265,105
13	Virginian Ry Co	22,196	22,136	14,526
6	American Shipbuilding Co	1,590	1,471	956

Necessity certificates issued from start of program in 1950 through April 11, 1957—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Number	Name of company	Estimated cost	Certified amount	Amortized amount
1	Hansand Steamship Corp	$6,073	$5,986	$3,592
1	Industrial Rayon Corp	4,373	4,373	2,842
410	Necessity certificates issued	1,736,643	1,685,767	1,021,813

NOTE.—29 companies issued necessity certificates.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated April 15, 1957, addressed by George B. Beitzel, Assistant Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C. April 15, 1957.

Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEELY: This is with further reference to your letter of March 28, 1957, requesting certain information as to Government aid to and purchases from a list of companies.

Attached is the information requested on necessity certificates issued for tax amortization through April 11, 1957. In total 410 necessity certificates were issued to 29 of the companies. None were issued the 56 remaining firms.

None of the 85 companies applied for a section 302 loan; hence, no certificates of essentiality have been issued nor such loans made by the Treasury to any on the list.

We are informed by the General Services Administration that the information you requested on Government purchases and contracts is being assembled but that it will take considerable time to complete the report. We will of course transmit the report to you immediately upon its completion.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. B. BEITZEL,
Assistant Director.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in putting this material in the RECORD, I point out that two companies in which the Secretary has the greatest personal interest, Iron Ore Co. of Canada and National Steel, of which company the Secretary it is reported will become chairman of the board, have received substantial writeoffs. Iron Ore of Canada, for example received permission to amortize $83,438,000—and I point out that its operations are largely in Canada and not the United States—and National Steel $77,856,000.

It might be interesting to find out how many requests for tax amortization certificates by these companies are now pending. In other words the Secretary's companies showed no reluctance to apply for, and Secretary Humphrey apparently saw no danger in, rapid tax writeoffs in the period 1950 through April 11, 1957. Could it be that the

danger only occurred after these companies had received substantial benefits, which they did not want others to have?

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an exhibit entitled "Interlocking Officers and Directors—Assets and Type of Business of Corporations Having Officers or Directors Who Are Also Officers or Directors of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. and the M. A. Hanna Co."

There being no objecton, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Interlocking officers and directors, assets, and type of business of corporations having officers or directors who are also officers or directors of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. and the M. A. Hanna Co.

Type of business	Company	Name of officers or directors who are also officers or directors of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. (P) or the M. A. Hanna Co. (H)	Total assets as of Dec. 31, 1956, unless otherwise stated (in thousands of dollars)
Bituminous coal	Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.	James F. Bisset, J. H. Bowen, S. M. Cassidy, C. W. Clayton, John Corcoran, G. R. Higinbotham, A. H. Hunt, James Hyslop, R. L. Ireland (H), A. A. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, J. W. Kepler, J. M. Knowles, G. W. Kratz, Arthur B. Lawrence, George H. Love (H), A. R. Matthews, D. L. McElroy, Joseph W. Oliver, Ernest G. Otey, Joseph Pursglove, Jr., H. C. Rose, W. F. Schulten, G. A. Shoemaker, H. N. Smith, G. O. Tarleton.	$340,803.
Coal, iron ore operators	M. A. Hanna Co	Warren Bicknell, Jr., Leonard C. Hanna, Jr., Gilbert W. Humphrey, R. L. Ireland (P), George H. Love (P), W. H. Marting, W. H. Moore, Ralph Perkins, William C. Pieper, James N. Sherwin, Lawrence W. Spang, Joseph H. Thompson.	$159,559.
Aircraft	Republic Aviation Corp	William H. Moore (H)	$108,808, Dec. 31, 1955.
Banks	Bankers Trust Co. (New York)	do	$2,711,111, June 30, 1956.
	Dollar Savings Bank (Pittsburgh)	Joseph Wood Oliver (P)	$140,606, June 30, 1956.
	Farmers and Merchants National Bank of Winchester, Va.	Charles Hill Jones (P)	$15,850, June 30, 1956.
	(First National Bank Bluefield, W. Va.).	Armstrong R. Matthews (P), Ernest Glenwood Otey (P)	$31,565, June 30, 1956.
	Mellon National Bank & Trust Co. (Pittsburgh).	George Hutchinson Love (P-H)	$1,947,915, June 30, 1956.
	National City Bank of Cleveland	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H), Joseph H. Thompson (H)	$707,744. June 30, 1956.
	Society for Savings in City of Cleveland.	Warren Bicknell, Jr. (H)	$340,549, June 30, 1956.
	Society National Bank of Cleveland.	do	$46,232, June 30, 1956.
	Union Bank of Commerce (Cleveland).	R. Livingston Ireland (P) (H)	$265,989, June 30, 1956.
	Union National Bank of Little Rock.	Jerome Holt Bowen (P)	$74,013, June 30, 1956.
Chemicals	Commercial Solvents Corp	Arthur B. Lawrence (P)	$74,580.
	Hooker Electrochemical Co	Walter A. Marting (H)	$122,870, Nov. 30, 1956.
	Union Carbide & Carbon Corp	George Hutchinson Love (P) (H)	$1,459,749.
Coal	Beaver Creek Consolidated Coal Co.	Samuel M. Cassidy	Subsidiary of National Steel Corp.
	Christopher Coal Co	Dennis Lee McElroy (P)	Subsidiary of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.
	Consolidation Coal Co	Carl W. Clayton (P), George R. Higinbotham (P)	Division of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.
	Hanna Coal Co	James Hyslop (P)	Do.
	Hanna Coal & Ore Corp	George Watts Humphrey (H), William C. Pieper (H), Joseph H. Thompson (H).	59 percent owned by M. A. Hanna Co.
	Jamison Coal & Coke Co	Dennis Lee McElroy	Subsidiary of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.
	Mathies Coal Co	George Alber Shoemaker (P)	33 percent owned by Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.
	North Western	Jacob W. Kepler (P)	Subsidiary of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.
	Pocahontas Fuel Co	Charles Hill Jones (P), Arthur B. Lawrence (P), Armstrong R. Matthews (P), Ernest Glenwood Otey (P).	$70,358, Dec. 31, 1955.
	Red Jacket Coal Corp	Ernest Glenwood Otey (P)	Affiliate of W. M. Ritter Lumber Co.
	Turkey Gap Coal & Coke Co	Carl W. Clayton (P)	Not available.
Containers	American Can Co	William H. Moore (H)	$499,841.
Electrical	Consolidated Electronics Industries Corp.	Arthur B. Lawrence (P)	$15,294, Sept. 30, 1956.
	General Electric Co	George Hutchinson Love (P) (H), Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H).	$1,727,553, Dec. 31, 1955.
	National Electric Coil Co	Ernest Glenwood Otey (P)	Not available.
Food products	Hershey Creamery Co	Charles Hill Jones (P)	$3,641, Dec. 31, 1955.
Insurance	Guardian Life Insurance Company of New York, New York, N. Y.	do	$403,678, Dec. 31, 1955.
	Royal Insurance Co., Ltd. (Liverpool, England) (American branch).	William H. Moore (H)	$63,039, Dec. 31, 1955.
Investment and sales companies.	Elk Horn Coal Sales Corp	Carl W. Clayton (P), Jacob W. Kepler (P)	Subsidiary of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.
	Renton Investment Co	George Hutchinson Love (P) (H)	Subsidiary of M. A. Hanna Co.
Machinery and mine supplies.	Fairmont (W. Va.) Machinery Co.	Samuel M. Cassidy (P), George R. Higinbotham (P), James Hyslop (P), Dennis Lee McElroy (P), Joseph Wood Oliver (P), George Albert Shoemaker (P).	Subsidiary of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.
	Fairmont Supply Co	George R. Higinbotham, James Hyslop (P), Dennis Lee McElroy (P), George Albert Shoemaker (P).	Do.
	Hill Acme Co	Ralph Perkins (H)	Not available.
Metal fabricating	Dravo Corp	George Albert Shoemaker (P)	$51,683, Dec. 31, 1956.
	Hayes Industries	Arthur B. Lawrence (P)	$8,127, July 31, 1956.
	National Steel Corp	R. Livingston Ireland (P), George Hutchinson Love (P), Joseph H. Thompson (H).	$591,331, Dec. 31, 1955.
	National, U. S. Radiator Corp	Charles Hill Jones (P)	$27,771, Mar. 31, 1956.
	Phelps Dodge Corp	R. Livingston Ireland (P-H)	$457,818.
Metals and mining	Butler Bros	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H), Joseph H. Thompson (H)	$41,343.
	Consumers Ore Co	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H)	32.5 percent owned by Inland Steel Co.
	Douglas Mining Co	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H)	65 percent owned by M. A. Hanna Co.
	Hanna Iron Ore Co	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H), Joseph H. Thompson (P)	Subsidiary of National Steel Corp.
	Hanna Nickel Smelting Co	William C. Pieper (H)	Subsidiary of M. A. Hanna Co.
	Hanna Ore Mining Co	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H), Joseph H. Thompson (H)	Subsidiary of National Steel Corp.
	Harmar Coal Co	George Albert Shoemaker (P)	75 percent owned by Wheeling Steel Corp.
	Holannah Mines, Ltd	Walter A. Marting (H)	50 percent owned by Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd.
	Hollinger, Hanna, Ltd	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H), Walter A. Marting (H)	50 percent owned by Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., and 50 percent owned by M. A. Hanna Co.
	Hollinger North Shore Exploration Co., Ltd.	Walter A. Marting (H)	60 percent owned by Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., M. A. Hanna Co.
	Iron Ore Co. of Canada	Gilbert Watts Humphrey, Walter A. Marting (H), William C. Pieper (H), Joseph H. Thompson (H).	Affiliate of Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., and other companies.

Interlocking officers and directors, assets, and type of business of corporations having officers or directors who are also officers or directors of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. and the M. A. Hanna Co.—Continued

Type of business	Company	Name of officers or directors who are also officers or directors of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. (P) or the M. A. Hanna Co. (H)	Total assets as of Dec. 31, 1956, unless otherwise stated (in thousands of dollars)
Metals and mining—con.	Iron Ore Land Co.	William C. Pieper (H)	Not available.
	Labrador Mining & Exploration Co.	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H), Joseph H. Thompson (H)	51 percent owned by Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd.
	Mahoning Ore & Steel Co.	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H)	Affiliate of Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.
	Maria Luisa Ore	do	50 percent owned by M. A. Hanna Co.
	Mesaba, Cliffs Mining Co.	do	Affiliate of National Steel Corp.
	Norton Ore Co.	do	59 percent owned by M. A. Hanna Co.
	National Potash Co.	George Albert Shoemaker (P)	Affiliate of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. and Freeport Sulphur Co.
	Shattuck Denn Mining Corp.	Warren Bicknell, Jr. (H)	$4,716, Dec. 31, 1955.
	Susquehanna Ore Co.	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H)	Affiliate of National Steel Corp.
Oil	Continental Oil Co.	Arthur B. Lawrence (P)	$503,899, Dec. 31, 1955.
	Seaboard Oil Co.	Walter A. Marting (H)	$60,746, Dec. 31, 1955.
Railroads	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western RR.	William H. Moore (H)	$316,884.
	Pennsylvania RR.	Joseph H. Thompson (H)	$2,464,339, Dec. 31, 1955.
	Pullman Co.	George Hutchinson Love (P) (H)	$214,668, Dec. 31, 1955.
	Quebec North Shore & Labrador Ry.	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H)	Subsidiary of Iron Ore Company of Canada.
	Virginia Ry. Co.	Ernest Glenwood Otey (P)	$187,689, Dec. 31, 1955.
Retail Trade	Champion Stores, Inc.	Samuel M. Cassidy (P), George R. Higinbotham (P), James Hyslop (P), Dennis Lee McElroy (P), Joseph Wood Oliver (P), George Albert Shoemaker (P).	Subsidiary of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.
Shipping and Shipbuilding	American Shipbuilding Co.	Joseph H. Thompson (H)	$13,085, June 30, 1956.
	Hansand Steamship Corp.	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H)	Affiliate of Wheeling Steel Corp.
	Iron Ore Transport Co., Ltd.	Walter A. Marting (H), William C. Pieper (H)	36 percent owned by National Steel Corp.
	Ore Transport, Inc.	Walter A. Marting (H), William C. Pieper (H)	Affiliate of National Steel Corp.
Telephone	General Telephone Co. of the Southeast.	Ernest Glenwood Otey (P)	Subsidiary of General Telephone Corp.
Textiles	Industrial Rayon Corp.	Gilbert Watts Humphrey (H)	$84,958.
Miscellaneous	Cleveland Construction Co.	Warren Bicknell, Jr. (H)	Not available.
	Columbia Corp.	Jerome Holt Bowen (P)	Do.
	Pines Realty Co.	do	Do.
	Ritter (W. M.) Lumber Co.	Ernest Glenwood Otey (P)	Do.
	Scholastic Corp.	Joseph Wood Oliver (P)	Do.
	Shuron Optical Co.	Charles Hill Jones (P)	$8,429, Dec. 31, 1955.
	F. S. Smithers and Co.	Arthur B. Lawrence (P)	Not available.

Sources: 1. Standard & Poor's Register of Directors and Executives, 1957. 2. Standard & Poor's Daily News Service. 3. Standard & Poor's Corporation Descriptions 4. Polk's Bank Directory, September 1956.

Mr. MORSE. As one Senator, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] for the research he has caused to be done in connection with the subject of tax amortization, as it pertains to the Secretary of the Treasury. It shows that the companies in which Mr. Humphrey has holdings and interests have obtained unfair advantage over their competitors. I have always said that Mr. Humphrey was disqualified for the post of Secretary of the Treasury because of the well-known prohibition against holding a Cabinet position when there was involved a conflict of interest between his personal economic interests and the interests involved in the jurisdiction of the office to which the President appointed him.

RECORD OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO THE LATE SENATOR JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to another subject in the morning hour. I shall be exceedingly brief.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before proceeding?

Mr. MORSE. Please permit me to finish.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is the Senate operating under the 3-minute rule during the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senate is still operating under the morning hour, with a 3-minute limitation on statements. The Chair would appreciate it if Senators would respect the 3-minute rule.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the exhibits which I have introduced into the RECORD, I could have spoken for a total of 12 minutes, if I had wished to take up each one individually. I am saving the Senate a great deal of time. I can speak later at much greater length on each of these subjects if the Senate so desires.

Mr. President, am I not entitled to 3 minutes on each of the several items to which I have referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is entitled to 3 minutes on each separate subject.

Mr. MORSE. Am I in order or out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is in order at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with a heavy heart I turn to the last subject which I wish to discuss.

Reference has been made on the floor of the Senate today to a prospective proposal to offer a resolution to expunge from the official records of the Senate the action taken by the Senate in regard to the so-called McCarthy case.

I believe that when the hand of God is placed upon the shoulder of a colleague, we should leave him before the bar of the judgment of God. I believe that a great disservice would be performed to the history of the Senate if it were proposed to expunge from the RECORD the chapter of American history involved in the McCarthy censure resolution.

I am perfectly willing to let history be the judge of the course of action taken by the Senate in this matter. As one of the participants in that course of action, let me say that in my judgment the Senate acted in no spirit of hysteria, but judiciously, upon the record, upon the facts, and rightly. Therefore, I trust that the Senate will not be thrown into a debate over this matter when the person involved is no longer here to defend himself. He is before God; and I suggest that the Senate of the United States leave him before the throne of God.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, Friday, May 3, marked the 166th anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution.

Events of the past year have demonstrated that the spirit which prompted that document flourishes undiminished in the hearts of the valiant people of Poland.

Poland's refusal to accept the yoke of Soviet communism, her insistence upon clinging to and observing the precepts of her ancient religious faith, have been magnificent demonstrations of a free people's determination to regain liberty.

The Poznan uprisings signaled the beginning of the end of international communism, though this may not be glaringly discernible to many. It was the workers of Poland who raised their hands against Russian tyranny. Like their fellow citizens in every walk of life, they served notice upon their oppressors that freemen can never be conquered.

Since Poland came under the Russian boot, we in America have sustained them spiritually toward that day to which the Polish people look forward and for which they pray hourly—the day when Poland once again assumes her rightful place in full dignity in the family of free nations.

Mr. President, during my trip behind the Iron Curtain in 1955, I visited Poland and I talked with the Polish people. I

was told over and over again: "We can continue to resist, we can continue to work for freedom, if only we know we are not forgotten by the people in America."

Mr. President, they have not been, they never have been, and they never will be forgotten by the people of America who owe so much to their fellow citizens of Polish descent and to the valiant Poles who came to this country to help us fight for and win our own independence.

Our continual spiritual support of these brave people has been most important and we must continue it in every way possible.

As a result of the events of last October, Poland has achieved for itself a slight degree of liberalization. That achievement is most significant. Now we must do more. We must give to Poland economic aid in the nature of loans, private or otherwise, for the purchase of mining and farming equipment and we must dispose to the Polish people some of our surplus farm commodities by barter or purchase.

Mr. President, I believe such action will have a great psychological impact, not only upon the Poles, but upon the peoples of the other countries under Russian domination. I am certain that any reasonable step we and the free world can take in reducing the dependency of the Polish people upon Russia will be a step toward their ultimate freedom.

The fear which the Polish people have instilled in the hearts of the Russian Communists has resulted in some liberalization. The observance of May 3, prohibited for many years and replaced by July 10, the day of Poland's subjugation by the Soviet Union, is once more allowed. While it has not yet been restored as a national day, the Warsaw government declared that people may commemorate it privately.

Mr. President, we, who owe so much to this great land and its valiant people; we, who were joined by the Poles in our fight for freedom; we, whose national heritage has been the recipient of so much from the sons and daughters of Polish descent, can do no less than our utmost in helping these valiant people in every way possible by lessening their dependence upon Russia.

I join with my fellow citizens of Polish descent, not only in Connecticut, but throughout the United States and the free world, in observing the 166th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. May God speed the day when this observance can be heralded once more throughout the length and breadth of a free Poland.

THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in recent months there has been much discussion about the International Labor Organization and the wisdom of further United States participation in it. This has been brought about partly by criticism by the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, both of which, of course, represent employer groups. On the other hand, the AFL–CIO has been urging that we continue our participation and seek to correct the apparent defects in procedures, rather than withdraw entirely. This is the attitude of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of State.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and also as ranking Republican on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have been concerned with various aspects of the ILO. I am one of those who have studied this activity for many years, and who feel that the continuance and strengthening of the ILO is of vital importance in the development of our foreign policy, and in the furthering of human relationships so necessary for world peace.

The International Labor Organization, the ILO, was established in 1919 as a part of the Treaty of Versailles, drawing much of it inspiration from the work of an American representative at those conferences, Samuel Gompers. This country failed to assume participating membership in the ILO until 1934, although prior to that date the United States did cooperate informally with the ILO by exchanging information and sending observers to some of the conferences.

This country has now been a member of the ILO for more than 20 years. Based upon the fundamental assumption that universal peace can only be established upon a basis of social justice, the objectives of the International Labor Organization have often been the universal development of enlightened and propressive labor-management conditions such as we have long possessed in this country.

In recent years, our participation in the ILO has become complicated, as have all our international relations, by the ramifications of the ideological struggle between Russia and the United States, and by the return of Russia to active participation in the ILO in 1954. Under the Constitution of the ILO each member country sends three distinct types of representatives: government, employer, and employee. Obviously there has been much difficulty in reconciling the Communist employer and employee delegates to the ILO with our conception of the employer and employee functions as they exist in a free-enterprise system.

The seating of these delegates from the Communist countries has brought forth criticism of the ILO and led some to conclude that it remains little more than a springboard for Communist propaganda. But, Mr. President, only 9 countries, members of the ILO, are Communist dominated among the total membership of 77 nations. In addition, the contrast between the employer-employee representatives of the Communist countries and those of our own country is a contrast easily recognized by other countries throughout the world, particularly by those striving to achieve freedom, independence, and self-determination.

In May 1956, the Departments of State, Commerce, and Labor appointed a citizens advisory committee to study "the effect of the activities and functions of the International Labor Organization in terms of United States national interest, including domestic and foreign policy aspects."

Joseph Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, was appointed chairman of the study committee, and the other members were Robert Gray, of the industrial relations section of the California Institute of Technology; Frederick H. Harbison, of the industrial relations section of Princeton University; Charles Myers, of the industrial relations section of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Howard Petersen, the president of the Fidelity Philadelphia Trust Co.

Having completed their report, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from that report, as published in the Labor Department's Monthly Labor Review, March 1957 issue, be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks together with a joint statement issued by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Labor of measures to be taken up by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Labor to improve United States participation in the ILO.

I feel that these evaluations of United States participation in the ILO should be available to all the Members of the Senate, and at a later time, when proposed legislation is before the Senate relating to the ILO, I will endeavor to discuss this matter further.

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

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

United States policy toward and participation in the International Labor Organization must be considered primarily in terms of the goals of United States foreign policy. With such a premise, our conclusions are bound to be somewhat different from those of persons whose chief concern is a narrower interest, whether it be that of labor, of management, or of the promotion of a particular economic or social philosophy. The committee's views will likewise be different from those of persons who do not share our conviction that the United States is no longer isolated and can no longer afford to be isolationist, who, in short, do not accept the foreign-policy goals of the United States as developed over the last decade on a bipartisan basis with broad public support.

Another premise underlying the committee's conclusions and recommendations is a practical one: While it is difficult to amend any constitution, it is particularly difficult to amend the constitution of an international organization. This requires agreement by the representatives of many nations and may in turn call for an educational campaign among the citizens of those nations. The difficulty is compounded when, as is the case of the amendments to the ILO constitution that some American employers have proposed, the amendments would strike at provisions that many in the United States as well as elsewhere regard as basic.

These premises underlie the following general conclusions.

THE PURPOSES OF THE ILO

The rationale and the purposes of the International Labor Organization are set forth in the preamble to its constitution, written in 1919:

"Whereas universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice;

"And whereas conditions of labor exist involving such injustice, hardship, and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled; and an improvement of those conditions is urgently required: as, for example, by the regulation of the hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week, the regulation of the labor supply, the prevention of unemployment, the provision of an adequate living wage, the protection of the worker against sickness, disease, and injury arising out of his employment, the protection of children, young persons, and women, provision for old age and injury, protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own, recognition of the principle of equal remuneration for work of equal value, recognition of the principle of freedom of association, the organization of vocational and technical education and other measures;

"Whereas also the failure of any nation to adopt humane conditions of labor is an obstacle in the way of other nations which desire to improve the conditions in their own countries;

"The high contracting parties, moved by sentiments of justice and humanity as well as by the desire to secure the permanent peace of the world, and with a view to attaining the objectives set forth in this preamble, agree to the following constitution of the International Labor Organization."

The committee believes emphatically that the rationale and the purposes embodied in the preamble are consistent with and expressive of American philosophy and ideals, and that the promotion of these aims is in the national interest. The committee also considers this preamble as valid today as in 1919. No one who knows the history of the last four decades will deny that in many parts of the world, notably the United States, the older members of the British Commonwealth, and much of Western Europe, there has been a great reduction of injustice, hardship, and privation, and that there has been great improvement of the conditions of labor in many countries. But much remains to be done, especially in the underdeveloped areas. And certainly "the principle of freedom of association" is far from being accepted in the Communist world, or indeed in a number of other countries.

DISSATISFACTION WITH THE ILO

No organization is perfect, and everyone can find something to criticize in the International Labor Organization. It was only among employers, however, that we found fundamental objections to the very existence of the International Labor Organization and to continued United States participation in it.

Our inquiries among employers revealed that the dissatisfaction expressed in resolutions of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is widespread among American employers who have had some experience with the ILO. We found, however, that the intensity of dissatisfaction varied considerably, and, most important, we learned that the dissatisfaction was not universal among employers. Employer representatives from the shipping industry, for example, have apparently found the work of the Maritime Commission generally useful, and furthermore two of the former employer delegates to the general conference are vigorous in support of the ILO and have a sophisticated understanding of the difficulties and frustrations of participations.

The first, and by far the most important, cause of dissatisfaction has been the failure of the United States Government to formulate a clear policy with respect to the Organization. The result has been that employers have not known surely what this Government's attitude toward the Organization is or how it conceives the relationship of the International Labor Organization to the advancement of American national objectives.

Until very recently governmental relations with the ILO were primarily the responsibility of the Labor Department, with the State Department showing little interest, the Department of Commerce almost none, and the White House even less. Given the relationship between the Department of Labor and organized labor, it was natural that employers should think of the Organization as being primarily concerned with the promotion of the interests of labor, and that employers should, therefore, look upon it with suspicion, a suspicion that may have been fortified by the name of the Organization, which does not accurately describe its function.

There has been a substantial change in the last year or so. Not only have there been policy statements at high levels, but there is now cooperation between the Departments of State, Labor, and Commerce, and the Department of State has upgraded its representation at the general conference.

A second, and lesser, cause of dissatisfaction has been the operation of the ILO machinery. Without going into this criticism in detail, it may be stated that it covers virtually all elements of the ILO. The annual International Labor Conference, its duration, its organization, its voting system; industrial committees; conventions and recommendations; the objectivity of the staff in the International Labor Office; all come under attack. The conditions that have been criticized by American employers existed before the reentry of the Soviet Union into the ILO. They have merely been accentuated by it.

The committee recognizes the validity of some of these criticisms, and attempts in its recommendations to suggest remedial measures. We believe, however, that the organization does not deserve the heavy charges that have been laid at its door. Some of the criticisms stem from the critics' limited experience with international organizations, and their consequent inability to put the ILO in perspective. The grounds for others can, we believe, be removed by effective action along the lines of our recommendations.

The third source of employer dissatisfaction can be briefly dealt with here and adequately taken care of by the employers themselves. It is the quick turnover in employer delegates and advisers, both to the general conferences and to industry committees. Whereas the employee delegate to the conferences and member of the governing body has served for 8 years, and succeeded one who had served for 11 years, there have been 5 employer delegates in 11 years. We believe greater continuity of delegates and advisers, with the resultant experience, would lead to greater understanding and effectiveness, provided of course that highly qualified men are chosen.

THE VALUE OF THE ILO TO THE UNITED STATES

An objective observer must in all fairness recognize that the ILO is not of great direct importance to the well-being of most American workers, or for the improvement of the conditions of labor or for the promotion of good industrial relations in domestic industries. By and large, the standards that have been attained in this country are generally higher than those proposed by the ILO.

If the ILO has no positive value internally, is it then harmful in its effect on the United States economy at home? The committee does not find that it is in any significant sense. We are satisfied that the ILO constitution and our own provide adequate safeguards against invasion by the ILO of the prerogatives of either the Federal Government or the States. The small number of ILO conventions submitted to the Senate and the few ratified (seven in all), none of which invades any American interest, are proof that the safeguards are there and are applied.

If the ILO is neither particularly beneficial nor harmful at home, it has a positive value to the United States in its foreign relations that, although not accurately measurable nor as yet fully realized, is real and recognized.

A vast differential in labor standards exists in the world today. To the extent that ILO action contributes to narrowing this differential, it improves the competitive position of American industry and serves also the interests of American labor. In the present state of our knowledge we cannot assign a rough figure to this improvement; not even in the maritime industry, where the benefits are clearest, is that possible. But neither do we believe that the ILO's contribution here is meaningless.

A more subtle, still less measurable, but in the long run more important, contribution that the ILO can make to the advancement of American interest, lies in the promotion of industrial democracy and efficiency. New trends in the ILO, notably those signified by the Cole report of 1955 and the committee of experts that considered it in 1956, can do much to reduce the pains of transition to industrialism, and thereby make it more likely that the transition will be reasonably efficient and foster the growth of democracy. The committee believes that it is in this field that the ILO has perhaps most to contribute over the longer term.

Then, there is the political value of the organization to the United States. It is a window on the United States in which we can display what we do and how we do it, what our labor-management relations are, what our free associations of employers and employees are like. It is also, and this cannot be repeated too often, an instrument in the ideological contest. It is not an excessively complicated instrument, and the committee is loath to believe that the United States lacks the skill to employ it in the interest of the freedom and dignity of all men.

To put the matter in its most negative sense, if we were to withdraw, or to participate halfheartedly or grudgingly, the damage to American interests in the larger sense, particularly to American prestige among the governments and leaders of Asia and Africa, would be severe.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee, convinced that the International Labor Organization can play an important and useful part in furthering United States foreign policy goals, and believing that United States participation in the ILO should be viewed as an integral part of our membership in international organizations, recommends continued but more effective and vigorous participation in the ILO, and to that end makes the following specific recommendations:

"1. The committee recommends that the Department of State, as the principal agency under the President responsible for United States foreign policy, take the leadership, in collaboration with the Departments of Labor and Commerce, in a clarification and elaboration of the place of United States participation in the International Labor Organization in furthering our broad foreign policy objectives.

"2. The Committee recommends that the appropriate agencies of the Government establish formal machinery for periodic discussion and development by Government officers, employers, and labor, of policy objectives for United States participation in ILO.

"3. The Committee recommends that the United States Government take urgently specific measures to improve the organization and staff responsible for United States participation in the ILO. Three problems must be tackled.

"(a) There must be continuous high-level United States governmental representation at Geneva.

"(b) Delegations to ILO general conferences, to the Governing Body meetings, and to various committees and other ILO gatherings work under high pressure over relatively short periods of time. If United States participation in these sessions is to be effective, account must be taken of four requirements—the quality of the delegates and their advisers, continuity in representation, adequate staffing, and thorough preparation.

"(c) The third problem is that of adequate and efficient organization and staffing in Washington.

"4. The committee recommends (a) that the United States continue to work for decreased emphasis on the use of conventions and recommendations; but (b) that when, nevertheless, conventions or recommendations are under consideration by the general conference, it should be United States policy to support or oppose them on their substantive merits, and not to oppose a proposal with which the United States is in agreement on principle simply because the measure is in convention form or is thought not to be properly a subject of legislation under the American system.

"The committee recognizes the difficult problems posed for the United States Government by the forced labor convention. On the one hand, the dominant belief in our Government seems to be that this convention in its present form, if ratified by the United States, would run counter to the dictates of our Constitution. On the other hand, this country stands to suffer a major setback in terms of world public opinion if it opposes the measure on forced labor. It seems to us that the convention on forced labor differs from other conventions in its significance for the United States. For one thing, it appears to us as laymen that the 13th amendment to the United States Constitution banning involuntary servitude places the forced labor issue within the realm of Federal jurisdiction, and therefore not subject to the Federal-State disability. Also, this whole issue arose primarily as the result of action taken by the United States in the United Nations. It was we who took the lead in bringing the problem before the world, and, even though it later took the form of an ILO draft convention, we cannot without damage to our prestige ignore that fact.

"The committee believes that the United States should continue to work for redrafting of this convention so that it will not conflict with United States law. But if we are unsuccessful in this effort, we should nevertheless strongly champion it, making it clear that because of our own constitutional processes, and for that reason alone, we will be unable to ratify it.

"5. The committee recommends that the United States direct its most careful attention to the technical assistance programs, the field services, and the research and informational operations of the ILO, and that United States delegations take leadership in proposing positive suggestions for the improvement, better integration, and possible expansion of these activities.

"6. The committee recommends that the United States support maintenance of the tripartite structure of the International Labor Organization and utilize this structure to demonstrate the advantages resulting from the activities of free employers and free workers.

"The term 'tripartite,' as it is used here, refers to the unique feature of ILO whereby not only governments, but 'the employers and the workpeople of each of the members' actively participate through delegates in the Organization's meetings. The committee has studied carefully the operation and impact of the tripartite system of ILO in the light of the criticisms directed against it and the arguments advanced in its defense.

"The issue was brought to its present acute stage by American employer delegates. Some of them had already manifested a general dislike of ILO's tripartitism, stemming from experience with tripartite agencies in the United States during World War II, from frustrations caused by the need to act as representatives rather than as individuals, and from a feeling that this procedure tends to emphasize class distinctions between employers and workers. To this was now added an intense opposition to the very thought that men from Soviet Russia should be classed as employers, and particularly that Communist employers should be admitted to the councils of free employers.

"The discussion and disputes that arose from American employer attack led to the appointment by ILO of a special committee of jurists, under the chairmanship of Lord McNair, to inquire into the degrees of freedom of the nongovernmental delegates from member nations. We are encouraged by the fact that the governing body, after considering the McNair report in November 1956, decided to request the Director General to submit to its next session a report on the desirability and the practicability (a) of establishing continuing machinery which would establish the facts relating to the freedom of association in member states of the International Labor Organization and would report to the governing body and to the International Labor Conference; and (b) of improving the practical methods of working of the Conference, including the committees of the Conference.

"We hope the governing body will see fit to install this machinery and will make sure that it is allowed to function freely.

"But realistically we must recognize that this alone will not solve the problem. The preamble to the ILO constitution proclaims the need for 'recognition of the principle of freedom of association,' and article 3, section 5, provides that the representatives of employers and workers shall be 'nongovernment delegates and advisers.' Unfortunately, however, there is no specific requirement that these delegates and advisers be representative of free workers or of free employers. Furthermore, while article 4 guarantees that 'every delegate shall be entitled to vote individually,' there is no guaranty that this individual vote will be independent.

"The committee shares the view of American delegates, governmental and worker as well as employer, that the appointment of representatives of state-controlled labor associations and of state industries as nongovernmental delegates and advisers violates the spirit of the ILO constitution, but we are not convinced that the letter of the constitution is so clearly violated that these representatives can, on constitutional grounds, be denied seats.

"As a practical matter, tripartism is established in the ILO constitution and any change in this principle at the present time is unlikely. Even if this change were possible, we believe that ILO's effectiveness would be decreased by abolition of the tripartite principle.

"Since ILO seems likely, in any event, to continue to use the tripartite system, it is essential that the United States utilize this structure to the best of its ability. This cannot be accomplished by the withdrawal, as has been suggested, of American employer participation. If such a withdrawal should take place, the American worker delegate, under the ILO constitution, would be stripped of his right to vote, thus leaving the two American Government representatives as our only two voting delegates. We do not favor representation in ILO solely by governments, either for this country's delegation or as a principle to be adopted by ILO for all countries. We have stressed the need for participation by workers and employers in the solution of their problems. Of even more importance, perhaps, is our conclusion that representation only by governments would result in a loss to the United States. It does not seem likely that outstanding business or labor leaders would participate in ILO activities if they were limited to advisory roles. In addition, the United States would lose the opportunity of demonstrating before the world the fact that, under our economic and political system, it is possible for either or both the employer delegate and the worker delegate to disagree with the government, as they frequently have done in voting on ILO matters.

"One proposal which we have studied with great sympathy is to give each group in the ILO more autonomy to conduct its own affairs at the general conference. Currently, the standing orders of the ILO provide that a delegate may appeal to the conference if he is denied a seat on a conference committee. This means that, if he wins his appeal, he may be seated as a worker or employer delegate over the opposition of the majority of other workers or employers who consider him not truly representative. It has been proposed that this rule be replaced by that formerly in force, which allowed the employer and worker groups each to pass on the eligibility of its own members without appeal, as is done in the two Houses of the American Congress.

"We believe, therefore, that it should be United States policy to advocate such a change at the proper time. But the timing is of vital importance and must be determined in the light of the probable propaganda impact.

"Pending such change, the United States delegations should challenge the credentials of employer and worker delegates from Communist nations, emphasizing repeatedly that to seat such delegates violates the spirit of the ILO, and utilizing every challenge to cast in a sharp light the contrast between freedom and oppression. We believe that, even though Communist employer delegates may, despite American objections, continue to be seated in the conference and given deputy membership (without voting rights) on committees, the impact of relentless American attacks will be felt. In any case we are convinced, for reasons set forth above, that, unsatisfactory as it certainly is, this is from the viewpoint of American national interests a less deplorable state of affairs than would result from the withdrawal of the United States or the refusal of American employers to participate in the ILO.

"Tripartitism makes possible constant and eloquent testimony to the fact that freedom, as it is enjoyed in most of the Western World, is not to be found in countries controlled by Communists.

"7. The committee recommends that the United States work for a shift in the emphasis of ILO industrial committees away from deliberations leading to a vote on final action, toward an approach based on discussion and exchange of expert information; that the United States press for a policy calling for

formation of industrial committees to meet specific problems rather than the present practice of perpetuating committees.

"8. The committee recommends that the United States work to improve the International Labor Office staff and to promote the highest degree of objectivity and competence of staff work.

"9. The committee recommends that the United States Government take the leadership and enlist the cooperation of American employer and employee organizations in undertaking expeditiously to formulate and to work for the adoption of proposals designed to improve the work of the general conference and its committees.

"10. Finally, the committee recommends that the United States Government make vigorous and sustained efforts to call the attention of the American people to the purposes, objectives, and activities of the International Labor Organization, emphasizing that it is the sole specialized agency of the United Nations devoted to improving management and labor standards throughout the world."

[Joint statement by the Department of State, Department of Commerce, and Department of Labor, February 28, 1957]

MEASURES TO BE TAKEN BY THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR TO IMPROVE UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE ILO

I. INTRODUCTION

As part of a general review of United States participation in the International Labor Organization, the United States Departments of State, Commerce, and Labor have studied the conclusions and recommendations of the Advisory Committee headed by Mr. Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Mr. Johnson's committee was asked by three Federal departments to study the effect of activities and functions of the ILO in terms of United States national interest, including domestic and foreign policy aspects. This request was stimulated by questions raised by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The insight and objectivity of the Advisory Committee's report reflects an exhaustive effort to gather and analyze the viewpoints of many groups. Representatives of labor, management, the Government, and the general public were interviewed in great numbers. The testimony of each group has contributed depth and scope to the final report, a thoughtful and thoroughgoing document which has added much to the Government's review of the problem.

Although the three Departments do not necessarily accept all of the Advisory Committees' conclusions and recommendations, they do consider the report a valuable source of information and thought on the question of United States participation in the ILO. It is hoped that the report will receive the widest possible circulation so that it may serve to inform the public of the activities of the ILO.

The measures which the three Departments propose to implement take cognizance of most of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. Some are left for further study.

II. BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

Proposals for improving United States participation in the ILO are based on the following considerations:

1. Participation in the ILO contributes to friendship, cooperation, and understanding between the United States and other nations.

2. The ILO is a valuable forum in which to explain the free processes of United States political, economic, and social systems and the benefits that these systems have brought to workers and employers; and to demonstrate on a factual basis the falsity of Communist claims to represent the true interest of free workers and to encourage adherence of free workers to democratic concepts and institutions. Discussion of American methods may stimulate other nations to consider them as a possible means with which to deal with their own problems.

3. The ILO can contribute to an orderly and appropriate solution of social and economic problems in many nations where there are surging demands for alleviation of these problems.

4. In brief, the ILO is principally an important means of furthering United States foreign policy objectives, which seek—in essence—the preservation of peace.

III. SPECIFIC MEASURES TO BE TAKEN

1. The United States will continue its participation and take greater advantage of the opportunities afforded by participating in the ILO to further our foreign policy objectives.

2. The United States Government will, in consultation with employers and workers, review its existing objectives for participation in the ILO. This will include clarification and elaboration of the role of United States participation in the ILO in furthering United States foreign policy objectives.

3. The State Department will continue to exercise primary responsibility for foreign policy issues in the ILO. In determining such policy the State Department will consult with the Departments of Commerce and Labor and with other appropriate Federal agencies. (This procedure was set forth about a year ago in an outline of responsibilities agreed upon by all three Departments.)

4. The three Departments will increase and improve consultation with United States workers and employers with a view to making overall United States activity in the ILO more effective in achieving United States objectives. Two new committees, the Worker Advisory Committee and the Employer Advisory Committee, will be established to work with the three Departments on ILO problems. The National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce will be asked to designate members of the employer group and the AFL–CIO to name members of the worker group. These committees will meet jointly when appropriate.

In addition to consulting on objectives, policies, activities, and on other matters as they may arise the Government will, in consultation with the workers and employers, continue to develop materials in respect to questionnaires and for other purposes in such a manner as to reflect accurately conditions in the United States, making them understandable to workers, employers, and governments whose social and economic systems are different from ours. The Government will also consult with employers and workers concerning such matters as ILO procedures, industrial committees, etc.

5. To contribute further to the effectiveness of United States representation the United States Government will endeavor to provide for a continuity of representation at ILO meetings. Government specialists on political and technical aspects of the agenda, included in the Conference delegations, will be available to non-Government as well as Government delegates. The Government will provide an opportunity for worker, employer, and Government representatives to compare the basic elements of United States and other social, economic, and political systems, so that United States delegates may present their Nation's case most effectively.

The Government will continue to provide representation at Geneva to follow ILO developments.

6. The departments will arrange for Government and non-Government delegates and advisors to become better acquainted with the special technical and foreign policy aspects of issues before the ILO, particularly those before the Conference and the governing body, and to become informed on procedures and techniques of negotiation in international bodies.

7. The Government will propose and support actions which it believes will bring about practical improvements in working and living conditions more effectively than formal international instruments and agreements. These actions would include increased technical services and assistance by the ILO to nations which require such aid; increased research and the publication of authoritative studies on labor problems; increased emphasis on exchange of experience and discussion of authoritative materials on labor problems and related subjects; and the preparation of an adequate record of discussions which would be available to interested governments, employers, and workers.

The Government will urge also that any international instruments give maximum emphasis to voluntary actions by labor and management; and a minimum role to governments. In addition, emphasis will be placed upon programs contributing to the development of concepts and management skills which enhance the dignity and uphold the value of the individual in industrial and agricultural enterprise.

8. The United States Government will make every effort to assist and promote public understanding of the purposes, objectives, and activities of the ILO.

9. The Government will continue its efforts to encourage well qualified United States citizens to accept positions at all levels in the ILO. It will maintain an active concern with the organization, staff, and operations of the ILO and will remain alert to deficiencies in any phase of its activities.

ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Monday, May 6, Israel celebrated its ninth independence day. Millions of Americans, in unison with lovers of freedom from all corners of the earth, join with me in expressing warm wishes and congratulations to this brave land. Its gallant people have labored devotedly, in the few years which have elapsed since 1948, to build a nation.

These years have been arduous and wearisome, but buoyant hope has sustained the flaming faith of a free people. Determination and courage have been triumphant against adversity.

But peace is yet only a shimmering hope in the Middle East, flickering weakly in the midst of poverty and violence.

If freedom and independence are to survive, determination must be leavened with responsibility, and strength with self-restraint and law. Only then will the barriers of misunderstanding and fear crumble, to the ultimate benefit of peace.

On this anniversary, it is the sincere hope of all Americans that the peoples of the Middle East, steadied by the principles of law and justice, will strive to develop harmonious solutions to mutual problems, and, that in the years ahead, Israel will continue proudly to proclaim its freedom and independence.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks a statement I have prepared in recognition of the ninth anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel, which occurred on May 6.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

On this ninth anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, it would be well for all Americans to pause for reflection on the ideals, the principles, and the mutuality of interest which inexorably bind the United States and Israel together.

With Israel, the United States has an overriding interest in the preservation of peace in the Middle East. With Israel, the United States joins in the struggle to defeat the sinister designs of international communism in Africa and Asia. For with Israel, the United States shares an abiding faith in the dignity of man, a faith upon which both nations are firmly built.

Since the creation of the state of Israel in 1948, it has grown through storm and stress until it is now the most progressive and stabilized country in the Middle East. Its population has been more than doubled by the influx of persecuted refugees from all over the world, particularly from Arab and Moslem countries. Those of us who were privileged to play a part, however small, in the creation and strengthening of the vibrant democracy that is Israel, have never entertained the slightest doubt as to the young nation's destiny.

Israel needs and merits the support of all freedom-loving peoples. I am, therefore, proud to be a sponsor of a Senate resolution urging our Government to support effective action, both in and outside the United Nations, which would guarantee against a resumption of border raids and blockades of vital international waterways and other activities which might erupt in new hostilities in the Middle East. As we rejoice in Israel's progress, and voice our prayers for a lasting peace in the Middle East, let us as Americans never forget the strong bonds of kinship which underlie the relationship between the United States and Israel.

EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Congress is presently considering proposed legislation to require reporting and disclosure by employee welfare and pension plans. At the same time more public attention is usually given to the exceptional cases of bad or weak management of such plans, than to the well-run funds serving hosts of members and beneficiaries.

I was therefore pleased to note an article on the front page of the New York Times for May 5, 1957, on the report of the first year's financial operations of the group hospital, surgical, and medical benefits plan for the nonoperating railroad employees. The report, furnished by the Travelers Insurance Co., was made public by the able president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Mr. George M. Harrison, and was published in the May 1, 1957, issue of the Railway Clerk magazine.

In contrast to the large commissions exposed in our investigation in 1955–56, this report reveals commissions paid in the unbelievably small amount of two-hundredths of 1 percent of premiums. Administrative costs and risk charges also seem low.

I therefore wish to congratulate the New York Times for the attention given in its news columns to this report, and the unions, employers, and insurance company that share the responsibility for the operation of this welfare plan and so evidently recognize their obligation to give a public accounting for the funds to the beneficiaries. With more of this spirit, we may hope to secure aproval of the legislation which would extend the protections of full disclosure to all such beneficiaries.

For the information of Senators, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article written by Mr. A. H. Raskin, to which I have referred, and published in the New York Times of May 5, 1957.

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

LABOR WELFARE FEES 0.02 PERCENT IN RAIL UNIONS, UP TO 25 PERCENT IN OTHERS

(By A. H. Raskin)

Commissions paid to insurance consultants retained by the country's railroads and unions representing a half million nonoperating employees came to only 2 cents on every $100 of premiums in the first year of a national welfare agreement.

A report made public yesterday showed that no other commissions had been paid to anyone in connection with jointly financed policies for hospital, surgical, and medical care for the members of 15 railroad unions.

The total outlay of two-hundredths of 1 percent contrasted with commissions and service fees ranging up to 25 or 30 percent in a few racket-infested welfare funds investigated in recent years by Federal and State authorities.

George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks and chief negotiator for the nonoperating unions, made public the detailed financial statement on the administration of $29,187,664 in insurance premiums.

NO CHANCE FOR RACKETS

The report, prepared by the Travelers Insurance Co. for the information of employer and union representatives, was distributed to union members through the medium of union publications.

Mr. Harrison is a vice president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and a member of its 5-man Ethical Practices Committee. He said there was no opportunity for racketeering, graft, kickbacks, or corruption in the operation of the railroad fund.

In transmitting the report, S. G. Dulaney, second vice president of the insurance company, certified that the only commissions paid had been $4,948 to consultants hired by the carriers and the brotherhoods for technical service in drawing up insurance specifications and in writing contracts.

Mr. Dulaney added that "no fee or other remuneration of any kind" had been paid, directly or indirectly, to any representative of either side in connection with the insurance policy or a special reserve account set up to supplement it.

The report covered payments in the year ended March 1, 1956. Under a national agreement signed by the unions and the railroads a year and a half earlier, each worker paid $3.40 a month into the welfare fund and his employer contributed an equal amount.

In agreements signed since that time, the railroads have undertaken to assume the full cost of the hospital, surgical and medical insurance and to extend similar protection to the workers' families.

CLAIMS TOTAL 19 MILLION

Mr. Dulaney informed the parties that the benefits paid to rail employees in the initial year, plus the estimated payments due on claims still to be settled, came to $19,625,000. This was a little more than two-thirds of the $29,187,664 in premiums collected by the railroads and turned over to the insurance company during the year.

Total expense and risk charges listed by the company amounted to $1,533,135, or 5¼ percent. Included in this list was $439,640 in taxes and $95,844 in special costs for establishing files, printing explanatory booklets for employees and other first-year outlays.

Because the total benefit and administrative cost was less than had been anticipated in the original calculations, a retroactive credit of $8,029,529 on the initial premium was made available to build up the fund's reserves.

RESERVE FUND SETUP

This money went into the special account designed to assure the workers of continued benefits if an adverse claims experience in future years made it necessary to raise the premium rate. The employers already had been paying 78.2 cents a month for each employee into this nest-egg fund.

When the retroactive credit was added to these payments, the reserve at the end of the year rose to $11,879,054. This money is earmarked for premium payments on written authorization of the union and management committees.

The railroads retained 1 percent of the original joint contribution of $6.80 a month for each employee, or 6.8 cents, to cover the direct cost to them of certifying the eligibility of workers presenting insurance claims. All the rest of the money went to Travelers Insurance Company for premiums and the special account.

MARKETING REVOLUTION IN THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a quiet but remarkable marketing revolution which has taken place in the gigantic automobile industry since the start of Senate committee hearings 18 months ago.

An article by Mr. Joseph M. Callahan, staff writer of the Automotive News, in the March 29 issue of that publication summarizes some 49 of the more outstanding concessions which factories have made to their dealers.

Incidentally, the Automotive News has for more than 30 years been one of the most highly respected trade publications of any industry. It is the "bible" of the automobile business, with a reputation for unerring attention to fact; and it has almost worldwide coverage and distribution.

Actually, according to reports from automobile dealers around the country, the manufacturers' concessions summarized in Mr. Callahan's article are merely the top of the iceberg. We hear that a new day of factory-dealer relations has been ushered in by voluntary

reforms in the factorys' day-to-day working attitudes toward their dealers. This is more important than any contractual change.

However, the contractual reforms are extremely gratifying to the members of my Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices. Changes which no law could properly have required have been made in the franchises. We realize that all is not rosy within the industry, but I think it has made a good start toward a new day of stability and fair dealing.

Remaining dark clouds in the business are some of the "self-cannibalizing" tactics used by dealers themselves—such as bootlegging, cross-selling, false advertising and deceptive finance and insurance practices indulged in by a few dealers, to the competitive detriment of the many. We are continuing to study methods of correcting these abuses. But the first step in bringing the sale of automobiles out of the oriental bazaar and putting it back on Main Street, United States of America, was to improve the factory-dealer relationships.

The importance to our entire economy of a healthy marketing climate in this industry is evidenced by the fact that automobile dealers employ about 9.7 percent of all retail employees. Approximately 10 percent of our national income is spent for the purchase and operation of automobiles. The 42,000 locally owned, locally managed, and locally financed dealerships constitute the real backbone of our American competitive, small-business, free-enterprise system. The dealers' investment in the automobile business is approximately the same as that of the manufacturers. Only with proper relationships between automobile dealers and manufacturers can there evolve a proper relationship between automobile dealers and the public.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Automotive News of April 29, 1957]

HOW NEW FRANCHISES COMPARE

(By Joseph M. Callahan)

Which factory offers the best all-around dealer contract?

With each auto maker having offered their dealers new selling agreements since the start of Congressional hearings 18 months ago, Automotive News has just completed an analysis of the five major contracts.

Of course, to evaluate a contract fully one must also weigh the factory concessions that have been made to the dealer body since the dealer revolt began. These concessions are in conjunction with—but not separate from—the contract.

A careful study of the accompanying chart will reveal each contract's features. This chart compares the factory-dealer arrangements of each of the five corporations on 49 points—40 contracts clauses and factory concessions.

Naturally, there are numerous intangible items in a factory-dealer relationship that can affect the value of the contract, favorably or unfavorably. But they are not analyzed as franchise items as such.

Many of the 49 points are relatively unimportant to dealers, and, taken singly, have little bearing on a factory-dealer relationship. Many of these comparative points have a considerable value, but they have been offered by all the manufacturers.

To evaluate a factory-dealer relationship properly, it is necessary to compare the corporations' contracts and concessions on the basis of 15 major items—items that mean either dollars or security to the dealer.

These items are: (1) the rebate on new cars carried into a new-model year; (2) the parts obsolescence plan; (3) the 90-day parts-return plan; (4) the 30-day accessory-return plan; (5) the widow clause; (6) the latitude each factory has in terminating a dealer; the dealer termination program in regard to (7) premises.

(8) Parts, (9) accessories and (10) tools; (11) the 100-percent warranty: (12) the $100,000 life insurance offered dealers; (13) the 2-percent discount for cash payment of parts; (14) the new-car billing policy, and (15) the continuous contract.

Chrysler's contract is superior or equal to the best on 13 of these items; GM is superior or equal to the best on 12 items; Ford is superior or equal to the best on 10 items; American Motors is superior or equal to the best on 6 items, and Studebaker-Packard is superior or equal to the best on 3 items.

Ford is the only manufacturer that bills its dealers for cars when the cars arrive. Chrysler bills its dealers 2 to 5 days after shipment. All other manufacturers bill the dealers on shipment.

Chrysler and AMC widows may participate indefinitely in a dealership's operations. Wives of deceased GM dealers may participate for 5 years. Widows of Ford dealers may participate for a year. There is no provision for the participation of widows of Studebaker-Packard dealers.

Ford and Chrysler are the only manufacturers that give their dealers a 2-percent cash discount on parts. Ford offered to trade this item for the 4-percent parts obsolescence plan offered by GM, but the dealers declined.

While Chrysler does not have the 4-percent obsolescence plan, its dealers can return surplus parts periodically if the parts are on the firm's active parts list. AMC and S-P dealers are permitted to submit a list of surplus parts for possible repurchase by the factory.

Ford has no parts obsolescence plan, no 90-day parts-return plan, and no 30-day accessory-return plan.

In addition, the Ford contract is below competition on the widow clause and in the latitude the factory is given in terminating a dealer. The agreement permits termination of any dealer with a continuous contract on 120 days' notice at will.

GM, Ford, and Chrysler offer a continuous contract to their dealers, AMC offers a 1-year and a 3-year contract, with the factory having the option, depending on the caliber of dealership involved.

S-P has offered a 3-year contract, with automatic 1-year renewals. GM and Ford also give their dealers the option of a 1-year or a 5-year contract. Upward of 90 percent of these dealers have indicated they prefer the 5-year pact.

However, a careful reading of the five contracts indicate that their duration is not so important, because each agreement has a list of causes for which a dealer can be canceled immediately and a list of causes for which the dealer can be canceled on 90 days' notice.

It's also probably true that, if a factory wished to, it could cancel almost any dealer for failure to live up to the sales performance clause in each contract.

NINETY-DAY TERMINATION

The S-P contract is unique in that it permits the factory to decline to offer a dealer a new agreement if the dealer is notified of this at least 90 days before expiration of the current contract.

The American Motors arrangement with its dealers is equal to the Big Three on these five items: The 100 percent warranty, 90-day return of parts, 30-day return of accessories, the factory latitude on terminations and the factory repurchase of tools on termination.

The Studebaker-Packard arrangement is equal on the 100-percent warranty, the 5 percent rebate on new cars carried into a new-model year and the 30-day return of accessories.

In addition, S-P is almost equal to GM on its parts and accessory obsolescence plan in that dealers may exchange up to 4 percent of their purchases quarterly or annually. An S-P dealer gets other parts and a GM dealer gets cash credit.

All manufacturers have the 5 percent rebate, except American Motors which has a 4 percent rebate. A rider in the Ford and Chrysler agreement provides that the rebate will not be paid if the factory offers a cleanup bonus or rebate to its dealers.

S-P permits dealers to return any parts and accessories up to 30 days after purchase.

Many dealers feel that these parts and accessory-return plans are important, particularly in the early months of a model year when it is difficult to know what to order.

All the manufacturers have offered the 100 percent warranty. In addition, GM, Ford and Chrysler offer up to $100,000 in life insurance to their dealers at a reduced cost. AMC has offered a dealer and employee insurance policy to its dealers and their employees for a number of years.

In the matters of disposition of a terminated dealer's premises, parts, accessories and special tools, GM, Ford and Chrysler make identical provisions.

They agree to help a dealer dispose of his premises and, if necessary, will lease the premises for a year after termination. They also will repurchase all the dealer's listed parts, all accessories purchased in the previous 12 months and all special tools purchased in the previous 36 months.

American Motors will pay, if necessary, up to 75 percent of a terminated dealer's lease expense for a year, AMC will also repurchase parts bought for the current model and three previous models, all accessories bought in the previous 6 months and all special tools purchased in the previous 36 months.

BAN ON DECEPTIVE ADS

S-P has no plan for disposing of a terminated dealer's premises. The company will repurchase from a terminated dealer any parts purchased for the current and two previous model-years, any accessories purchased in the previous 6 months and any special tools purchased in the previous 12 months.

All the contracts require a dealer to agree that he will not use advertising that is misleading or deceptive.

The Chrysler contract is the only one that permits a dealer to designate what type of transportation will be used in delivering his cars, although the factory still selects the specific shipper.

Most of the other contracts say the factory will attempt to ship the cars by the type of transportation preferred by the dealer.

In summary, the new contracts and concessions reflect a remarkable advance in the status of the American auto dealer in the past 14 months.

GM led the other makers by 10 to 14 months on contract changes and concessions.

It was also GM which named the first dealer vice president and the only dealer umpire, giving dealers a direct pipeline to top management.

A comparison: Dealer contracts, factory concessions

	General Motors	Ford	Chrysler	American Motors Corp.	Studebaker-Packard
CONTRACT					
New dealer selling contract released	March 1956	April 1957	April 1957	January 1957	January 1957
Number of clauses in contract	34	34	30	34	37
1-year, 5-year or continuous contract—dealer option	X	X			
Continuous contract for all dealers			X		
1-year or 3-year contract—factory option				X	
Current contract for 3 years, automatically renewed annually thereafter					X
Rebate of 5 percent on unsold new cars carried into new-model year	X				X
Rebate of 4 percent on unsold new cars carried into new-model year				X	
Rebate of 5 percent on unsold new cars carried into new-model year, if no cleanup bonus offered		X	X		
Parts obsolescence plan, whereby 4 percent of parts may be returned annually	X				
Parts obsolescence plan, whereby listed parts may be returned periodically			X		
Obsolescence plan, whereby dealers may submit list of parts and accessories for possible repurchase by factory				X	X
Obsolescence plan, whereby 4 percent of parts and accessories may be exchanged for new parts accessories annually or quarterly					X
Permits return of parts up to 90 days after purchase	X		X	X	
Permits return of parts up to 30 days after purchase					X
Permits return of accessories up to 30 days after purchase	X		X	X	X
Permits widow of dealer to have interest in dealership indefinitely			X	X	
Permits widow of dealer to have interest in dealership for 5 years	X				
Permits widow of dealer to have interest in dealership for 1 year		X			
Improved successor clause	X	X	X	X	X
Provides for 90-day delay of termination on death or incapacity of dealer	X	X		X	X
Provides sales criteria for evaluating dealer's performance	X	X	X	X	X
Contains "opportunity to cure failure" clause		X			
Permits dealer to designate method of shipping cars to him			X		
Dealer agrees not to use any misleading or deceptive advertising	X	X	X	X	X
TERMINATION PROCEDURE					
Dealer can terminate on 30-day notice	X	X	X	X	X
Factory can terminate term contracts on 90-day notice for listed causes	X	X	X	X	X
Factory can terminate all contracts without notice for several listed causes	X	X	X	X	X
Factory can terminate continuous contracts on 120-day notice "at will"		X			
Factory can decline to offer a new contract if dealer is given a 90-day notice					X
On termination, factory will lease premises for 1 year if no other tenant found	X	X	X		
On termination, factory will pay up to 75 percent of lease charges for 1 year				X	
On termination, factory will repurchase all listed parts at wholesale price, plus 5 percent	X	X	X		
On termination, factory will repurchase at current price all parts purchased for current and 3 previous models				X	
On termination, factory will repurchase all listed parts purchased for current and 2 previous models, less 15 percent					X
On termination, factory will repurchase all accessories purchased in previous 12 months	X	X	X		
On termination, factory will repurchase all accessories purchased in previous 6 months				X	X
On termination, factory will repurchase all special tools purchased in previous 36 months	X	X	X	X	
On termination, factory will repurchase all special tools purchased in previous 12 months					X
On termination, factory will repurchase all signs at fair market value	X	X	X	X	X
FACTORY CONCESSIONS					
100 percent warranty labor charges paid by factory	X	X	X	X	X
Up to $100,000 life insurance on dealer for a nominal charge	X	X	X		
Low-cost group life and hospitalization insurance for dealer and employees				X	
2 percent discount on parts for cash payment		X	X		
Dealer-elected dealer council	X	X	X	X	X
Dealer, relations board or vice president	X	X	X		
Umpire for terminations	X				
Policy of billing dealers for cars when they arrive, rather than when shipped		X			
Policy of billing dealers for cars 2 to 5 days after shipment			X		

NOTE.—Some manufacturers cover parts and accessory programs in separate agreement.

SUPREME COURT DECISION IN THE GIRARD COLLEGE CASE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, April 29, 1957, the United States Supreme Court shifted gears again; and this time the Court threw into a mass of confusion the fairly well settled law of trusts and estates. The Court, which seems bent on its desire to strip the States and individuals of their most cherished and fundamental rights, has now taken up the hobby of rewriting wills and denying to individuals the right to dispose of their property for any purpose they may choose.

In the Girard College case, the Supreme Court, in a 1-page opinion reversed a 5 to 1 decision of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court which was backed up by a 40-page majority opinion full of legal doctrines and precedents which had been the law of the land for more than a century. The Court added a postmortem codicil to the will of Stephen Girard, who in his 1831 will, bequeathed his money for the establishment of a college for "poor white male orphans." One hundred and twenty-six years later, the Supreme Court, after twice holding the provisions of the will to be valid, has violated the expressed intent of the testator, by permitting persons excluded by the will to enter Girard College.

The Court seized upon the fact that officials of the city of Philadelphia assist as trustees in the management of Girard College. The failure of the officials to admit the persons excluded by the will was described as discrimination under the 14th amendment, which amendment was approved some 30 years after the testator's death.

A great number of prominent attorneys and newspapers have already voiced deep concern over this latest attempt by the Supreme Court to further curb the fundamental rights of the States and individuals.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks several editorials and comments from outstanding newspapers. One article contains a comment by the President of the American Bar Association, the Honorable David F. Maxwell, in which he said that the latest Girard College decision "hurts to the quick."

I also call attention to a splendid analysis of the decision which appeared in numerous newspapers across the country, and which has already been inserted in the RECORD of May 2, 1957. This article was writen by one of America's most outstanding columnists, Mr. David Lawrence. Another excellent editorial has also been inserted in the May 6, 1957, RECORD. It was taken from the April 30, 1957, issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle.

I urge that every Member of the Senate give most careful attention to all of these newspaper comments.

At a later date I shall have more to say about this decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

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

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State, of May 7, 1957]

THE GIRARD CASE

The Girard College decision which can only lower still further the once-high standing of the United States Supreme Court is bad on several grounds, one of which is that it has applied to a will a constitutional amendment that was approved some 30 years after the death of the maker. Even if the amendment in question, the 14th, had been legally processed, it should not be applicable to an instrument drawn before it existed.

As lawyers know this is not the first time the Girard will has been before the highest court. Twice previously, it had been declared valid in toto.

Girard was a Frenchman. He died in the early 1830's and relatives in France sought unsuccessfully, though represented by none other than Daniel Webster, to have his will set aside on two grounds: (1) that a municipal corporation could not act as a trustee, and (2) that a provision in the will forbidding any Protestant, Catholic or Jewish ecclesiastic to enter the grounds rendered the whole will void. It was contended that this prohibition barred the teaching of religion.

The Supreme Court held the will valid in what is the most famous of all opinions as to whether Christianity is a part of the common law. The Court held that though Christianity in a loose sense is a part of the common law, this fact did not override protective statute or constitutional provision. Further there is nothing in the will, the Court said, that actually forbade teaching of religion, save by duly licensed religious leaders such as pastors and rabbis. Incidentally the argument lasted 10 days.

Some years later the limits of Philadelphia were extended. The Girard will said the college was to be operated for white male orphans of the city. In the meantime the State of Pennsylvania didn't like the way the municipal corporation was conducting the trust, and so its legislature enacted a statute providing for the selection of new trustees. When this was done, Girard's heirs brought another suit on grounds that Girard had meant white male orphans in the original territory of Philadelphia, and to include a larger area was to bring under the will persons not intended to be covered. The heirs asked again that the bequest for the college be set aside but the Supreme Court again upheld the will. In other words, Girard had a right to dispose of his means as he saw fit.

In its third decision, just rendered, in which it declared Negroes must be admitted, the Supreme Court voided terms the Court had twice before declared valid. But did it give the property back to the descendants of those who originally sought to break the will? It did not. It said Girard's money should be used for persons who by no measuring stick could have been in Girard's mind as beneficiaries of his will. What are we coming to?

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of May 3, 1957]

DISAPPEARING CONSTITUTION

By its ruling Monday in the Girard College case the United States Supreme Court has destroyed the right of American citizens to dispose of their property as they see fit.

This particular case involved two Negro youths who had applied for admission to Girard College, which for 109 years has been open to "poor white male orphans" as specified in the will of the founder.

A board of directors appointed by the city trust of Philadelphia, which administered the school, was held by the Court to be an agency of the city of Philadelphia. In this case, the Court said, the two Negro youths would have to be admitted.

In this the Supreme Court of the United States brusquely shoved aside the opinion of the Pennsylvania supreme court which said: "It is one of our most fundamental legal principles that an individual has the right to dispose of his own property by gift or will as he sees fit," and that this right is so well protected "that a testator's direction will be enforced, even though contrary to the general views of society."

In addition, the Pennsylvania court said the trustees were not acting as public officials, but merely in a fiduciary capacity with the same limits as any private individual or trust company acting as trustee. The State court also pointed out that not one cent of tax money had been involved.

Under the direction of the United States high court, Negro students must be admitted. However, if the Negro students receive an education at Girard College, the Government will have entered the will-breaking field. Girard specifically limited the use of his money—with which he established the college—to education of people who were white and orphans. Next the court could say he had no right to specify orphans.

The Supreme Court of the United States, by extending its decision of May, 1954, which was based on sociological doctrines and not law, has now impaired the right of an individual to make a will to aid any specific group. Presumably now an orphanage established for Catholic youngsters could not exclude Protestants or Jews, or vice versa. Corporations chartered by the State—which, most orphanages seem to be—could not differentiate because of religion or race on the basis of the Court's pronouncement. The decision may be hailed in some quarters as a great victory. It is a victory—but not one for freedom. For it can just as well be used against a group as for it.

What the situation amounts to is this: The Constitution of the United States now amounts to the Supreme Court and the 14th Amendment. This further means that we now have a Government of whimsey instead of law, because no one has ever been able to figure out what the troublesome, illegally-adopted Fourteenth Amendment really means. The Supreme Court itself has reversed during the past 90 years practically every decision it ever based on this provision of the Constitution—interpreting it on the basis of election returns and current frustration fads.

The Constitution in its real meaning is fast disappearing.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 4, 1957

GIRARD COLLEGE CASE REHEARING TO BE SOUGHT

PHILADELPHIA, May 3.—The directors of the Board of City Trusts voted 12 to 1 yesterday to ask the United States Supreme Court for a rehearing of the Girard College case. The high Court on Monday handed down a decision opening the college to Negroes for the first time in its more than 101-year history.

Under the terms of Stephen Girard's will enrollment was open only to "poor male white orphans."

Industrialist Girard, founder of the school, was one of the richest men and in some ways one of the most controversial figures in the earlier days of the Republic.

The lone dissenting vote was cast by Mayor Richardson Dilworth, ex-officio member of the board which administers the college under the will.

Dilworth's administration and that of Joseph S. Clark, former mayor and now United States Senator, opposed the board's stand, and sought to win the admission of two Negro boys at the all-white school. Upon that issue the case was carried to the Nation's highest Court.

The Supreme Court found that the Board of City Trusts functions as an agency of the State, and that an agency of the State has no right to exclude nonwhites from the college.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 3, 1957]

BREAKING A WILL

Until Monday, an individual's last will and testament had some real meaning. If a man or woman were of sound mind when the will was drawn, its provisions were accepted by the heirs and the public.

This is no longer true. The United States Supreme Court has, in effect, broken a will by Stephen Girard who in 1831 left $2 million to establish a school for "poor white male orphans." The High Court ruled Monday that the school had to admit two Negroes who sought entrance.

The Court seized upon the fact that officials of the city of Philadelphia assist in the management of Girard College. The failure of the officials to admit the Negroes was described as discrimination forbidden under the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

The terms of Stephen Girard's will are perfectly clear. Nonetheless, the Supreme Court has chosen to ignore them. It has shown contempt for a basic property right—the right to pass on one's possessions to those of one's own designation.

What is to prevent the Supreme Court from breaking the will of any citizen who leaves his property to persons or causes which are not favored by political court appointees? Today, there is nothing to prevent such judicial tyranny.

One day, the people of this Nation may realize how their rights are being stolen and their property diverted. They may act to reduce the powers of the Supreme Court. We hope they will not wait until it is too late.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 6, 1957]

WARNINGS NEEDED

David F. Maxwell, president of the American Bar Association, said in Greenville Friday that the Supreme Court's Girard College decision "hurt to the quick." The decision called for the admission of Negroes to a Philadelphia school established, as specified in the founder's will, for white orphans.

Mr. Maxwell, who is from the North, holds a position of national influence.

We hope that during his tenure in office he will explain to legal circles across the Nation the injuries the Supreme Court is inflicting on the American people.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 4, 1957]

BAR ASSOCIATION TOLD GIRARD CASE "HURT TO QUICK"

GREENVILLE, May 3.—The contribution that lawyers have made in area of human liberties was praised here today by David F. Maxwell of Philadelphia, president of the American Bar Association.

Maxwell, in his luncheon address, made reference to the Supreme Court's Girard College decision, which he said "hurt to the quick." He referred to South Carolina as a place "where we are sure we are going to get comfort and understanding."

(In the decision handed down recently, the court ruled out racial segregation in Philadelphia's Girard College, which has admitted only "poor white male orphans" as specified in his will by Stephen Girard, who left part of his fortune to found the school.)

Despite their contribution they have been subjected to abuse down through the ages and have become accustomed to it, Maxwell said in speaking at a luncheon attended by South Carolina Bar Assn. members and their wives at Poinsett Hotel.

He deplored a recent "rash" of magazine articles critical of lawyers and indicated that the good done by the bar is often not mentioned. Maxwell expressed the view that lawyers of the country are the persons best qualified by training and experience to defend liberties.

The 3-day convention, 63d of the association, will be concluded tomorrow. A business session tomorrow morning will include the election of officers and reports from the executive and resolutions committees. Meetings of committees are scheduled in the afternoon. A banquet tomorrow night will be the closing event.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of May 2, 1957]

SUPREME COURT STARTS REWRITING WILLS

Prior to the United States Supreme Court's strange preoccupation with forcing integration of the races at all costs, most competent lawyers probably would have advised a client that he could bequeath his estate for almost any purpose he might choose.

More than one eccentric has decreed in his will that the bulk of his estate should be used to maintain an animal, say a cat, in luxury. And public officials have carried out the terms of such wills, even though they must have thought it a bit strange to have to do so when widows and orphans were in need.

But the United States Supreme Court has held in a decision in a case arising in Pennsylvania that a man cannot use the wealth he has accumulated in his lifetime to found and operate a school for "white male orphans" to the exclusion of Negroes.

The Court based its decision on grounds that administration of the will was vested in a public agency, the Philadelphia City Trust, and held that since a public body was involved the "equal protection of the law" clause of the Constitution made it unlawful to exclude Negroes.

The Court did not go into the issue of whether the will limiting the school to whites was itself lawful. But the effect is about the same. No will can be lawfully administered without some public agency, the probate court to start with, entering into it.

A will that is improperly drawn can be broken. But so long as it is properly drawn, at least we thought heretofore, one could use his money as he saw fit—to establish a school for redheads exclusively, or to teach cats not to catch mice.

But from now on a will means not what the maker of the will says, but what the Supreme Court says it means.

This is but another example of the contents of the legal Pandora's Box the Supreme Court opened on May 17, 1954, when it departed from the law and the precedents to promulgate integration as a sociological principle.

There probably is yet more to come. Private colleges and other institutions which have benefited from wills may one of these days find themselves before the courts, with a demand to open their doors to all persons regardless of race, on the same sort of far-fetched pretext.

[From the Jasper County (S. C.) News of May 3, 1957]

NINE MEN TAKE AWAY ANOTHER FREEDOM

According to our daily papers, the United States Supreme Court has gone another step in setting up a dictatorship in this country. They are placing the dictatorship in their own hands. I am speaking of their decision, which opened Girard College in Philadelphia to two Negro boys.

In 1831, Steven Girard died at the age of 80. In his will he left $2 million to establish Girard College, with the provision that the trustees would set up and operate a school for poor white male orphans. This original $2 million has grown to $98 million by 1955.

The Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania had upheld this will, and said, "It is one of our most fundamental legal principles that an individual has the right to dispose of his property by gift or will as he sees fit." Now the United States Supreme Court has upset this will and has ruled that the two Negro boys must be admitted.

I think that the Supreme Court has gone further in this decision than in any decision to date. This decision is not a case of racial discretion but a matter of telling a person that he cannot do what he wishes to do with his own property. This is certainly not only leading our Nation into a dictatorial pattern but a communistic pattern as well.

We have fought many wars to maintain the freedom which was supposedly left to us by our Constitution. However, we are now faced with the problem that nine old, politically ambitious persons are changing our way of life and taking away the freedoms that we have cherished and fought for over the period of almost 200 years.

I think that it is now time for the States of these United States to step up and be counted. If we are going to allow the United States Supreme Court to go this far, then the next move will probably be to take away our property before we die instead of after. I hope that South Carolina will let the Nation know that we do not intend to stand for this.

[From the Orangeburg (S. C.) Times and Democrat of May 3, 1957]

ADD SUPREME COURT

The United States Supreme Court has ruled that Girard College, which for 109 years has admitted only "poor white male orphans," as specified in the will of its founder, cannot bar Negroes.

The Supreme Court, in another unanimous decision, held that the board of directors of City Trust of Philadephia, which administers the school, is actually an agency of the State of Pennsylvania. Therefore, said the Court, the board—although acting as trustee—cannot comply with the terms of the will of the late Stephen Girard, a French-born philanthropist, whose estate in Philadelphia was largely left to various municipal and educational purposes.

There is no argument over the fact that the college is a sort of semipublic institution. However, it was set up under the terms of a will which specifies that only poor children and only males and members of the white race were to be admitted.

The Court has interpreted the board's recent action in refusing to admit two Negro boys as discrimination by the State. Therefore, it is, in effect, ordering the violating of Girard's will and intention in establishing the school. While this may be construed as legally correct, it is morally wrong, and is carrying the cause of equal rights to unexpected lengths.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 30, 1957]

GIRARD'S WILL UPSET

Yesterday's decision of the United States Supreme Court declaring the will of Stephen Girard invalid insofar as it restricts admission to Girard College to "poor white male orphans" may be more far reaching than appears on the surface.

The will, probated in 1831, was responsible for much of the early legislation in this country which related to the creation of trusts. It was nullified because the Board of City Trusts administers it and is by law forbidden to practice discrimination. A private administrator could continue to carry out the provisions.

The applications of two Negro boys for admission, which were rejected, brought the will case into court. When the Pennsylvania Supreme Court passed on the issue, it decided 5 to 1 to uphold the provisions of the will. Justice Musmanno dissented.

The appeal to the Supreme Court was joined by both the city and the State. Political considerations undoubtedly motivated both.

Despite the fact that the will was written before enactment of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, the Supreme Court decision yesterday held its provisions to be in violation of that amendment and consequently invalid, at least so far as the bar against nonwhites is concerned. The effect will be to permit admission of orientals as well as Negroes.

The unanimous decision of the highest court in the land was in keeping with its finding several years ago against segregation. It may fundamentally alter the program of a Philadelphia institution which has been doing outstanding work for more than a century.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if there be no further morning business, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the call of the calendar will be proceeded with.

RESOLUTIONS AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President was announced as first in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 24) to amend rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 913) to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations

and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4815) to provide permanent authority for the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) authorizing an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission into the activities and practices of companies engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of newsprint in interstate commerce, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

NICOLA MARCELLO

The bill (H. R. 1757) for the relief of Nicola Marcello was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point, in connection with the passage of House bill 1757 a letter addressed to me from Commissioner Swing, of the Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, which will explain the reasons why this bill was held over a few weeks ago and why there is now no further objection.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1957.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: Reference is had to Mr. Quigley's request for details concerning the offense for which Mr. Nicola Marcello, beneficiary of private bill H. R. 1757, was reportedly convicted as indicated in the last paragraph of the memorandum of information accompanying the Service report dated July 9, 1956, relative to this case.

It has been ascertained that the conviction actually occurred on January 1, 1936, and not during the 1940's, as reported. According to a police certificate from the authorities in Lanciano, Abruzzi, Italy, the beneficiary was fined 120 lire for a violation of article 669 of the Italian criminal code. This article regulates peddling and provides penalties for peddling without a license or without observing other provisions of the law.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING, *Commissioner.*

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 495) to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia and the construction thereon of additional facilities for the United States Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 728) to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in squares 725 and 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF INTERNAL SECURITY ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1956

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) to print, for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, additional copies of the Internal Security Annual Report for 1956 was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary 75,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 131, 85th Congress, entitled "Internal Security Annual Report for 1956."

COL. BENJAMIN AXELROAD

The bill (S. 1008) for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad was announced as next in order.

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

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to attempt to make an explanation.

In the latter part of the 83d Congress a bill was passed, which was approved by the Army, providing for the payment of $28,000 compensation to two persons who had been very seriously and permanently injured, and to the estate of a young lady who had been killed.

Mr. Axelroad, who was attorney for these people, had presented a claim in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate on two occasions. Unquestionably he was entitled to an attorney's fee much larger than the usual 10 percent.

In the latter part of the 83d Congress, in order to permit the passage of bills in the Senate, since objections were being made to provisions for attorneys' fees, a provision was written in the bill now pending that no part of the sum should be paid to an attorney, so Mr. Axelroad was precluded by the action of the Committee on the Judiciary from receiving any compensation. He had agreed to this action.

The committee has considered the matter. Mr. Axelroad was put to great out-of-pocket expense. In fairness to him, since he can otherwise not collect any fee, we felt he was entitled to compensation in the amount provided in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, we took this matter up and looked into it thoroughly. We came to the unanimous conclusion that for the work he had done Mr. Axelroad should be paid the amount provided by the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the committee made a unanimous report of the bill, and in the light of the explanation of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I withdraw my objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1008) for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. Benjamin Axelroad, Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $2,799.50, as compensation for legal services performed and expenses incurred in assisting Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, James Thomas Harper, and Mrs. T. W. Bennett, all of Tullahoma, Tenn., in the successful prosecution of their claims against the United States. Although the efforts of the said Col. Benjamin Axelroad contributed materially to the obtaining of evidence which led to the enactment of a private law for the relief of the above-mentioned claimants (Private Law 498, 83d Cong.), such private law prevented any payment to the said Col. Benjamin Axelroad out of sums appropriated in such private law: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act, shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim of the said Col. Benjamin Axelroad for such compensation, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 124) citing Edward E. Hintz for contempt of the Senate, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

GUIDO WILLIAM GRAMBERGS

The bill (S. 147) for the relief of Guido William Grambergs was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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

MARIA PARISI

The bill (S. 239) for the relief of Maria Parisi, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Parisi shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Antonio Parisi, a citizen of the United States.

ARISTEA VITOGIANES

The bill (S. 256) for the relief of Aristea Vitogianes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Aristea Vitogianes shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Augustus and Maria Vitogianes, citizens of the United States.

LIVIO SENNI

The bill (S. 470) for the relief of Livio Senni was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Livio Senni may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

BLANCA G. HIDALGO

The bill (S. 616) for the relief of Blanca G. Hidalgo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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

GEORGINA MERCEDES LLERA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 622) for the relief of Georgina Mercedes Llera, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee," to strike out "upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Georgina Mercedes Llera shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JOHN EICHERL

The bill (S. 629) for the relief of John Eicherl was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond which may have been issued in the case of John Eicherl. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said John Eicherl shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants or order have issued.

ISABELLA ABRAHAMS

The bill (S. 650) for the relief of Isabella Abrahams was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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

SUI-AN FUNG AND SHU-NUNG WU FUNG

The bill (S. 710) for the relief of Sui-an Fung and Shu-nung Wu Fung was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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

MARIA CACCOMO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 308) for the relief of Maria Caccomo, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Caccomo shall be held and considered to be the minor child of Salvatore Caccomo, a lawful permanent resident of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DONINI MAURIZIO DONATO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 623) for the relief of Donini Maurizio Donato, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Donini Maurizio Donato, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Dr. and Mrs. Lawrence L. Massa, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ELVIRA A. BELFORD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 641) for the relief of Elvira A. Belford, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "be", to insert "issued a visa and", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 9 of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elvira A. Belford may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. This act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SHIGEKO KIMURA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 776) for the relief of Shigeko Kimura, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. On April 15, 1957, the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably the bill, S. 776, to provide for the admission to the United States of the fiance of a United States citizen serviceman, to enable them to be married. The bill also provided for the admission of the couple's child, if such child was born prior to the adult beneficiary's departure to the United States. In behalf of the adult beneficiary, the bill provided a waiver of the excluding provision of existing law relating to those afflicted with tuberculosis.

On April 17, 1957, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 2723, a similar bill, for the relief of the same beneficiaries. That bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Inasmuch as the language of House bill 2723 is substantially the same as that of Senate bill 776, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2723.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2723) for the relief of Shigeko Kimura and her minor child.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 776 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1164) to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PEDRO AMPO

The bill (S. 463) for the relief of Pedro Ampo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Pedro Ampo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Diosdado D. Aba, a citizen of the United States.

MARIA CONCETTA DI TURI

The bill (S. 465) for the relief of Maria Concetta Di Turi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Concetta Di Turi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Leonardo Di Turi, a citizen of the United States.

SHAO FONG SHA

The bill (S. 730) for the relief of Shao Fong Sha was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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

GIUSEPPE SCIORTINO

The bill (S. 756) for the relief of Giuseppe Sciortino was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Sciortino may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

DR. CHEUNG NUNG HUANG

The bill (S. 891) for the relief of Dr. Cheung Nung Huang was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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

MRS. ELSBE HERMINE VAN DAM HURST

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 653) for the relief of Mrs. Elsbe Hermine van Dam Hurst, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elsbe Hermine van Dam Hurst shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CORNELIS VANDER HOEK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 874) for the relief of Cornelis Vander Hoek, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cornelis Vander Hoek shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ANTOINE VELLEMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1206) for the relief of Antoine Velleman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after "1944", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Antoine Velleman, of Geneva, Switzerland, the sum of $526.06. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Antoine Velleman against the United States for compensation for services rendered by him as an instructor for the United States Army internees at Adelboden, Switzerland, from August 1, 1944, to September 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

NOEMI MARIA VIDA WILLIAMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 307) for the relief of Noemi Maria Vida Williams, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "section" and insert "sections"; at the beginning of line 4, to insert "(a) (9) and"; and, at the top of page 2, to insert:

SEC. 2. That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Loretta Vida shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States

for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Noemi Maria Vida Williams may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of Justice or the Department of State has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Loretta Vida shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Noemi Maria Vida Williams and Maria Loretta Vida."

CHRISTOS A. MAUROYENIS (MAVROGENIS)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 767) for the relief of Christos A. Mauroyenis (Mavrogenis), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "child", to strike out "Christos A. Mauroyenis (Mavrogenis)" and insert "Christo Pan Lycouras Mauroyenis (Maurogenis)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Christo Pan Lycouras Mauroyenis (Maurogenis), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Mauroyenis, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Christo Pan Lycouras Mauroyenis (Maurogenis)."

GEORGE CHRISTOPOULOS, A MINOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 804) for the relief of George Christopoulos, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "George Christopoulos" and insert "Georgios D. Christopoulos," so as to make the bill read:

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Georgios D. Christopoulos."

CERTAIN SPOUSES AND MINOR CHILDREN OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 133) for the relief of certain spouses and minor children of citizens of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, at the top of page 2, to strike out "That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act:" and insert "That except in the cases of beneficiaries entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further*, That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."; on page 3, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "and"; and, in the same line, after "Wong", to insert a comma and "Salvatore Adornetto, Mrs. Anni A. Anthony, Mrs. Antonietta Polintan Averitt, Mrs. Concetta Battaglini Bosio, Angelo Capitello, Mrs. Julia W. Chang, Mrs. Yu Yuk Chun, Mrs. Fukuko Kanda Deppiesse, Mrs. Yoshiko S. Estapa, Mrs. Maria Lourdes Figueras, Mrs. Olga M. Finartijs, Mrs. Virginia Montilla Gallego, Mrs. Cheng Kam Hou, Mrs. Mafalda Marchini Iacopucci, Mrs. Hiroko Nakagawa Irish, Rev. Gottfried G. Krodel, Mrs. Agnes Moreland McCall, Mrs. Edith D. McKinnis, Mr. Milenko Mijatovich, Jung Chew Ming, Lau Chung Oi, Gaetano Patrasso, Mychajlo Pawliczko, Michele Povia, Mrs. Wah Lung Price, Vittorio Quartarone, Mrs. Liliane Thurau, Mrs. Enrichetta Troncone, Mrs. Lydia Atienza Venzon, Mrs. Mitsuyo Shinbo Watanabe, and Mrs. Siv I. M. Woods."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read the third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1639) to provide for the suspension of the vesting of alien property and the liquidation of vested property, under the Trading With the Enemy Act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ADJUDICATION OF CONFLICTING CLAIMS OF NAVAHO AND HOPI INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 692) to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Indians entitled to the use thereof the lands described in Executive order of December 16, 1882, and for adjudicating the conflicting claims thereto of the Navaho and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "Indians who are entitled to be thereon" and insert "Hopi Indians and such other Indians as heretofore have been settled thereon by the Secretary of the Interior"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 14, to insert "pursuant to such Executive order"; in line 22, after "Sec. 2.", to strike out "Any lands" and insert "Lands, if any,"; in line 25, after the word "Reservation", to strike out "Any lands" and insert "Lands, if any,"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "If the court determines that the said Navaho Tribe, Hopi Tribe, including any Hopi village or clan thereof, or individual Indians have a joint or undivided interest in any part of the lands subject to section 1 of this act, the court shall determine the reservation to which such lands shall be added as in its opinion shall be fair, just, and equitable."; at the beginning of line 18, to insert "tribal or individual"; and, in line 19, after the word "Act", to insert a comma and "or to affect the liability of the United States, if any, under litigation now pending before the Indian Claims Commission"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the lands described in the Executive order dated December 16, 1882, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Hopi Indians and such other Indians as heretofore have been settled thereon by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to such Executive order. The Navaho Indian Tribe and the Hopi Indian Tribe, acting through the chairmen of their respective tribal councils for and on behalf of said tribes, including all villages and clans thereof, and on behalf of any Navaho or Hopi Indians claiming an interest in the area set aside by executive order dated December 16, 1882, and the Attorney General on behalf of the United States, are each hereby authorized to commence or defend in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona an action against each other and any other tribe or Indians claiming any interest in or to the area described in such Executive order for the purpose of determining the rights and interest of said parties in and to said lands and quieting title thereto in the tribes or Indians establishing such claims pursuant to such Executive order as may be just and fair in law and equity. The action shall be heard and determined by a district court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 2284, except that no judge from the State of Arizona shall serve thereon, and any party may appeal directly to the Supreme Court from the final determination by such three-judge district court.

SEC. 2. Lands, if any, in which the Navaho Indian Tribe or individual Navaho Indians are determined by the court to have the exclusive interest shall thereafter be a part of the Navaho Indian Reservation. Lands, if any, in which the Hopi Indian Tribe, including any Hopi village or clan thereof, or individual Hopi Indians are determined by the court to have the exclusive interest shall thereafter be a reservation for the Hopi

Indian Tribe. The Navaho and Hopi Tribes, respectively, are authorized to sell, buy, or exchange any lands within their reservations with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and any such lands acquired by either tribe through purchase or exchange shall become a part of the reservation of such tribe.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to be a Congressional determination of the merits of the conflicting tribal or individual Indian claims to the lands that are subject to adjudication pursuant to this act, or to affect the liability of the United States, if any, under litigation now pending before the Indian Claims Commission.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN TRIBAL LANDS ON THE CATAWBA INDIAN RESERVATION, S. C.

The (H. R. 676) to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1574) to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Coulee Dam and Grand Coulee areas, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Washington, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DELIVERY OF WATER TO CERTAIN LANDS IN THE SHOSHONE FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 79) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Heart Mountain division, Shoshone Federal reclamation project, Wyoming, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the House passed a joint resolution identical with the Senate joint resolution just reached on the calendar. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House joint resolution, which is on the calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 287) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Heart Mountain division, Shoshone Federal Reclamation project, Wyoming.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 79 is indefinitely postponed.

DEVELOPMENT OF PHOSPHATE ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 334) to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment in line 5, after the word "words," to insert "or permits," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 27 of the act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., 184), is amended by the deletion of the words "or permits exceeding in the aggregate 5,120 acres in any one State, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DESERT-LAND ENTRIES

The bill (S. 359) to permit desert-land entries on disconnected tracts of lands which, in the case of any one entryman, form a compact unit and do not exceed in the aggregate 320 acres was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third read, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of March 3, 1877, entitled "An act to provide for the sale of desert lands in certain States and Territories," as amended (43 U. S. C. 321), is further amended by the deletion at the end of that section of the following words ": *Provided*, That no person shall be permitted to enter more than one tract of land and not to exceed 320 acres which shall be in compact form" and the addition of the following: "Except as provided in section 3 of the act of June 16, 1955 (69 Stat. 138), as amended, no person may make more than one entry under this act. However, in that entry one or more tracts may be included, and the tracts so entered need not be contiguous. The aggregate acreage of desert land which may be entered by any one person under this section shall not exceed 320 acres, and all the tracts entered by 1 person must form together a compact unit, as determined by rules and regulations to be issued by the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act of June 16, 1955 (69 Stat. 138), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Any person who, prior to June 16, 1955, made a valid desert-land entry on lands subject to such act of June 22, 1910, or of July 17, 1914, may, if otherwise qualified, make 1 additional entry, as a personal privilege, not assignable, upon 1 or more tracts of desert land subject to the provisions of such acts, as hereby amended, and section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes,' approved June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1269, 1272; 43 U. S. C. 315f). The additional land entered by any person pursuant to this section shall not, together with his original entry, exceed 320 acres, and all the tracts included within the additional entry authorized by this section shall form together a compact unit, as determined by rules and regulations to be issued by the Secretary of the Interior. Additional entries authorized by this section shall be subject to all the requirements of the desert-land law."

CARE AND MAINTENANCE OF THE SURRENDER TREE SITE IN SANTIAGO, CUBA

The bill (S. 1063) vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the Surrender Tree site in Santiago, Cuba, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the American Battle Monuments Commission is responsible for the care and maintenance of the Surrender Tree site in Santiago, Cuba. This act takes effect on the next July 1 after the date of its enactment.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF PORTION OF SPRINGFIELD CONFEDERATE CEMETERY, MO.

The bill (S. 1274) to amend the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1077), to remove restrictions on the use of a portion of the Springfield Confederate Cemetery, Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the condition contained in the first section of the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1077), which requires that the land comprising the Confederate Cemetery at Springfield, Mo., be used only as a cemetery for the graves of men who were in the military or naval service of the Confederate States of America, is applicable only to the portion of that cemetery inside the walled enclosure where those graves are located. The portion of that cemetery outside of the walled enclosure shall be used as part of the Springfield National Cemetery.

RENOUNCEMENT OF RIGHT, TITLE, AND INTEREST IN CERTAIN LANDS IN MONTANA

The bill (S. 1319) to renounce any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in certain lands in Montana was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby renounces any right, title, and interest to lots 5 to 12, block 25, Graves second addition, Harlowton, Wheatland County, Mont., which it may have obtained under the last will and testament of Edwin A. Patterson, of Harlowton, Mont., who died on May 12, 1954.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE FAIRVIEW CEMETERY ASSOCIATION, INC., WAHPETON, N. DAK.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1352) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc., Wahpeton, N. Dak., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "improvements", to insert

"thereon upon payment", and, in line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "sum of $4,000" and insert "fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Interior", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc., Wahpeton, N. Dak., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in section 2, together with all improvements thereon upon payment by such association to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this act is situated in the county of Richland, State of North Dakota, and is more particularly described as follows:

North half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 6, township 132 north, range 47 west, fifth principal meridian, comprising 20 acres.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

USE OF PUBLIC LANDS GRANTED TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

The bill (S. 1396) to amend section 6 of the act approved July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222), relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming by providing for the use of public lands granted to said State for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishing, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said State, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222, 223), providing for the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That 50 sections of the unappropriated public lands within said State, to be selected and located in legal subdivisions as provided in section 4 of this act, shall be, and are hereby, granted to said State for the purpose of erecting public buildings at the capital of said State, including construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishing, equipment; and any other permanent improvement of such buildings, and the acquisition of necessary land for such buildings, and the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued for any of the above purposes."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of July 10, 1890.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA

The bill S. 1568 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I rise merely to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if he will tell us whether the bill calls for any appropriations on the part of Congress.

Mr. BIBLE. No; quite to the contrary. The bill would enable the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land at the fair market value to the State of Nevada. It would require no appropriation whatever by the Congress.

Mr. BARRETT. The title of the bill indicates that the title to the land will go to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada. Is that an instrumentality of the State of Nevada?

Mr. BIBLE. The Colorado River Commission of Nevada is a State agency, set up and headed by the Governor of the State of Nevada.

Mr. BARRETT. As I understand, any improvements placed upon the land would be made at the expense of the State of Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Any improvements placed upon the land would be made at the expense of the State of Nevada.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, line 19, after the word "valid", to strike out "claims against" and insert "rights pertaining", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, acting for and in behalf of the State of Nevada, upon the payment by the State of Nevada into the Treasury of the United States, not more than 5 years after the Secretary has notified the State of the purchase price, of an amount equal to the fair market value as of the date of approval of this act of the lands to be conveyed as determined by the Secretary upon the appraisal of those lands, a patent or patents to the following described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately 126,775 acres:

(1) All of south half, township 23 south, range 63 east, with the exception of the following areas: east half section 22; four 5-acre tracts located in section 26 and described as follows: South half southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, north half southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter and south half southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; and those portions of the northeast quarter section 23, and north half section 24, within the Lake Mead national recreation area.

(2) Fractional sections 25 and 36, township 23 south, range 63½ east.

(3) All of sections 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, township 23 south, range 64 east.

(4) Fractional sections 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, township 23½ south, range 64 east.

(5) All of southeast quarter of township 24 south, range 62 east.

(6) All of township 24 south, range 63 east.

(7) All of township 24 south, range 64 east, except sections 1, 12, 13, 24, 25, and 36.

(8) All of township 25 south, range 62 east.

(9) All of township 25 south, range 63 east.

(10) All of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 25 south, range 64 east.

(11) All of sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, and 14, township 26 south, range 62 east.

(12) All of northwest quarter, township 26 south, range 63 east.

All range references contained in the foregoing refer to the Mount Diablo base and meridian.

SEC. 2. The Colorado River Commission of Nevada, acting on behalf of the State of Nevada, is hereby given the option, which may be exercised at any time during the 5-year period provided in the first section of this act, of having patented to it a portion of the described area upon payment of the appraised value thereof: *Provided*, That no such purchase shall be for less than 10,000 acres.

SEC. 3. The conveyance or conveyances authorized by this act shall be made subject to any existing valid rights pertaining to the lands described in the first section of this act, and to any reservations necessary to protect continuing uses of those lands of the United States.

SEC. 4. If the State of Nevada purchases under this act any lands which are subject to a lease, permit, license, or contract issued under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended (39 U. S. C. 181 and the following), it shall be required to purchase all the lands subject to that lease, permit, license, or contract which are included within the boundaries of the lands described in section 1. The purchase of lands subject to a lease, permit, license, or contract shall neither affect the validity nor modify the terms of the lease, permit, license, or contract in any way, or affect any rights thereunder, except that the State shall assume the position of the United States thereunder, including any right to rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing on or after the date on which the purchase by the State becomes effective, and any right to modify terms or conditions of such leases, permits, licenses, or contracts.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF SPEARFISH, S. DAK.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2401) to provide for the reconveyance of certain land to the city of Spearfish, S. Dak., was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CATHEDRAL OF THE PINES AT RINDGE, N. H., AS A MEMORIAL TO AMERICAN WAR DEAD

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the recognition of the Altar of the Nation, located in the Cathedral of Pines, Rindge, N. H., as a memorial to all American war dead was considered and agreed to.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE VILLAGE OF CENTRAL, N. MEX.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 45) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to the village of Central, State of New Mexico, certain lands administered by him formerly part of Fort Bayard Military Reservation, N. Mex., which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 3, line 17, after the word "if", to strike out "it" and insert "any parcel or lot"; in line 18, after the word "such", to strike out

"property" and insert "parcel or lot"; and in line 23, after the word "reserve", to strike out "rights-of-way" and insert "easements", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to section 2 of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to sell, at market value as determined by him, and to convey to the village of Central, in the State of New Mexico, for the purpose of residential and business development, the followng described lands, formerly part of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation, Grant County, N. Mex., comprising approximately fifty-eight and thirty-one one-hundredths acres situated in the north half of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 17 south, range 13 west, and in the north half of the south half of section 35, township 17 south, range 13 west, New Mexico principal meridian, more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

Beginning at a point located at the intersection of the south right-of-way line of United States Highway 260 and the south boundary of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation, from which the Fort Bayard Military Reservation 1-mile marker bears north 89 degrees 59 minutes east, 30.65 feet distant;

Thence along the south right-of-way line of United States Highway 260 as follows:

First, along a circular curve to the left, the radius being 1,332.5 feet and the long chord being 1,078.87 feet in length and bearing north 58 degrees 47 minutes west;

Thence along a transition curve to the left, the long chord being 287.83 feet in length and bearing north 86 degrees 48 minutes west;

Thence north 88 degrees 38 minutes west, 1,067.69 feet;

Thence along a circular curve to the left, the radius being 8,494.42 feet and the long chord being 2,364.46 feet in length and bearing south 83 degrees 18 minutes west;

Thence south 75 degrees 18 minutes west, 1,309.49 feet to a point of intersection of the south right-of-way line of United States Highway 260 and the south boundary of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation;

Thence leaving said right-of-way, along the south boundary of the Fort Bayard Military Reservation as follows:

North 89 degrees 17 minutes east, 654.26 feet to the Fort Bayard Military Reservation 2-mile marker;

Thence north 89 degrees 59 minutes east, 2,629.20 feet to the Fort Bayard Military Reservation 1½-mile marker;

Thence north 89 degrees 59 minutes east, 2,610.00 feet to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act (1) shall provide that the described land shall not be used in a manner incompatible with the proper and effective operation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., and if any parcel or lot shall ever be used in such manner, the title to such parcel or lot shall revert to the United States, which shall have the immediate right of reentry thereon, provided that such reversion shall terminate in the event the Veterans' Administration ceases operation of the hospital, (2) shall protect existing valid rights, (3) shall reserve easements for existing facilities such as roads, telephone lines, pipelines, electric power transmission lines, or other facilities or improvements in place, and shall reserve such easements for roads as the Secretary of Agriculture finds necessary to assure access to lands of the United States or to meet public needs, (4) shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land so conveyed, and (5) may contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to the village of Central, N. Mex., a tract of about 58.31 acres desired by the village for town expansion. The village would be required to pay full market value. The land now serves as a watershed for the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., but is not needed by the Government. The conveyance provided for by the bill would require the land to be used in a manner compatible with the proper operation of the hospital.

The committee amendments, which are of a technical nature, were suggested by the Department of Agriculture. They would make the Government's reversionary interest applicable to each parcel or lot, instead of to the entire tract, so that a violation of the condition of the deed by a single parcel or lot owner would not affect the rights of owners of other parcels or lots. The committee amendments also would change the phrase "rights-of-way" to "easements" in order to make the language of the bill consistent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1491) to revise the Transportation of Explosives Act, chapter 39, title 18, of the United States Code, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF CERTAIN STATUTES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1492) to provide more adequate penalties for violation of certain statutes administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 6, after "1893", to insert "(27 Stat. 532)"; in line 8, after the word "words", to strike out "five hundred dollars" and insert "two hundred and fifty dollars"; on page 2, line 1, after "1910", to insert "(36 Stat. 299;"; in line 3, after the word "words", to strike out "five hundred dollars" and insert "two hundred and fifty dollars"; in line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "words "not less than $100 nor more than"." and insert "amount of "$100" and substituting therefore the amount of "$200"."; at the beginning of line 11, to insert "(36 Stat. 916)"; in line 13, after the word "words", to strike out "five hundred dollars" and insert "two hundred and fifty dollars"; at the beginning of line 16, to insert "(49 Stat. 564)"; in line 22, after the word "than", to strike out "$500" and insert "$200"; in line 23, after the word "than", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$500"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "$500" and insert "$200"; at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$500", and in the same line, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$250"; and, in line 5, after the word "than", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That the Safety Appliance Acts, as amended (45 U. S. C. 1–16), are amended as follows:

(1) By striking in the first clause of section 6 of the act of March 2, 1893 (27 Stat. 532), as amended (45 U. S. C. 6), the words "one hundred dollars" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "two hundred and fifty dollars"; and

(2) By striking in the first clause of section 4 of the act of April 14, 1910 (36 Stat. 299; 45 U. S. C. 13), the words "one hundred dollars" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "two hundred and fifty dollars."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Hours of Service Act (34 Stat. 1416), as amended (45 U. S. C. 63), is amended by striking in the first clause of the first sentence thereof the amount of "$100" and substituting therefor the amount of "$200."

SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Locomotive Inspection Act (36 Stat. 916), as amended (45 U. S. C. 34) is amended by striking in the first clause thereof the words "one hundred dollars" and substituting therefor the words "two hundred and fifty dollars."

SEC. 4. Section 222 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 Stat. 564), as amended (49 U. S. C. 322), is amended as follows:

(1) By striking in the first sentence of subsection (a) thereof the words "not more than $100 for the first offense and not more than $500 for any subsequent offense.", and substituting therefor the words "not less than $100 nor more than $500 for the first offense and not less than $200 nor more than $500 for any subsequent offense.", and

(2) By striking in subsection (c) thereof the words "not more than $500 for the first offense and not more than $2,000 for any subsequent offense." and substituting therefor the words "not less than $200 nor more than $500 for the first offense and not less than $250 nor more than $2,000 for any subsequent offense.".

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill increasing penalties for violation of certain safety and other statutes administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission."

AWARDS OF MEDALS OF HONOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1463) to amend the Medals of Honor Act to authorize awards for acts of heroism involving any motor vehicle subject to the motor carrier safety regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "Act", to strike out "(45" and insert "of February 23, 1905 (38 Stat. 743; 45"; and, in line 8, after the word "vehicle", to strike out "subject to safety regulations established by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the provision of section 204 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act" and insert "on the public highways,

roads, or streets of the United States,", and"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Medals of Honor Act of February 23, 1905 (38 Stat. 743; 45 U. S. C., secs. 44–46) is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting between the word "commerce" and the colon preceding the proviso in section 1 thereof the words "or involving any motor vehicle on the public highways, roads, or streets of the United States,", and

(2) By changing section 3 thereof to read: "Appropriations for the Interstate Commerce Commission are hereby made available for carrying out the provisions of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Medals of Honor Act to authorize awards for acts of heroism involving any motor vehicle."

OVERALL FEED PROGRAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 125) requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of methods of providing an overall feed program, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture with an amendment, to strike out all after the word *"Resolved,"* and insert "That the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to conduct a thorough study of possible methods of improving the feed grain program which can be effective, as far as possible, with the 1958 crop, and to report thereon with specific recommendations, including drafts of any legislation considered necessary to carry out such recommendations, not later than July 15, 1957."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this resolution requests the Secretary of Agriculture to study and report on ways to improve the feed-grain program. His report would include drafts of any proposed legislation which might be necessary to carry out his recommendations. The report would be made before July 15 of this year.

This resolution is substantially the same as section 3 of S. 1771, the corn bill, which failed to pass the Senate earlier this year. There was, however, no opposition to section 3, and the rejection of the bill resulted largely from a failure to solve the problems of other feed grains. The report called for by the pending resolution would be of assistance to Congress in working out a solution to the entire problem.

The committee amendment to the text of the resolution makes no change in the substance of the resolution.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire from the distinguished Senator from Missouri with reference to the report. I note from the last paragraph of the report that it is indicated that—

The committee amendment to the text of the resolution makes technical changes, to give recognition to the existence of current feed-grain programs; the fact that it may not be possible to make some of the recommendations resulting from the study effective with the 1958 crop; and the possibility that legislation may not be necessary to carry out the recommendations made.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether the committee felt there was good reason that the study should be made, in view of that statement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will say to my good friend from Wyoming that the members of the committee from his side of the aisle did believe it to be a good idea.

Mr. BARRETT. I can see no objection to the study being made, and will therefore withdraw my objection.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of methods of improving the feed grain program."

LENDING OF CERTAIN ARMED SERVICES EQUIPMENT TO BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The bill (S. 1859) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Gold Rush '57 Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Boy Scouts of America, a corporation created under the act of June 15, 1916, for the use and accommodation of the approximately 12,000 Scouts and officials who are to attend the Gold Rush '57 Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America to be held beginning May 24, 1957, and ending May 26, 1957, at the Highland State recreation area in the State of Michigan, such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national-defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN COBB COUNTY, GA.

The bill (H. R. 1544) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Cobb County, Ga., to the trustees of the Methodist Church, Acworth, Ga., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEVELOPMENT OF FARM INCOME DATA

The bill (S. 405) to require the Bureau of the Census to develop farm income data by economic class of farm was announced as next in order.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, by request, I should like to make a brief statement with reference to the pending bill.

The bill would require the Secretary of Commerce to collect annually money and nonmoney farm-income data by economic class of farm. It is identical to S. 3145, which passed the Senate last year but failed to pass the House of Representatives. The data collected pursuant to this bill will be helpful in dealing with many of the problems of agriculture.

Passage of the bill would require the expenditure of approximately $500,000 the first year, and somewhat less thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 13 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

" §147. Farm income data

"The Secretary shall collect annually money and nonmoney income data relating to per capita and family farm income by economic class of farm."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the call of the calendar has been concluded, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY IN THE COULEE DAM AND GRAND COULEE AREAS, WASHINGTON

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the calendar and proceed to the consideration of Order No. 267, S. 1574.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1574) to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Coulee Dam and Grand Coulee areas, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Washington, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 3, line 4, after the word "southeast", to strike out "quarter," and insert "quarter"; in line 13, after the word "northeast", to strike out "one-quarter," and insert "one-quarter"; in line 21, after the word "all", to strike out "personal and real property" and insert "lands and improvements"; on page 4, line 15, after the word "the", to insert "land and"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 6, to insert "Assignments under this paragraph shall be subject to such general rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, including denial, in any instance where the Secretary in his judgment finds it proper, to the assignee concerned, or his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, of any discount in or rebate of the purchase price to which such person or persons would otherwise be entitled under this act"; on page 9, line 9, after the word "Secretary", to insert "Residential property which is not sold under the preceding provisions of this subsection shall be open to bids from the general public and shall be sold to the highest responsible bidder"; in line 13, after the word "Property", to strike out "not sold under (1) and property"; in line 16, after the word "section", to insert "and land with church or hospital improvements thereon"; in line 20, after the word "is", to strike out "zoned for residential use or that to be sold under subsection (b)" and insert "covered by subsections (b), (c) (3), and (e) (1)"; on page 10, line 8, after the word "compact", to strike out "and without non-"; in line 22, after the word "exercised", to strike out "or, if no priority or preference period is provided herein, within one year following the time when such land can be first purchased hereunder"; and, on page 13, line 11, after the word "section", to insert "or property sold to the first taker from the general public under subsection (h) of this section or by negotiated sale under subsection (c) (3) of this section"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act, in connection with the Columbia Basin project, to authorize the disposal of certain Federal property in the unincorporated area in the State of Washington commonly known as the town of Coulee Dam in order that the United States may withdraw from the ownership and operation of the town and that the people of that area may enjoy self-government, to facilitate the establishment by them of a municipal corporation under the laws of the State of Washington, and to authorize the disposal of certain Federal property in and in the immediate vicinity of the city of Grand Coulee, Wash., in order to reduce restrictions on the growth thereof. The area herein referred to as the town area is situated in Douglas, Grant, and Okanogan Counties and comprises the following lands:

Douglas County: Township 29 north, range 30 east, Willamette meridian, section 36, lots 2, 3, 4, east half southwest quarter and southwest quarter southwest quarter.

Grant County: Township 28 north, range 30 east, Willamette meridian, section 1, lots 1 and 2.

Okanogan County: Township 28 north, range 31 east, Willamette meridian, section 6, lot 3.

Township 29 north, range 30 east, Willamette meridian, section 36, lots 5, 6, and 7.

Township 29 north, range 31 east, Willamette meridian, section 30, all those portions of the south 300 feet of lot 4 included within the area conveyed to the United States of America by warranty deed executed by Charles E. Hopkins, and others on September 11, 1946, and recorded in book 107 of deeds at pages 175 and 176 under Okanogan County auditor's file No. 346972 and by warranty deed executed by Charles E. Hopkins, and others on November 7, 1945, recorded in book 102 of deeds at pages 441 and 442 under Okanogan County auditor's file No. 339487.

Section 31, west half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter, and lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

The area herein referred to as the Grand Coulee area is situated in Grant County and comprises the following lands:

Township 28 north, range 30 east, Willamette meridian, section 11, south one-half north one-half, north one-half southwest one-quarter, northeast one-quarter southeast one-quarter.

The term "the municipality," as used in this act, refers to any municipal corporation organized hereafter embracing any part of the town area described.

SEC. 2. Except for property, disposal of which is authorized under section 6 of this act, the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, is authorized to sell all lands and improvements situated in the town and Grand Coulee areas which was acquired or built by the United States for the construction, operation, and maintenance of Grand Coulee Dam and its appurtenant works and which is not needed for Federal purposes. Such disposals shall be made in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in section 3 of this act, but lands to be sold in the Grand Coulee area shall be sold at public sale to the highest responsible bidder.

SEC. 3. (a) All land authorized to be sold under section 2 of this act which, when offered for sale, is occupied by improvements owned by the United States shall be sold with the improvements in place.

(b) Of the property authorized to be sold under section 2 of this act, lands in the town area occupied by dwelling units shall be sold in accordance with the following terms and conditions:

(1) First priority to purchase shall be given to the tenant of the United States in the town area who occupies the land and dwelling unit to be sold. Such dwelling unit shall be offered at the appraised value as established under section 5 less any applicable discounts under this act. This right of priority shall expire unless a deposit of earnest money in an amount to be fixed by the Secretary is received by him before the expiration of 60 days after the date on which the property has been offered for sale, and the right of priority shall be deemed abandoned unless within an additional 180 days the prospective purchaser shall have signed a contract to purchase the property.

Any tenant having a priority under (1) who desires to continue to rent the property occupied by him rather than to purchase it may assign his priority to a person who has entered into a valid contract to lease the property back to him. The Secretary may permit such other assignments of priorities under (1) as he finds to be fair and equitable. Assignments under this paragraph shall be subject to such general rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, including denial, in any instance where the Secretary in his judgment finds it proper, to the assignee concerned, or his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, of any discount in or rebate of the purchase price to which such person or persons would otherwise be entitled under this act.

(2) Second priority to purchase shall apply to property in the town area not purchased under (1) and shall be given to persons who are tenants of the United States in Federal housing in the town area or who would meet the requirements for eligibility to become such tenants under the most recent regulations of the Bureau of Reclamation for the assignment of persons to Federal housing in the town area. Applicants to purchase shall be placed in order of opportunity to choose pursuant to a public drawing, but spouses of such applicants shall not be entitled to apply. Sales shall be at the appraised value as established under section 5, less applicable discounts under this act. Selection of dwelling units by successful applicants, to be accompanied by a deposit of earnest money fixed as under (1), shall be concluded within limits of time established by the Secretary, and thereafter the purchase shall be concluded in the same manner as provided under (1). A purchase under (1) or (2) shall render the purchaser and any spouse of such purchaser ineligible thereafter to purchase under either (1) or (2).

(3) Property not sold under (1) or (2) shall be opened to bids from the general public and shall be sold to the highest responsible bidder.

(c) (1) Of the property authorized to be sold under section 2 of this act, land in the town area occupied by privately owned improvements shall be offered for sale to the owner of such improvements at the appraised value as established under section 5 less applicable discounts under this act. This preference right shall expire unless a deposit of earnest money in an amount to be fixed by the Secretary is received by the Secretary before the expiration of 60 days after the date on which the property has been offered for sale, and thereafter the purchase shall be concluded in the same manner as provided under subsection (b) (1) of this section.

(2) Land not purchased by the owner of the improvements (except church or hospital improvements) thereon under (1) shall be made available for sale for a period of 30 days to those eligible for purchase under subsection (f) of this section, and thereafter shall be opened to bids from the general public and sold to the highest responsible bidder.

(3) Land with church or hospital improvements thereon which has not been purchased by the owners of the improvements under (1) may be disposed of by advertising and competitive bids, or by negotiated sale or other transfer at such prices and on such other terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine to be fair and equitable.

(d) (1) Of the property authorized to be sold under section 2 of this act, land in the town area occupied by improvements owned by the United States other than dwelling units shall be offered to the lessee of the United States in such improvements at the appraised value as established under section 5 less applicable discounts under this act: *Provided*, That where there is more than one lessee in a given improvement and the Secretary finds it impractical to offer each lessee an interest in the property, the Secretary, pursuant to such standards as he deems appropriate, shall designate an order

of priority among such lessees for acceptance of the offer of sale of such property, which shall be sold at the appraised value as established under section 5 less applicable discounts under this act and pursuant to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary deems proper. Any preference or priority right under this paragraph shall expire unless a deposit of earnest money in an amount to be fixed by the Secretary is received by the Secretary before the expiration of 60 days after the date on which the property has been offered for sale, and thereafter the purchase shall be concluded in the same manner as provided under subsection (b) (1) of this section.

(2) Property referred to in (1) which is not under lease granted by the United States or which has not been purchased under (1) shall be made available for sale for a period of 30 days to those eligible for purchase under subsection (f) of this section and thereafter may be opened to bids from the general public and sold to the highest responsible bidder.

(e) Of the property authorized to be sold under section 2 of this act, land in the town area which has not been improved or land from which the improvements have been removed shall be sold in accordance with the following terms and conditions.

(1) Residential property in the town area shall be offered for sale to persons who are tenants of the United States in Federal housing in the town area or who would meet the requirements for eligibility to become such tenants under the most recent regulations of the Bureau of Reclamation for the assignment of persons to Federal housing in the town area. Applicants to purchase shall be placed in order of opportunity to choose pursuant to a public drawing. No application shall be accepted from the spouse of any applicant or from a person, or the spouse of such person, who owns, has owned, or has contracted to buy other residential property in the town area. Sales shall be at the appraised value as established under section 5 less applicable discounts under this act, and selection and purchase under this priority by successful applicants shall be concluded within limits of time to be established by the Secretary. Residential property which is not sold under the preceding provisions of this subsection shall be open to bids from the general public and shall be sold to the highest responsible bidder.

(2) Property which at the time of sale is zoned for other than residential use, except such as is disposed of under subsection (f) of this section and land which church or hospital improvements thereon, shall be open to bids from the general public and shall be sold to the highest responsible bidder.

(f) Of the property in the town area authorized to be sold under section 2 of this act, except that which is covered by subsections (b), (c) (3), and (e) (1) of this section, land not purchased by the holders of a priority or preference under this section shall, for 30 days following the period during which holders of a priority or preference could purchase the same, be offered for sale at the appraised value as established under section 5 less applicable discounts under this act to persons leasing property in the town area from the United States for business or commercial uses. The Secretary may, in his discretion, permit more than one lot to be included in a single purchase, but only if the property to be purchased is compact contiguous areas. If two or more applicants to purchase under this subsection desire the same property, their order of opportunity to purchase shall be determined pursuant to a public drawing. A purchase under this subsection shall render the purchaser and any spouse of such purchaser ineligible either to make an additional purchase under this subsection or to purchase the business or commercial property he is renting from the United States.

(g) Any improvement owned by the United States located on lands in the town area subject to being purchased by the holder of a priority or preference right hereunder and not purchased, after being offered for sale, within 1 year following the expiration of the period within which the priority of preference right can be exercised may be opened to bids from the general public and may be sold to the highest responsible bidder.

(h) In all public sales of property under this act to the highest responsible bidder, which shall include all sales of property to be sold in the Grand Coulee area, the Secretary shall reserve the right to reject all bids; and, in the event all bids are less than the appraised value of the property as established under section 5 or in the event no bids are received, the property shall be available for sale to the first taker from the general public at not less than aforesaid appraised value until all such property has been sold.

(i) (1) Whenever the Secretary, on presentation of adequate evidence by a prospective purchaser or purchasers under subsections (b) (1) or (b) (2) of this section, shall determine that financing of purchasers on reasonable terms cannot be arranged from other sources, he is authorized to enter into contracts with such purchasers under which the purchaser would not be required to make a downpayment of more than 10 percent of the appraised value of the property as established under section 5 less applicable discounts under this act and the remainder of the repayment obligation shall be paid on terms as to amount, repayment period, installments, and interest rate not more favorable to the purchasers than those which would be available were the purchases to be financed under mortgages eligible for insurance under subsection 223 (a) of the National Housing Act, as herein amended: *Provided*, That the Secretary may increase the interest rate by additional components equal to the premium being charged (and any periodic service charge being authorized by the Federal Housing Commissioner for property of a similar character) under subsection 223 (a) of the National Housing Act, as herein amended, at the effective date of the aforesaid contracts.

(2) Whenever the Secretary, on presentation of adequate evidence by a prospective purchaser or purchasers under subsections (c) (1), (d) (1), or (f) of this section, shall determine that financing of purchases on reasonable terms cannot be arranged from other sources, he is authorized to enter into contracts with such purchasers under which the purchaser would not be required to make a downpayment of more than 10 percent of the appraised value of the property as established under section 5, less applicable discounts under this act. The remainder of the repayment obligation shall be paid with such terms as to amount, repayment period, installments, and interest rate as the Secretary shall determine to be fair and equitable.

(3) The Secretary may assign any installment contract under this section as such times and on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate. Any such assignment made at a discount shall be defeasible if within 60 days after receipt of notification of such assignment the original obligor of the assigned contract, or his successors, assigns, or legal representative, shall cause to be received by the Secretary a tender of the amount for which such assignment was made, in which event such tender shall be accepted as full payment of the contract.

(j) Except in the case of property sold to the highest responsible bidder under this section persons purchasing property under this section or property sold to the first taker from the general public under subsection (h) of this section or by negotiated sale under subsection (c) (3) of this section, or their successors, assigns, or legal representatives, shall be entitled to a discount in the purchase price at the time they enter into a purchase contract equal to 5 percent of its appraised value as established under section 5 and, in the event of incorporation of the municipality within 4 years from the date of this act, they shall be entitled to an additional discount in the purchase price (or rebate as appropriate) equal to 10 percent of the aforesaid appraised value.

(k) In establishing rules and regulations, governing sales of property in the town area under this section, and in determining the terms and conditions of such sales other than those prescribed in this act, the Secretary shall consult with the representatives of the Coulee Dam Community as determined by him.

SEC. 4. Paragraph (3) of subsection 223 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the words "Tennessee Valley Authority" the words ", or of any housing under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior located within the town area of Coulee Dam, Wash., acquired by the United States for the construction, operation, and maintenance of Grand Coulee Dam and its appurtenant works: *Provided*, That for the purpose of the application of this title to sales by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to subsections 3 (b) (1) and 3 (b) (2) of the Coulee Dam Community Act of 1957, the selling price of the property involved shall be deemed to be the appraised value."

SEC. 5. The appraised values referred to in section 3 of this act shall be determined from time to time for a period of 5 years after the date of this act by the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency or his designee at the request of the Secretary. Thereafter, the Secretary may make such reappraisals as he deems necessary. Appraisals or reappraisals in the town area shall be made only after representatives of the Coulee Dam community, as determined by the Secretary, and of the Columbia Basin Commission, or such corresponding organization as may succeed it, have been granted an opportunity to offer advice. All appraisals and reappraisals shall be made on the basis of the properties' fair market value in the locality. In the sale of property to a tenant under subsections 3 (b) (1) and 3 (d) (1) of this act, the value of structural improvements made at such tenant's own expense shall, to the extent the appraiser or appraisers hereunder determine that such improvements actually enhance the value of the property, be deducted from what would otherwise be the appraised value of the property to be sold; and the difference shall be deemed the appraised value for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to transfer without cost out of the properties in his custody within the town and Grand Coulee areas ownership of—

(a) any federally owned municipal-type property and facilities together with rights-of-way therefor, equipment, materials, and supplies, in or serving said areas, including but not limited to the sewer, water, fire-alarm, street-lighting, electric feeder lines, and power-distribution systems, and the highways, streets, alleys, sidewalks, parks, and parking areas to the municipality or Grand Coulee if their respective areas are substantially served by such properties. Any such transfer to the municipality, however, will not be made unless the town area or a part thereof is incorporated within 4 years from the date of this act;

(b) the school buildings and grounds, athletic fields, tennis courts, and other properties currently used for educational purposes to the appropriate school district; and

(c) highway improvements in and connecting the town and Grand Coulee areas and the bridge across the Columbia River, to-

gether with the necessary rights-of-way therefore to the State of Washington.

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby made available out of the proceeds of sales made pursuant to section 3 of this act an amount not to exceed $130,000 for expenditure, directly or through the local units of government involved, for work in connection with the disposal of sewage in the immediate vicinity of the town of Coulee Dam and the city of Grand Coulee, including betterment work on the existing open drain along the north side of the highway through the city of Grand Coulee. Of this amount the Secretary shall pay not more than $100,000 to Grand Coulee and not more than $30,000 to the municipality. Except to the extent that any expenditures have been made directly as provided in the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall, upon application, pay to Grand Coulee the amount of $10,000 and to the municipality the amount of $3,000 for engineering surveys and drafting of specifications for proposed construction and/or improvement of sewage disposal and drainage facilities. After final drawings and specifications have been approved by the Secretary and the construction contracts have been entered into, the Secretary shall pay monthly to Grand Coulee and to the municipality additional amounts equivalent to earnings under their contracts as evidenced by construction progress reports certified by their contractors and by Grand Coulee and the municipality, but not to exceed a total of $90,000 for the former and $27,000 for the latter.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection 9 (a) of this act, the following amounts shall be made available, out of the proceeds of sales made pursuant to section 3 of this act, to the municipality if incorporated within 4 years from the date of this act: (1) On incorporation, $44,000; (2) at the end of 1 year after incorporation, $21,000; and (3) at the end of 2 years after incorporation, $15,000.

(c) The Secretary is hereby authorized to make available as herein provided, as power and energy reserved for the operation and maintenance of the Columbia Basin project, for users in the town area and, to other communities within 3½ miles of Grand Coulee Dam which are served by municipally owned distribution systems such amount of power and energy as, in his judgment, is needed to meet load requirements for space-heating purposes existing at the time of incorporation of the municipality. Such power and energy may be made available directly to the users or indirectly through distributing agencies, for a period of 10 years from the date of this act, and may be at such special rates as the Secretary finds to be proper but at not less than cost.

SEC. 8. Property sold under any contract deferring transfer of title pending payment of the purchase price upon recordation of such contract in the county records shall be subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Washington relating to the assessment and collection of property taxes, and to liens for such taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, if the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned property. The United States does not assume any obligation for the amounts so assessed or taxed; and any proceedings to enforce them shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States and to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under sale contracts made hereunder.

SEC. 9. (a) All proceeds from sales of property (including the assignment of contracts) authorized under section 2 of this act are hereby appropriated for expenditure by the Secretary for (1) expenses of disposal of Federal property under this act, including rebates, where appropriate, to vendees of the United States entitled to the discount provided under section 3 of this act for attainment of early incorporation of the municipality, and (2) for purposes authorized in subsection 7 (a) and (1) of subsection 7 (b) of this act: *Provided*, That amounts referred to in (2) and (3) of subsection 7 (b) of this act shall be expended only after specific appropriation has been made by Congress therefor. So much of the aforesaid proceeds as is in excess of amounts which may be necessary for expenditures referred to in this subsection shall be covered into the reclamation fund.

(b) Transfers under this act of Federal property to non-Federal ownership shall not result in any diminution of the reimbursable costs of the Columbia Basin project except to the extent that any net proceeds from sales of property under this act are credited to said project.

SEC. 10. Transfers of Federal property under this act shall not impair rights under leases granted by the United States.

SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in any contracts and conveyances such provisions as he deems proper for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, including provisions for payment for furnishing of municipal facilities and services while such facilities and services are provided by the United States and for the establishment of liens in connection therewith. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not otherwise appropriated, as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act. Wherever in this act functions, powers, and other duties are conferred upon the Secretary, such functions, powers, and duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with the municipality whereby either party might undertake to render to the other such services in aid of the performance of activities and functions of the municipality and of the Department of the Interior within or near Coulee Dam as will, in the Secretary's judgment, contribute substantially to the efficiency or economy of the operations of the Department of the Interior.

(c) The authority conferred by this act is in addition to any authority conferred by any other law and shall not be subject to the provisions of any law inconsistent herewith.

SEC. 12. This act may be cited as the "Coulee Dam Community Act of 1957."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the pending bill, S. 1574, was reported with the unanimous agreement of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill provides for the disposal of Government-owned property in the towns of Grand Coulee and Coulee Dam, which lie adjacent to the $300 million structure of Grand Coulee Dam itself.

The bill makes provision for a system of priorities on behalf of the present residents of the area in obtaining the property and, in addition, a grant totaling $210,000 is included to start the new towns on their way towards incorporation. Of this amount, $130,000 is to be set aside for sewage improvements in both towns and $80,000 is to be used for assisting Coulee Dam in financing its municipal operations for the first 3 years after incorporation.

The subject has been under discussion for a period of years and the bill conforms to legislation previously enacted by Congress in connection with the disposition of the cities of Richland, Washington, and Oak Ridge, Tenn.

It is of prime importance to the Government that these communities be allowed to function as wholesome and attractive towns suitable as residences for the personnel stationed at the dam. I further submit that the grants involved represent obligations which the Government has already assumed, regarding the sewage disposal facilities. Obviously, Government money will be saved in the long run if the management of these two towns is removed from the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. After limited allowances, provided in S. 1574, the Government will be relieved of any further financial responsibility to these two communities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

REVISION OF TRANSPORTATION OF EXPLOSIVES ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 280, S. 1491.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1491) to revise the Transportation of Explosive Act, chapter 39, title 18, of the United States Code, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to state that if the request is agreed to, it is not my purpose to ask the Senate to proceed immediately to the consideration of the bill. After a quorum call is held, I shall ask that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering the Executive Calendar.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I hope that the attachés of the Senate will take notice of the suggestion when it is made, and that they will notify absent Senators, because it is my purpose to move that the Senate go into executive session for consideration of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Fulbright	Monroney
Allott	Goldwater	Morse
Anderson	Gore	Morton
Barrett	Green	Mundt
Beall	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bricker	Hill	Potter
Bridges	Holland	Purtell
Bush	Hruska	Revercomb
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Byrd	Jackson	Russell
Capehart	Javits	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Church	Kerr	Sparkman
Clark	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Kuchel	Symington
Curtis	Magnuson	Talmadge
Dirksen	Malone	Thurmond
Douglas	Mansfield	Thye
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Yarborough
Frear	McNamara	Young

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is necessarily absent. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

REGULATION, CONTROL, AND ERADICATION OF PLANT PESTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1442) to facilitate the regulation, control, and eradication of plant pests, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—FEDERAL PLANT PEST ACT

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal Plant Pest Act."

SEC. 102. As used in this act, except where the context otherwise requires:

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States or any other person to whom authority may be delegated to act in his stead.

(b) "Properly identified employee of the Department of Agriculture" means an employee of that Department authorized to enforce the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act, and wearing a suitable badge for identification, or otherwise properly identified.

(c) "Plant pest" means any living stage of: Any insects, mites, nematodes, slugs, snails, protozoa, or other invertebrate animals, bacteria, fungi, other parasitic plants or reproductive parts thereof, viruses, or any organisms similar to or allied with any of the foregoing, or any infectious substances, which can directly or indirectly injure or cause disease or damage in any plants or parts thereof, or any processed, manufactured, or other products of plants.

(d) "Living stage" includes the egg, pupal, and larval stages as well as any other living stage.

(e) "United States" means any of the States, Territories, or Districts (including possessions and the District of Columbia) of the United States.

(f) "Interstate" means from one State, Territory, or District (including possessions and the District of Columbia) of the United States into or through any other such State, Territory, or District.

(g) "Move" means ship, deposit for transmission in the mail, otherwise offer for shipment, offer for entry, import, receive for transportation, carry, or otherwise transport, or move, or allow to be moved, by mail or otherwise.

(h) "Plant Quarantine Act" means the act of August 20, 1912 (37 Stat. 315), as from time to time amended (7 U. S. C. 151 and the following).

(i) "Mexican Border Act" means the act of January 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 40), as from time to time amended (7 U. S. C. 149).

SEC. 103. (a) No person shall knowingly move any plant pest from a foreign country into or through the United States, or interstate, or knowingly accept delivery of any plant pest moving from any foreign country into or through the United States, or interstate, unless such movement is authorized under general or specific permit from the Secretary and is made in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary may prescribe in the permit and in such regulations as he may promulgate under this section to prevent the dissemination into the United States, or interstate, of plant pests.

(b) The Secretary may refuse to issue a permit for the movement of any plant pest when, in his opinion, such movement would involve a danger of dissemination of such pests. The Secretary may permit the movement of host materials otherwise barred under the Plant Quarantine Act when they must necessarily accompany the plant pest to be moved.

SEC. 104. (a) Any letter, parcel, box, or other package containing any plant pest, whether sealed as letter-rate postal matter or not, is hereby declared to be nonmailable, and will not knowingly be conveyed in the mail or delivered from any post office or by any mail carrier, except when accompanied by a copy of a permit issued under this act.

(b) Nothing in this act shall authorize any person to open any letter or other sealed matter except in accordance with the postal laws and regulations.

(c) The prohibitions of this act shall not apply to any employee of the United States in the performance of his duties in handling mail.

SEC. 105. (a) Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Secretary may, whenever he deems it necessary as an emergency measure in order to prevent the dissemination of any plant pest new to or not theretofore known to be widely prevalent or distributed within and throughout the United States, seize, quarantine, treat, apply other remedial measures to, destroy, or otherwise dispose of, in such manner as he deems appropriate, any product or article of any character whatsoever, or means of conveyance, which is moving into or through the United States, or interstate, and which he has reason to believe is infested or infected by or contains any such plant pest, or which has moved into the United States, or interstate, and which he has reason to believe was infested or infected by or contained any such plant pest at the time of such movement; and any plant pest, product, article, or means of conveyance which is moving into or through the United States, or interstate, or has moved into the United, or interstate, in violation of this act or any regulation thereunder: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not authorize such action with respect to any product, article, means of conveyance, or plant pest subject, at the time of the proposed action, to disposal under the Plant Quarantine Act.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Secretary may order the owner of any product, article, means of conveyance, or plant pest subject to disposal under paragraph (a), or his agent, to treat, apply other remedial measures to, destroy, or make other disposal of such product, article, means of conveyance, or plant pest, without cost to the Federal Government and in such manner as the Secretary deems appropriate. The Secretary may apply to the United States district court, or to the United States court of any Territory or possession, for the judicial district in which such person resides or transacts business or in which the product, article, means of conveyance, or plant pest is found, for enforcement of such order by injunction, mandatory or otherwise. Process in any such case may be served in any judicial district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or may be found, and subpena for witnesses who are required to attend a court in any judicial district in such a case may run into any other judicial district.

(c) No product, article, means of conveyance, or plant pest shall be destroyed, exported, or returned to shipping point of origin, or ordered to be destroyed, exported, or so returned under this section, unless in the opinion of the Secretary there is no less drastic action which would be adequate to prevent the dissemination of plant pests new to or not theretofore known to be widely prevalent or distributed within and throughout the United States.

(d) The owner of any product, article, means of conveyance, or plant pest destroyed, or otherwise disposed of by the Secretary under this section, may bring an action against the United States in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, within one year after such destruction or disposal, and recover just compensation for such destruction or disposal of such product, article, means of conveyance, or plant pest (not including compensation for loss due to delays incident to determining eligibility for movement into or through the United States or for interstate movement) if the owner establishes that neither this section nor the Plant Quarantine Act authorized such destruction or disposal. Any judgment rendered in favor of such owner shall be paid out of the money in the Treasury appropriated for plant disease and pest control activities of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 106. The Secretary may promulgate such regulations requiring inspection of products and articles of any character whatsoever and means of conveyance, specified in the regulations, as a condition of their movement into or through the United States, or interstate, and imposing other conditions upon such movement, as he deems necessary to prevent the dissemination into the United States, or interstate, of plant pests, in any situation in which such regulations are not authorized under the Plant Quarantine Act.

SEC. 107. Any properly identified employee of the Department of Agriculture shall have authority to stop and inspect, without a warrant, any persons or means of conveyance moving into the United States, and any plant pests and any products and articles of any character whatsoever carried thereby, to determine whether such persons or means of conveyance are carrying any plant pest contrary to this act and whether any such means of conveyance, products, or articles are infested or infected by or contain any plant pest or are moving in violation of any regulation under this act; to stop and inspect, without a warrant, any persons or means of

conveyance moving interstate, and any plant pests and any products and articles of any character whatsoever carried thereby, upon probable cause to believe that such means of conveyance, products, or articles are infested or infected by or contain any plant pest or are moving subject to any regulation under this act, or that such persons or means of conveyance are carrying any plant pest subject to this act; and to enter, with a warrant, any premises in the United States, other than places which may be entered under section 15 of the Plant Quarantine Act, to make any inspections and seizures necessary under this act. Any judge of the United States or of a court of record of any State, Territory or possession, or a United States commissioner, may, within his respective jurisdiction, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause to believe that there are on certain premises any products, articles, means of conveyance, or plant pests regulated or subject to disposal under this act, issue warrants for the entry of such premises to make any inspections or seizures under this act. Such warrants may be executed by any authorized employee of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 108. Any person who violates section 103 of this act, or any regulation promulgated under this act, or who forges, counterfeits, or without authority from the Secretary uses, alters, or defaces any permit or other document provided for by this act or the regulations thereunder, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

SEC. 109. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 110. The act entitled "An act to provide for regulating, inspecting, cleaning, and, when necessary, disinfesting railway cars, other vehicles, and other materials entering the United States from Mexico," approved January 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 40; 7 U. S. C. 149) is hereby amended by deleting the provision that "the cleaning and disinfection of vehicles or materials necessary to accomplish the purpose shall be carried out by and under the direction of authorized inspectors of the Department of Agriculture," and by substituting therefor the following: "the cleaning and disinfection of vehicles or materials necessary to accomplish the purpose shall be carried out by or under the direction of authorized inspectors of the Department of Agriculture."

SEC. 111. The authority conferred by this act shall be in addition to authority conferred by other statutes not specifically repealed hereby. Nothing in this act shall amend or repeal any of the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act. The act entitled "An act to prohibit importation or interstate transportation of insect pests, and the use of the United States mails for that purpose," approved March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1269; 7 U. S. C. 141–144), and the act entitled "An act to prevent the entry of certain mollusks into the United States", approved September 22, 1951 (65 Stat. 335; 7 U. S. C. 441), are hereby repealed. However, all acts amended or repealed hereby shall be deemed to continue in full force and effect for the purpose of sustaining any action or other proceeding with respect to any right that accrued, liability that was incurred, or violation that occurred prior to the effective date of this act. Nothing contained in this act shall affect the validity of any findings, regulations, or other orders, permits ,or certificates, which were issued under any of the acts cited in this section prior to the effective date of this act and which are in effect on said date, but such findings, regulations, other orders, permits, and certificates shall remain in effect unless and until modified in accordance with this act.

TITLE II—ERADICATION AND CONTROL OF INSECT PESTS, PLANT DISEASES, AND NEMATODES

SEC. 201. Subsection (a) of section 102 of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, as amended (7 U. S. C. 147a), is hereby further amended by adding after the phrase "or to prevent or retard the spread of" the word "insect pests, plant diseases, and nematodes, such as imported fire ant, soybean cyst nematode, witchweed, spotted alfalfa aphid."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry took up this matter at its last meeting, and authorized me to move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1442.

I have consulted with the majority leader, the minority leader, and the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and there is no objection to the action I am now proposing.

Mr. President, in that connection I ask unanimous consent that a short explanation of the amendments added by the House of Representatives be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

SHORT EXPLANATION OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 1442

The House amendment to S. 1442 is in the nature of a substitute.

Title II of the House amendment is identical to the bill as passed by the Senate, except that the spotted alfalfa aphid has been added to the enumerated pests covered by section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944. The House report states that the spotted alfalfa aphid first appeared in this country in 1954 and is extremely destructive of growing alfalfa.

No part of title I of the House amendment was contained in the Senate bill. Title I, to be cited as the Federal Plant Pest Act would prohibit the importation, interstate movement, or mailing, of plant pests, except as authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture. The importation and interstate movement of injurious insects and of plants and plant products which may carry insect pests or plant diseases, and the interstate movement of any materials which may carry insect pests or plant diseases are regulated by existing law, but this authority does not now extend to plant diseases as such, disease-bearing organisms, mites, nematodes, protozoa, bacteria, fungi, parasitic plants and viruses injurious to plants or plant products. All of these, as well as certain other organisms and substances, would be included in the definition plant pest and covered by title I.

Title I would also (1) authorize emergency measures, such as seizure and destruction of products, articles and conveyances which may disseminate new or localized plant pests, (2) provide compensation for property destroyed or disposed of under certain circumstances, and (3) authorize the issuance of regulations controlling the inspection and movement of articles and conveyances as necessary to prevent the dissemination of plant pests in situations not covered by the Plant Quarantine Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether this measure is the same as the one he discussed with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] before he left the Chamber.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the Senator from California is agreeable to the action the Senator from Louisiana now proposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1442.

The motion was agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there are present in the Chamber at this time some representatives of the parliamentary bodies of five different NATO countries—Belgium, Germany, Iceland, Norway, and the United Kingdom. I take pleasure in presenting to the Senate these distinguished gentlemen, as follows:

Mr. Georges J. N. Dejardin, of Liege, Belgium, a Member of the Chamber of Representatives.

Mr. Siegfried Moerchel, of Salzgitter-Lebenstedt, Germany, a Deputy Member of the Bundestag.

Mr. Petur Petursson, of Reykjavik, Iceland, a Member of Parliament.

Mr. Arnfinn S. Roald, of Vigra, Norway, a Deputy Member of the Storting.

Lt. Comd. L. C. Maydon, of Wells, England, a Member of Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Thomas Peart, of Workington, England, a Member of Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Mr. President, I desire to state that we are delighted to have these gentlemen visit our country. It is their plan to be in the United States for approximately 30 days, during which they will tour throughout the country and will observe its functioning. We are happy to have them in the Senate on this occasion.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The Chair expresses the good wishes of the Senate to these distinguished visitors who are observing our parliamentary procedure.

ACTUAL LIVING STANDARDS OF MANY UNION LEADERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recent headlines about lavish spending and abuse of union funds by certain labor officials have created in the public mind lurid impressions which must reflect adversely on the leaders of all labor unions. Such an adverse reflection would be an unfortunate—even if unavoidable—consequence of the disclosures concerning the management of a few unions. Yet it seems highly inaccurate and unfair, so far as the great majority of labor's leaders are concerned.

The Wall Street Journal for May 7, 1957, carried a front-page review of the compensation and expense allowances paid to a cross section of officials of major national labor organizations. The Wall Street Journal concludes that "most live conservatively." "While far from lavish livers for the most part,"

union leaders do not believe that they should put on a studied "poor front" to dramatize their representation of working men and women, the article states; and it explains that "caught in the crossfire of hostile criticism that the charges against Mr. Beck have sparked are many unions which insist on—and get—strict accounting of spending by officials, and a host of other labor leaders who have nothing but contempt for Mr. Beck's mode of living."

Mr. President, because the national headquarters of the International Woodworkers of America is located in Portland, Oreg., near the vast forests of the Pacific Northwest, where many thousands of its members work, I was particularly interested in the references in the Wall Street Journal to Mr. Albert F. Hartung, the president of that union:

When A. F. "Al" Hartung, president of the International Woodworkers of America, picks up a dinner tab for guests, for example—

Says the Wall Street Journal—

he invariably scrawls across his union voucher the names of the people he's buying for.

It may be a fair question, Mr. President, how many corporation presidents follow this practice. I should like to read the remainder of the Wall Street Journal's references to Mr. Hartung, of the Woodworkers Union:

He draws a $9,100 a year salary and $8 a day on trips "for meals, pressing my suits, and buying papers."

Says the slow-talking, soft-toned Mr. Hartung of his personal spending: "By the time we pay our rent, put one girl through college, and Uncle Sam takes his slice, I don't know whether we live above my salary or below it, but we use it up and don't squander it."

In addition to the 2-bedroom apartment he rents in Portland ("It's not a dump," observes Mr. Hartung, "but it's not elaborate."), the Woodworkers' top man has a "little old farm" of his own on about 5 acres along the Tualatin River near Portland. He says he and his wife are trying to fix it up as a summer place.

Mr. President, I have singled out, from the Wall Street Journal article, these references to Al Hartung because I know him well, personally, and because they square exactly with what I have known about him. But I am hopeful that Al Hartung's modest scale of living and his careful accounting for the union funds expended in his limited expense account represent the rule, rather than the exception, in the leadership and management of labor unions. I think it is particularly significant that confirmation for this view should come from the Wall Street Journal, which will never be accused of being a special apologist or mouthpiece for America's organized labor and its leaders. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article from the Wall Street Journal of May 7, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

LABOR LEADERS: UNLIKE BECK, MOST LIVE CONSERVATIVELY, BUT THEY SHUN POOR FRONT—STEELWORKER MCDONALD PAYS A MORTGAGE—MR. REUTHER OBJECTS TO SALARY BOOST—CADILLACS AND MIAMI HOTELS

David John McDonald, urbane, silver-haired president of the 1,250,000-member United Steelworkers of America, resides in a mortgaged $30,000 seven-room house in Mount Lebanon Township, a pleasant, nicely kept community a few miles south of Pittsburgh, Pa.

"We live quite simply," says the $50,000-a-year labor leader. "I drive a Pontiac convertible and have no chauffeur, and my wife has no servants. A cleaning lady comes in once in a while but my wife does the cooking and the housekeeping, and my own boy (Dave, Jr., 17) or guys in the neighborhood cut the grass."

There's no real austerity in Mr. McDonald's life—and he doesn't try to convey the impression that there is. "I'll guarantee you," he says, "that when I'm out of town, I'm going to live the best I can." And at home, he adds, "I am not going to live in a slum with an outside toilet."

AN ECONOMIC PAR

In many ways, Mr. McDonald's philosophy about his mode of living typifies views held by a good many other top labor leaders. While far from lavish livers for the most part, they're not willing to put up a "poor front" simply because they represent a large group of working people. Indeed, there's solid conviction among some that they should live, dress, and travel on an economic par with their corporate counterparts.

The economic fortunes of union leaders are of more than casual interest today. Disclosure by Senate investigators of the high living on union-provided funds of teamsters' boss, Dave Beck, has touched off demands by officials—and rank-and-file union members as well—for closer accounting of all union money. Yesterday, in elaborating on its corruption charges against the teamsters union, the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee made Mr. Beck's conduct the target of most of its accusations. And tomorrow, Mr. Beck again will be called before the Senate's Special Investigating Committee for questioning about his alleged misuse of union funds.

Caught in the crossfire of hostile criticism that the charges against Mr. Beck have sparked are many unions which insist on—and get—strict accounting of spending by officials, and a host of other labor leaders who have nothing but contempt for Mr. Beck's mode of living.

Over the past quarter of a century, of course, the economic power of unions has grown mightily. Less clearly defined perhaps, but nonetheless significant, is the growing affluence of the men who now occupy the top labor positions.

Wall Street Journal reporters talked with more than a dozen chief executives of the Nation's large international unions, the men around these union leaders and management people who deal with them. In interviews, conducted in the offices and homes of labor leaders, the newsmen found the union chiefs willing to talk quite frankly about their salaries, their expense accounts, their way of living and their spending attitudes.

SALARIES, PLUS EXPENSES

Salaries of international union leaders interviewed range from a low of $6,750 (John Clark, president of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers) to a high of $50,000 a year for Mr. McDonald and John L. Lewis, the 77-year-old, grumpy-looking chief of the United Mine Workers. Dave Beck's salary is listed as $50,000 a year, too.

These salaries, of course, are supplemented by liberal expense accounts, with most leaders—by choice or by requirement—giving detailed accounting of where the money goes. When A. F. "Al" Hartung, president of the International Woodworkers of America, picks up a dinner tab for guests, for example, he invariably scrawls across his union voucher the names of the people he's buying for.

Says Lee Minton, head of the Glass Bottle Blowers Association of the United States and Canada: "My boys tell me that they don't care what it costs—within reason, of course—for me to be able to negotiate with management as an equal. They want me to be well dressed and have money in my pocket."

Generally, the homes and offices of these labor chiefs reflect fairly closely their salaries and union's status. In some cases, the price of the place a union chief lives in is below his annual salary. L. S. "Buck" Buckmaster, president of the AFL-CIO United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, for example, still lives in the neat, yellow, clapboard, brown shingled house in suburban Akron that he bought in 1924 for $6,200.

"I'll bet I've paid three times that price on that cussed house," jovially confides the 62-year-old U. R. W. chief. "I got behind in payments during the depression, made my last payment 2 years ago." The house, he figures, is now worth about $12,000. Mr. Buckmaster earns $15,000 a year as head of the 170,000-member U. R. W.

THE SOCIAL LIFE

Socially, many of these labor leaders shun country clubs and similar social organizations. Aside from the obvious reason of wanting to avoid any appearance of social climbing, many spend much of their time away from home on union business and thus form few local social ties.

"With all the traveling I do," comments Mr. Minton, "my wife figures that out of the last 18 years I've spent about 8 with her and the kids."

Perhaps the stanchest advocate of quiet, simple living among labor leaders is fiery Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, a unionist who almost belligerently practices what he preaches.

In typical, dramatic fashion, he successfully killed a move by UAW members 4 years ago to raise his salary from the then $11,250 a year to $50,000.

"I felt then, and still feel," he declares, "that it would be a mistake to allow too great a gap to develop between the wages of the rank-and-file members and those of the people who are expected to lead them. I don't criticize others who feel differently, but that's my attitude."

AUSTERITY ON $22,000

Mr. Reuther did accept two salary boosts since that time and now makes $22,000 a year. In view of his salary, his mode of living seems austere. The popular report that Mr. Reuther squeezes oranges in his hotel room while out of town to save on breakfast costs is not true, however. Good-naturedly, the UAW chief explains that he had a small refrigerator in his hotel room in Miami early this year when he attended a union session there with his family. He bought fruit at a nearby grocery, he says, and kept it in the refrigerator. "We didn't have a squeezer," he relates. "We just ate the oranges."

In addition to his salary, Mr. Reuther is allowed transportation expenses and $13 a day for meals and incidentals, including tips, while he's on union missions. He's permitted to have a suite in which to conduct out-of-town business, but he's been known to call a hotel manager and insist on being moved after being ushered into something he considered too ostentatious.

Mr. Reuther is almost painfully conscientious about footing the additional bills when he is accompanied on one of his family trips by his wife, May—a slender, attractive woman who shares the red hair and youthful appearance of her 49-year-old husband—or their two young daughters.

"Actually, that's where a lot of his own salary goes," confides a longtime friend. "May doesn't go with him much, compared

with all the traveling he does, but she does make quite a few trips and the costs mount."

A BODYGUARD DRIVER

There are few emoluments added to Mr. Reuther's pay when he's at home. The union does provide him with a rented, medium-priced car and a bodyguard driver, but the UAW does not reward him with a home or a downtown suit for entertainment purposes. Mr. Reuther, in fact, still pays his own union dues which went up—at his own recommendation—at the last convention to $3 a month from $2.50.

The UAW leader's home, the third he has ever owned, is a modest, two-story frame house in a Detroit suburb about 45 minutes' drive from his office at Solidarity House. Purchased originally in 1951 as a summer cottage for about $10,000, it since has been expanded and made into a substantial all-year dwelling. Except for a high, sturdy fence around the property and bullet-proof glass in the house's windows, all of the improvements have been paid for by Mr. Reuther. As befits a man who once earned his living as a toolmaker, the Auto Workers' chief has done some of the work himself.

The house stands on 4 acres of ground ("At least 1 acre is under water," laughs Mr. Reuther) in a hilly, heavily wooded area. The labor chief, who designed the house himself, describes it a combination of modern, Japanese, and Swiss chalet architecture." Across the property runs a stream perhaps 15 to 20 feet across, which almost totally surrounds the house.

The elaborate security measures that the UAW provides for Mr. Reuther are a result, of course, of the attack on him in 1948 by a still-undiscovered assailant who fired a shotgun blast through his kitchen window and shattered his right arm. His right hand and arm still are partially disabled.

A few years ago the union bought for Mr. Reuther's use a huge limousine fitted with bullet-proof glass and steel-plated body. But an official recalls, "Walter couldn't stand it, and after about 6 months he refused to ride in it." The Reuthers' family car, appropriately enough, is an "economy" model, an American Motors Corp. Rambler.

SUITS AT WHOLESALE

His own appearance is of no great concern to Mr. Reuther, but he dresses well in conservative but fashionably cut suits in the $100 range. Actually, he doesn't pay that price. Through his friend Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Mr. Reuther buys them at wholesale prices, usually 3 or 4 at a time. His normal practice is to wear the batch until they're ready to discard, generally in 2 or 3 years.

Quite different from Mr. Reuther in his personal economic philosophy and spending habits is the Steelworkers' McDonald. Ranking among the higher-paid union leaders, Mr. McDonald maintains, nonetheless, that his pay is not making him rich.

"I own no stock options, and I have no money," says the steelworkers' boss. "I still have a mortgage and a pretty healthy one. There's no pension plan for my wife, and if I were to die tomorrow, Rosemary (his wife) would have to go to work."

Mr. McDonald hasn't been in the $50,000-a-year category for long. His salary was boosted to that from $40,000 last September. As secretary-treasurer of the union, Mr. McDonald made $15,000 a year until shortly before Philip Murray's death in 1952.

Mr. McDonald has an expense account, and although he doesn't use the word "unlimited" in describing it, the account has no stated limit on it, being governed by his own judgment of what is necessary. But expenses must be rigidly accounted for on a semi-monthly basis, he says:

The steelworkers' chief admits to a fondness for the better things in life. On out-of-town trips, he stays at the finest hotels, frequents the best restaurants, and indulges in one of his favorite pastimes—attending the theater. Unlike most other union bosses, he belongs to several clubs, including the South Hills Country Club, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Elks, Moose, and the Variety Club. Occasionally, in late afternoons on his way home, he drops into Pittsburgh's Sherwyn Hotel just around the corner from union headquarters for a couple of gentlemanly bourbons with water.

When the occasion demands it, Mr. McDonald dons a conservative business suit. But at more leisurely times, he favors sports outfits, tweeds, and bow ties. Although he's seldom seen without his pipe in public appearances, he's partial at times to a cigar—a good one, to be sure.

FOR MEANY: $35,000

As president of the AFL-CIO, George Meany receives a salary of $35,000 a year, the same pay he received as head of the AFL. In addition, he's allowed $12.50 a day in expense funds for meals, but this is raised to $15 whenever he's at high expense places. "Like everyone else," says an aid, "he turns in an expense account."

Away from home, Mr. Meany lives well but his off hours are spent in far from lavish pursuits. He enjoys himself, for example, at a place like Miami Beach—and makes no apologies for it. A gin rummy fan, he spent 8 straight hours playing the game in the sun at Miami last January while other union officials were hotly debating the Teamsters' refusal to testify before Senate investigators.

Mr. Meany, who works in Washington, lives in a suburban Maryland home in about the $30,000 class, across the road from Burning Tree Country Club, President Eisenhower's home golf course.

An associate describes Mr. Meany as conservative in his personal spending. "He's not cheap," hastily adds the confidant, "but he doesn't wave the dough around."

In explaining Mr. Meany's ways, an aid tells of a day recently when the chief suddenly disappeared. It developed the former head of the plumbers union, Mr. Meany, was at his home—fixing up some plumbing.

NEEDED: A PAINT JOB

Among the higher-paid union leaders is John L. Lewis. A widower, Mr. Lewis lives alone in large white frame house in Alexandria, Va., which seems to be in need of a coat of paint.

Mr. Lewis drives himself to work in Washington and home again in a Cadillac. At his beck and call he also has a union-provided Cadillac limousine for union business. While the shaggy-haired union chief used to be something of a lion of the embassy parties, he seldom steps out for an evening now. His principal relaxation nowadays, he says, is reading and, in warm weather, "following the shade around."

On the other end of the pay scale for union leaders is John Clark, 69, president of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, headquartered in Denver. This union, booted from the CIO in 1950 on charges that the leadership followed the Communist line, has a membership variously estimated between 60,000 and 100,000.

As head of the union, Mr. Clerk earns a salary of $6,750 a year. Sitting in a swivel chair in his large but far from lavishly furnished office in the Tabor Building in Denver, Mr. Clark says he receives $14 a day for expenses while on the road and $3 daily for incidentals while in Denver.

SAVINGS AND SPECULATING

Mr. and Mrs. Clark live in a $100-a-month, 3-room apartment in Englewood, a middle-class Denver suburb. A union member since 1908, Mr. Clark does not smoke and "only very rarely" takes a cocktail. His only investments, he says, are in United States Savings Bonds. "When I have a little money ahead," he says, "I put it in bonds."

O. A. (Jack) Knight, president of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, another Denver-headquartered union, leans to more speculative investment fare; sometimes, he says, he makes "a little" and sometimes he loses on ventures with uranium stock investments or on oil leases. On a yearly salary of $13,500, plus $5 a day for incidental expenses, Mr. Knight and his wife live quietly in a $33,000 three-bedroom ranch house in Denver.

Mr. Knight concedes that his house, bought in 1949 when the union moved its headquarters to Denver, was a little over the mean for his income but explains that he had built up savings which paid for a "substantial" part of it. He says he still owes "a few thousand" on the mortgage.

A scotch-and-soda man, Mr. Knight often keeps a bottle of bourbon on hand during his out-of-town excursions for callers with bourbon tastes. But he says he never bills the union for the bottled spirits, paying for it instead out of his salary.

An Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers spokesman, noting that Mr. Knight receives the same expense allowance as other lower ranked officers and staff members, expresses the union philosophy thusly:

"The general Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers attitude is that we don't claim to have taken a vow of poverty, but we just don't want any fat-catting or any slack practices that permit expense spending to be abused."

TIGHT WITH MONEY

A union leader considered tight with his money is 59-year-old Mr. Hartung of the 130,000-member Woodworkers Union, headquartered in Portland, Oreg. He draws a $9,100 a year salary and $8 a day on trips "for meals, pressing my suits and buying papers."

Says the slow-talking soft-toned Mr. Hartung of his personal spending: "By the time we pay our rent, put one girl through college and Uncle Sam takes his slice, I don't know whether we live above my salary or below it, but we use it up and don't squander it."

In addition to the 2-bedroom apartment he rents in Portland ("It's not a dump," observes Mr. Hartung, "but it's not elaborate."), the Woodworkers' top man has "a little old farm" of his own on about 5 acres along the Tualatin River near Portland. He says he and his wife are trying to fix it up as a summer place.

Earl Heaton, president of the Allied Industrial Workers of America, in Los Angeles, describes the society in which he moves as "working class," though he earns $15,000 a year and lives in a house in the $45,000 class (with a mortgage). His next-door neighbors in Los Angeles are a lawyer and a building contractor.

Mr. Heaton says he doesn't believe in "living up" to his salary if by that is meant spending it all, or borrowing to spend, to enhance his prestige. "I believe in saving something," says he. "You never know when you might need it."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on April 22, 1957, I had occasion to discuss at the Portland Central Labor Council some of the issues which recently have received extensive public attention as a result of the hearings of the special committee on alleged racketeering in the labor-management field. On this occasion, I expressed my views about the fundamental integrity and idealism of most of organized labor and its leaders, and about the relative modesty of their salaries and expenditures, which are borne out by some of the May 7 conclusions of the Wall Street Journal.

I also suggested a checklist of six standards for the internal administration of union affairs, which must be assured and protected either by union constitutions and by-laws and by the vigilance of rank and file members, or, in some instances, by legislation. These standards refer to such matters as internal union democracy, the administration of different kinds of funds handled by union officials, and the assurance of nondiscriminatory membership rules which will make participation in unionized employment open to anyone who has the skills, irrespective of his race, creed, religion, or nationality.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks at the Portland Labor Temple, on April 22, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR NEUBERGER TO PORTLAND CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, APRIL 22, 1957

The public scrutiny which organized labor is undergoing today confronts it with undeniable dangers to future effectiveness on behalf of working men and women—but also with an opportunity for self-examination and for strengthening its position with its members and with the public.

For what is being scrutinized today is labor unionism in a new role, under new conditions of industrial organization—conditions which are very different from those of a generation ago, when labor relations were last a central object of public attention and of public policy.

In the early decades of the century, from the years around the first World War through the depression years of the thirties, I believe both the public and the labor movement itself shared the image of unionism as the struggle for organization, for recognition of working men's right to confront the life-and-death economic power of management over each of them with a comparable economic power of workers bargaining collectively for decent wages, hours, and working conditions. These were the years when organization was itself the first objective of trade unions and their leaders, when the very right to organize was the principle at issue in strikes and in legislative controversies, when union membership itself endangered a man's job, or more.

Labor leadership in those years was not all good, or all bad, any more than it is today—or than business leadership has been. But at its best, it left the Nation a memory of dedicated men, who sacrificed personal gain or comfort to the cause of all working men and women—and many of whom became martyrs in that cause.

In time, the Wagner Act and other liberal legislation of the Roosevelt years gave national recognition both to the principle of labor organization and to minimum standards of wages, hours, safety and other working conditions, at least so far as interstate commerce is concerned. That still leaves much to be accomplished, as we know. But in one major industry after another, collective bargaining and union security agreements of one form or another have become fully established. And with that, the role of unions has changed. In such industries, with the coming of the union shop, of long-term contracts, of union insurance programs and pension and welfare funds, labor leadership has new responsibilities in representing its members.

You and I know that by and large, today's labor leaders have accepted these new responsibilities with just as much understanding and integrity as their counterparts in management have shown in adapting to the new era in industrial relations. But some few of these have obviously fallen short, as is inevitable in any human activity. Their shortcomings, when faced with the possession of great power and with control over great wealth, have for the first time spotlighted for the public at large the recent growth of that power and of the funds entrusted to them.

Inevitably, the revelations of reckless handling of union funds, of instances where private dealings between labor officials and management have been substituted for collective bargaining, will result in an outcry for legislative reform. "There ought to be a law" is a common American reaction to any social problem. In this instance, the outcry is likely to include a proportion of crocodile tears. The demand for protection of the rank and file against leaders unworthy of their trust may have some substance in sound policy, but it also will be joined by those whose first interest is not that of the rank and file union member. No doubt an impetus has been furnished, for example, for the drive for State "right to work" laws directed against union-security agreements.

The response of the labor movement itself to the challenge of these demands for reform may largely determine whether or not there will be legislation enacted which will hamstring the legitimate and necessary functions of unions on behalf of their members. I am glad to be able to say that the top leadership of American labor has indicated firmly and unequivocally its intention to rid its organizations of any and all corruption and abuses, that can only result in giving all unions a black eye. Some legislation may be necessary, quite apart from the current investigations—for instance, in the field of pension and welfare funds. The fate of other possible legislation more restrictive in character may depend on the actions of the unions themselves and their effectiveness in telling their own story to the public.

I would like to suggest a checklist of six standards or objectives for labor unions which either deserve legislative protection, or which must be assured and protected by action within unions themselves if legislative and governmental controls are to be avoided. They are these:

1. Internal union democracy: Local officers should be elected at least annually by secret ballot of the membership, announced sufficiently long in advance to permit the members to consider available candidates for leadership. Perhaps nominating committees might make a practice of placing more nominees before the membership than there are offices to be filled, so as to encourage some rotation.

I also believe that national officers should be chosen under similar conditions at national conventions of elected local delegates, held not less often than every 2 years, and that the election of these national officers might well be submitted to a membership referendum throughout the locals.

2. Fair procedures for members' appeals: Many large unions already have appeal boards to hear and determine a controversy between a union member and his union or one of its officials. A sense of real confidence that such disputes will be fairly heard and adjudicated, without risk of retribution against the complaining member, is an essential element in any democratic association, and unions are no exception.

Similarly, anyone who may espouse a minority point of view in a union or at a meeting must be confident of his right to do so without fear of intimidation blacklisting, job discrimination or coercion of any kind.

3. Membership open to anyone qualified by skill: This aspect of union democracy is an indivisible Siamese twin to the union shop and other union security arrangements which limit job openings to union members. Unions cannot hope to maintain their hard-earned record of idealism and dedication to democratic values, if they establish discriminatory exclusions from membership, and thus from work opportunities, on the basis of race, religion, nationality or other arbitrary factors unrelated to skill. Unions have not always refrained from racial discrimination. This must be corrected.

4. Protection of general union funds: Members must be entitled to periodic full and correct information about the disposition of their union dues and to a voice in major decisions on their expenditure. Union financial accounts should be checked by independent outside audits at least once a year, by reliable accounting firms. Many unions today follow as a matter of course these elementary practices of responsible fiscal management; but those officials which have failed to do so have created a damaging image of financial irresponsibility for all unions. Labor's leadership must nail down firmly in the public mind its recognition that it acts as trustees, not as owners, of union members' dues.

5. Protection of welfare and pension funds: I would support legislation in the Congress to provide for the registration of welfare and pension funds, and for full disclosure of all relevant information about their administration, so as to place them under protective provisions similar to those for insurance policyholders and for investors under the SEC. Such legislation has been proposed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois as a result of extensive hearings on welfare and pension funds held in the 84th Congress by a committee under his chairmanship. I understand that national labor leaders favor such legislation, but that employers have been reluctant to endorse it.

General dues must be available to unions to finance their operations and to give them strength for collective bargaining, but these welfare funds are wholly trust funds in nature and can be subjected to special safeguards without weakening union functions.

6. Labor political-education funds: As long as unions receive dues from all workers in a plant or an industry under union-security arrangements, dues cannot fairly be used in political campaigns with which some union members might not agree. However, the use of voluntary funds collected among union members is quite different and is entirely proper for political purposes. Let me add here that candidates supported in part by these voluntary funds are almost always outspent overwhelmingly by opponents who are backed by the owners and managers of big business and industry.

However, I believe that candidates should not enter high office obligated either to business or to labor. That is why I am sponsoring legislation to put into effect a proposal made half a century ago by President Theodore Roosevelt, to have the Government underwrite essential costs of political campaigns—in order to liberate candidates from unwise private commitments, and to assure the public access on more nearly equal terms to the views, programs, and personalities of all parties and candidates. And I have challenged those who most loudly criticize labor political action to join me in passing this reform legislation.

Finally, I would like to add to the elements of union democracy the suggestion that business agents and other union officials should be bona fide members of the union, who have worked at the craft or in the industry which the union represents. They should never be imposed on the local union by dictation from above. This applies to the whole practice of locals being in trusteeship or receivership for any length of time, and thus under the direction of national or international representatives. Basically, some of the evils now being revealed reflect the attitude that labor is a commodity to be managed and traded, rather

than the original union philosophy of human interests to be represented. As long as unions represent this true, original philosophy, they will be able to continue to claim the support of the public for their work and for their rights.

I want to see a labor movement which is law abiding, but I do not want the law used to break or shackle the labor movement. Many Americans of today may forget what occurred in our country during the 1920's, when the trade-union movement was manacled and hampered.

In this period, total labor membership fell from 5 million in 1920 to 3,400,000 in 1929. In the cotton mills of Gastonia, in 1929, grown men received $9 for a full workweek of 66 hours. Girls 14 years old stood on their feet 11 hours a day, 6 days a week, operating heavy spinning frames; they were paid $4.95 per week.

This took place in America when people were not protected by a labor movement. This took place when an illiterate immigrant laborer or some lone woman, with hungry children to support, had to bargain alone for his or her hire.

The trade-union movement ameliorated such injustice It brought about what we now regard as the American standard of living. The trade-union movement became strong because it had martyrs within its own ranks and beyond its membership lists. It had men like Andrew Furuseth, the gaunt Norseman who fought for the men who worked on the ships and the waterfront. When they came to arrest him for violating a no-strike law, Andy looked at his captors in contempt and said:

"You can put me in jail, but you cannot give me narrower quarters than as a seaman I have always had. You cannot give me coarser food than I have always eaten. You cannot make me lonelier than I have always been."

And there were men, too, like Senator George William Norris, for whom the great anti-injunction law is named, and who defied a lynch mob waiting for him with tar and feathers because he dared to be ahead of his time. Norris said, "No man can stick his legs under the tables of the idle rich every night, and be fit the next day to sit in judgment on those who toil."

That is why those who use the labor movement for personal wealth and aggrandizement have betrayed one of our Nation's richest legacies—the legacy of long-dead heroes and heroines. The labor movement has been nurtured by the blood of men and women who did not flinch at the ultimate in personal sacrifice. Against such a heritage, there is no place for corruption, slot machines, plush tropical resorts, open expense accounts and strikes that are conducted not to win better wages for men who labor but to decide who shall control the loot from punchboards or pinball machines.

I want to offer one bit of advice. If any members or leaders of labor have been detected in conduct against the public welfare, nothing will be served by denouncing those who did the detecting—whether they be in the press or in Government. Behavior inimical to the general good cannot be countenanced. Citizens who ferret out such behavior merit approval and not condemnation. After all, many in the ranks of labor have applauded—and rightly so—when Congressional investigators like Thomas J. Walsh and George Norris apprehended malefactors in the ranks of business. Labor cannot both hold with the hounds and run with the hare on this issue. A labor leader who pilfers or embezzles the funds of his dues-payers is quite as legitimate a target for investigation as any banker or corporate head who cannot distinguish between other people's money and his own.

Some of the revelations about reckless handling of dues-payers' funds in the labor movement are disturbing. Yet there is no more reason to doubt the integrity of the labor movement as a whole because of these disclosures than there is to question the validity of free enterprise, because some executives of one of the Nation's greatest business corporations were recently shown to have hired "call girls" in an effort to push merchandise more successfully. The chairman of a powerful Congressional committee went to jail some years back, but this certainly does not impugn the honesty of all Congressmen. It is always dangerous—and unfair—to reason from the particular to the general.

On the other hand, I have heard some labor officials claim, in defense of their conduct, that they have done nothing worse than what many leaders of industry have gotten away with for years. To me, that is a poor excuse. As one American, I expect higher ideals and ethics of leaders of the labor movement than the purely financial motives of business corporations and monopolies. The dedicated founders and heroes of the history of unionism would not have approved of labor being involved in gambling rackets, or of plush "open-end" expense accounts for unlimited vacations at Las Vegas and Palm Springs.

In Oregon I have visited the homes of a good many officials of organized labor. These are modest homes. They are the homes of men who do not earn so-called "big money." Whatever may be true of labor indiscretions elsewhere in the land, it is my firm opinion that the great majority of Oregon labor officials are law-abiding, ethical, honest, and the recipients of only modest salaries. Indeed, I should like to see the Oregon State Federation of Labor sponsor an audit of the pay of every labor official in this State, and then announce the result for all the world to see. I am certain that the salaries and expense accounts of most trade-union officials would be relatively small, particularly when compared with the incomes received in Oregon by many of the great captains of business and industry—if such a comparison is at all valid.

I might add that if labor statesmanship acts swiftly and decisively to reassure the public, including its rank and file members, that it retains its idealism, its integrity, its devotion to democratic values and to the welfare of working people, it need not long remain on the defensive because of the present disclosures that all has not been perfect within every union. I have suggested that labor might challenge its critics to compare the salaries and emoluments of its leaders with those paid a representative cross-section of American business and industrial managers—not to mention their income from shareholdings. I would go further and suggest that a labor movement which could show that its own house is in order might well ask for an investigation of corporate expense accounts.

At least, when union officials enjoy palatial homes, luxurious limousines, extensive vacations at plush resorts, or make valuable presents to their friends, from union funds, it is generally recognized as an exceptional situation requiring correction. That fact alone speaks for itself. For which among these identical situations is not a commonplace in the management of corporate wealth in the Nation—in the form of expense accounts for executive travel, entertainment allowances, public relations expenditures—all of which are paid half by the stockholders, and half by the Treasury, in the form of corporate tax deductions?

No one has a right to apply double-standards of morality in a free and democratic society. All of us are to be judged by the same standards. The conduct of every man and woman must be tested with the same litmus paper, by the identical yardstick.

I doubt if that has occurred in the recent investigations and probes which have centered in Portland, and in the public discussion of these events. Let me explain what I mean.

I remember the prolonged uproar because a Sheriff of Multnomah County had given a gun permit to an official of the Teamsters Union in the State. It was said this was wrong because the teamster leader had sustained a conviction in his youth. Yet there was comparative silence over the fact that the then mayor of Portland had appointed this same leader of the Teamsters Union to be 1 of 5 citizens charged with spending over $8 million of taxpayers' money for an exposition center. Why one standard for the then sheriff and another for the then mayor?

I have read Republican speeches pointing out with horror that DICK NEUBERGER, for example, was endorsed by the Teamsters Union when he ran for the Senate. I was endorsed by the entire united labor movement, which included the teamsters, and I make no apology for that fact. I have the welfare of average people at heart and so does my wife, Maurine. We would expect to receive the endorsement of labor. But I do not understand how it can be bad in Republican speeches for DICK NEUBERGER to be endorsed by the teamsters, but something which is not mentioned in polite society that, for example, Dave Beck stood on the steps of the White House last October 18 to proclaim that he was bolting the rest of the labor movement so he could support Dwight Eisenhower enthusiastically for reelection—let alone teamster support of such stalwart local Republicans as Rudie Wilhelm, Shirley Field, and Stanley Earl.

And what of legalized dog races and the fuss over pinball machines? My wife and I have consistently opposed legalized gambling all during our public careers, because we think gambling is not only basically contrary to morals but because it drains the wage-earner's pocket, to no good purpose. It neither hews wood not draws water. It feeds no children, it clothes no people.

Morals are morals, and ethics are ethics. They are indivisible. Can the State of Oregon legitimize the vast pageantry of parimutuel racing—with all its millions of dollars in wagering—and thus successfully control pinball gambling? Perhaps it can be done. But there has been constant trouble over this double standard for many years. This city did not even allow an honest and upright mayor to continue in office, for it was charged that she had shut up the town too tight. Dorothy McCullough Lee enforced the law because she recognized that double standards were impossible, that once law and order broke down there was no end to the difficulties and trouble ahead. Yet she was ridiculed out of office as "Dotty-Do-Good," although Portland would have been better served—and better governed—had she stayed. It is my opinion that the prevailing anomaly of our approach to gambling cannot be disregarded as a factor in this whole unfortunate situation.

The basic fact remains that, under the laws of the State of Oregon, it is legal for a working mother with small children to take her whole paycheck and wager it on the dog races in the heart of the city of Portland—with floodlights on, bands playing, and policemen standing around to protect the proceedings. But if this mother stops on the way home and bets the 10 cents left in her purse on a pinball machine in a grocery store, she and the proprietor of the grocery store are violators of the law.

I have been opposed to both the races and the pinballs, but by what token is one right and the other wrong?

As members of the Oregon Legislature, both Mrs. Neuberger and I opposed continuation of parimutuel gambling. We felt

it was highly inconsistent for the State itself to license a vast betting orgy at stadiums and grandstands, while outlawing wagers of far smaller amounts on pinballs and other devices. Maurine and I joined with leaders of the Oregan Council of Churches in pointing out that parimutuels were an invitation to all kinds of illegal gambling to trek into an area and to take advantage of the gambling fever thus created.

Our efforts to eliminate the parimutuels were always defeated in the legislature, because the sponsors of the races had cleverly made all county fairs the beneficiary of a certain portion of racing receipts. This converted fair boards into virtual lobbyists for the races. But it did not change the moral and ethical basis of our argument, any more than legalized prostitution might be justified if a share of the income were diverted, for example, to hospitals.

No longer are Mrs. Neuberger and I members of the legislature, and the problem of the dog and horse races is outside our jurisdiction. Yet we still are struck by the absurdity of legalizing nearly $15 million worth of wagers on dog races in the Portland area, while ardent supporters of these races carry on a flaming antigambling crusade against pinballs and punchboards. The whole irony is worthy of Anatole France's famous satire entitled "Penguin Island," in which a flock of penguins occasionally behaves as foolishly and paradoxically as human beings.

Virgil W. Peterson, director of the Chicago Crime Commission, has pointed out that parimutuel gambling, while theoretically honest, is often an invitation to a hoodlum element. "It is virtually impossible," he has said, "to keep the professional racketeering element out of big-scale gambling operations." And what is the impact on the children and young people of a community who are told that gambling is wrong in principle, but who can see tens of thousands of their parents and elders betting large sums night after night on dog and horseraces in brightly lighted stadiums, surrounded by the panoply of uniformed policemen, brass bands and even an occasional Governor of Oregon to present blue ribbons and gold cups.

It is our opinion that the State should not legalize any gambling, and that once the bars are let down to a vast gambling project like parimutuel racing, the whole moral basis of strict enforcement has been imperiled.

PROTEST BY VIRGINIA SENATORS IN CONNECTION WITH ACCELERATED TAX-WRITEOFF PROGRAM FOR IDAHO POWER CO.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a fine editorial entitled "Virginia's Senators Protect Taxpayers," from the Northern Virginia Sun of May 2, 1957.

The editorial properly praises the action of the two distinguished Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] in protesting the decision of the Office of Defense Mobilization to grant an accelerated tax writeoff totaling $65 million to the Idaho Power Co. for its private projects in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River.

The Northern Virginia Sun, published in the neighboring city of Arlington, has pointed out that one of the principal arguments put forward by the Idaho Power Co. in its claim to the great power site at Hells Canyon was that the Idaho Power Co. would pay taxes. Now, adds the Sun, that argument has been exploded by the company itself—for the company seeks a tax subsidy to help finance its powerplants along the Snake River.

Thus, the Idaho Power Co. not only gets America's finest hydroelectric site from the Government for nothing, but the Government advances an interest-free loan to help subsidize the company's projects. The two Senators from Virginia have been acting in the public interest when they protest such an indefensible arrangement. I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate this praise of Virginia's two Senators by an influential Virginia daily newspaper.

Furthermore, Mr. President, a cogent analysis of the operation of the accelerated tax writeoff for Idaho Power has been published in the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., of May 6, 1957, under the byline of Herbert Lundy, editor of the editorial page of that newspaper. Mr. Lundy emphasizes the fact that the Idaho Power Co. actually can place the deferred tax funds in a special account to be used for dividends to stockholders—and then could make the later tax payments a justification for electric-rate increases to its customers.

I believe Mr. Lundy's explanation of the details of the writeoff scheme should likewise be published in the RECORD, for the information of Senators; and I ask unanimous consent that such permission be granted to me for that purpose.

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

[From the Arlington (Va.) Northern Virginia Sun of May 2, 1957]

VIRGINIA'S SENATORS PROTECT TAXPAYERS

Virginia's Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON have done well, we believe, to criticize the decision of the Office of Defense Mobilization to grant to the Idaho Power Co. a "fast tax writeoff" on two of its Hells Canyon Dam facilities in the Northwest.

These fast tax writeoffs deserve some explanation. In brief, they allow a company to depreciate (or wirte off) a given investment in 5 years instead of the normal 20. This means that they can deduct 4 times as much from their profits, during the first 5 years, before computing their taxes. Hence their profits subject to taxes are much less, and their tax bills correspondingly less.

In the case of the Idaho Power Co., the fast tax writeoff on the 2 dams will mean a saving of $65 million.

It is true that after the 5 years are up, the Idaho Power Co. will pay higher than normal taxes, and if tax rates stay the same for 20 years, theoretically their taxes will be the same as if they had not received the fast writeoff. But they have gained a great advantage in having had, during the first 5 years, the use of the $65 million that they would ordinarily have had to pay in taxes.

In short, they will have enjoyed the benefits of a $65 million interest-free loan—all courtesy of the American taxpayers.

Such a subsidy may well have been justified during World War II and during the Korean emergency (when the device was put into effect) as an incentive to companies making special investments in defense-related production facilities which have little or no civilian usefulness. But now that the height of the emergency is over, the taxpayers have a right to expect less extensive use of this subsidy, particularly for facilities, like the two dams in question, that are not special defense facilities but are designed to meet normal demands for power.

Senator BYRD's criticism of this Idaho Power decision carries particular weight because of his highly influential position as chairman of the tax-writing Senate Finance Committee. In fact, he is starting hearings today on a measure to prohibit the Government from giving any more tax benefits such as it gave to Idaho Power.

There is one other aspect of this particular case that deserves comment. The entire Hells Canyon dispute has been one of the classic struggles between public versus private power—between those who believe that the Snake River's potential can be most fully developed by a Government-built dam and those who believe that it is better to have the job done by private enterprise.

In this case, private enterprise won out, and the Idaho Power Co. is to build the dams. But the first thing that private enterprise does is to come in and ask for a Government subsidy, in the form of a fast tax writeoff.

We do not believe the Idaho Power Co. should have its cake and eat it too. If the taxpayers are going to help pay for the dams, then they ought to reap the full benefits. But if private enterprise wants to relieve the taxpayers of the cost of building the dams, let them do so, and not expect to reap a private profit from the public's investment.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian of May 6, 1957]

IDAHO POWER TAX AID RILES CONGRESS

(By Herbert Lundy)

The accelerated tax amortization certificates granted Idaho Power Co. for two of its dams on Snake River have caused such an uproar in Congress that two results are possible: (1) Repeal or drastic revision of the 1951 act allowing such deferred tax payments on defense projects; and (2) attraction of several more Senate votes for the bill to supersede Idaho Power's dams with a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon.

Besides the Hells Canyon Dam advocates, such free-enterprise Democrats as Senators BYRD and RUSSELL have assailed the tax benefits to Idaho Power. They have not, however, said they would vote for a Federal dam. The present outlook is that Hells Canyon may pick up a few more votes than when it was defeated in the Senate last session—but probably not enough.

The original, stated purpose of accelerated depreciation of plants for tax purposes has long since been lost. This device was legitimately used in World War II to help industry meet war demands for new planes and other rush jobs—expansion which would be obsolete or unneeded after the emergency had been met. It is doubtful in the extreme if the revival in 1951, under the Korean war impact, was justified insofar as the legislation applied to such long-range projects as hydroelectric dams under 50-year amortization.

Idaho Power Co.'s application was made before the Federal Power Commission granted licenses for the three dams in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake, and before last year's freeze on new grants. The Office of Defense Mobilization evidently felt obliged to honor the application, which had been kept alive, after the United States Supreme Court refused to intervene against FPC.

ODM permitted Idaho Power to write off in 5 years, in depreciation for Federal tax purposes, 65 percent of the cost of Brownlee Dam and 60 percent of the cost of Oxbow Dam. The way this works is that the company takes larger than normal deductions for 5 years, and smaller than normal deductions for the remaining 45 years of the license.

Statisticians say this means a tax saving for Idaho Power of about $31 million in 5 years, and that if the interest-free loan from

Uncle Sam were reinvested at a rate of return of 6 percent the company could benefit to the extent of $338 million at the end of the 50th year. This would be not a bad gimmick, since the two dams would cost about $100 million. In the meantime, of course, the Government would get its money back—but not the interest.

What burns up the Government dam proponents—and may interest all taxpayers and power consumers—is this. The $6,500,000 a year withheld in taxes by the company for 5 years is collected from rate payers and put into a deferred account. Yet it can be paid to stockholders as dividends subject only to capital gains taxation, which is much lower than ordinary taxes. What happens, they ask, at the end of the accelerated depreciation period if the money has been paid to stockholders? Their answer: Probably rate increases, to pay the higher Federal tax for the next 45 years.

This tax benefit is an outright subsidy from the Treasury, an interest free loan, to private utilities qualifying under a nonexistent "defense emergency." The Government might justify it by requiring a utility to eliminate the "loan" from its rate base. But utilities need not consider it in ratemaking. And, of course if the tax saving is passed along to stockholders under the heading of capital gains, there is another tax bonanza at Government expense.

It is estimated that rapid amortization for tax purposes has deferred Federal tax revenues amounting to around $50 billion since the program started. Senator BYRD's committee should recommend repeal of the entire act.

DAVID LAWRENCE AS A PROPAGANDIST FOR THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a few days ago, in colloquy on the floor of the Senate, I had occasion to refer to the columnist David Lawrence as being one of the leading propagandists for the Eisenhower administration. In that colloquy I asked a question which indicated that in my opinion Mr. Lawrence had been rather generously rewarded for his propagandizing for the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. President, in that connection I wish the Record to show that I had no purpose of casting any reflection upon the personal integrity of Mr. Lawrence. I consider him very highly in that regard. My reference to him was concerning what I conceive to be the improvement in his influence, position, and stature with the administration, by reason of his efforts in its favor, as he makes them.

MIDEAST PROBLEM NOT INSOLUBLE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I propose to make a series of brief statements on our foreign policy, as I have done at previous sessions of the Senate. At this time, attention is invited to an analysis of the Middle East situation. This is the first of the statements.

Recent events have given us more hope for an ultimate solution of the problems raised by the seizure and nationalization by Egypt of the Suez Canal, the resulting invasion by Great Britain and France, and the simultaneous invasion of Egypt by Israel. At the height of these events, one could scarcely have imagined that any solution was possible. But the policies of our State Department and of the United Nations have been leading to a period of a temporary diminution of active conflict. The dust of that conflict has begun to settle. The primary conditions underlying possible solutions are therefore more plainly visible than they have been.

In the first place, it must be said that the United States has taken on a serious responsibility. The beginnings of that responsibility lay in our support of the Egyptian demand for the evacuation of the Canal area by British troops. We asked the British to accede to that demand. In so doing, we took on the burden of representing the interests and the conscience of the rest of the world in the operation of the Suez Canal. So far as world interests are concerned, they had been on the whole well represented by the private canal management, supported by British arms. The new responsibility we took on was that of assuring ourselves that Egyptian ownership and operation would be at least in the same degree responsive to international interests. It was not immediately apparent that we recognized that responsibility, but it has now been borne heavily in upon us by the course of events. We are faced not by theories but by facts.

Mr. President, I can find no better suggestion to make than that the whole situation be viewed as would be the case in finding solutions to conflicts between private parties. Sometimes these private conflicts come to the courts for a solution. Sometimes they are bitterly fought in appeal after appeal. This is the aspect of private conflicts as the public sees them, but it represents but a fraction of the solutions that are found by discussion, by adjustment, and by compromise, unseen by and unknown to the general public.

Unfortunately, the spirit of too much of present-day international statesmanship does not admit of adjustment and of compromise. For that reason we sometimes fail of peaceful solutions, and even of just solutions, which might have been reached had a spirit of accommodation prevailed.

In urging a recourse to this spirit of accommodation, I am not suggesting that the eternal moral principles should be disregarded or betrayed. I am suggesting that these moral principles themselves lead to peaceful and just accommodations.

In the Mid-East situation we have to seek for the solution which will have in it some advantage for all the nations concerned. Particularly must it carry with it advantages for all the peoples of the nations concerned. The people of Israel, the people of Egypt, the people of the rest of the Arab world, must find in any effective solution some benefit for themselves. The material benefits lie ultimately in provisions for food, clothing, shelter, and education. The spiritual advantages derive from the establishment of peaceful and free relations among people. These are the foundations on which a solid structure of accommodation must be raised.

Let us now turn to the consideration of one of the countries concerned.

THE SITUATION OF EGYPT

The first and most thorny problem in the Egyptian situation relates to the nationalization of the Suez Canal. This immediately struck the nations of America and Western Europe as being a high-handed and arbitrary action. It was certainly done in a high-handed and arbitrary manner; but it bears such a close resemblance to the nationalization by Great Britain of its privately owned railroads and privately owned coal mines that the parallel is embarrassing. What Nasser did was to nationalize an Egyptian company incorporated under Egyptian law, which had a concession to operate a canal running through Egyptian territory and which had been built by Egyptian labor. It will be remembered that he offered the shareholders full compensation at the price of their shares on the Paris Bourse on the day preceding the nationalization decree.

Thus far the action was parallel to that of the British private expropriation of British industry.

There are, however, some points of difference. One of them lies in the fact that the great majority of the owners of the industries seized by the British Government were themselves British. The private owners of the Suez Canal were not predominantly Egyptian. However, provided that the offer of reimbursement could have been carried out effectively, it would have answered all the requirements of substantial justice to international shareholders.

The other point of difference is more fundamental and more serious. The operation of the British railroads is primarily a matter of British interest. The operation of the British coal mines is primarily a matter of British interest. The operation of the Suez Canal, however, extends far beyond the interest of Egypt alone. It is a matter of concern to all the nations who participate in world commerce. These nations have an interest in the efficient and even-handed administration of the canal. They have a right to insist that their interest must be regarded and served.

There are also interests of the Egyptian people which must be recognized. They are among the most poverty-stricken people of the earth. Their standards of living in terms of food, clothing, shelter, and education are among the lowest of those who for generations have been in contact with the higher standards of the Western World. While Nasser's interest in the Aswan Dam doubtless had in it a political motivation, yet the motivation was one which was presumably favorable to the proper aspirations of the Egyptian people. When we suddenly, and in appearance arbitrarily, withdrew our offer of assistance in the building of the Aswan Dam, on the face of it we dealt a blow to Nasser's political power. Did we also deal a blow to the hopes of the Egyptian people for a better living? That is a question we must face.

In facing that question we may properly assume to analyze the plans for the grandiose development in terms of improvement of popular well-being. Will

this great dam and the controlled supply of water in the lower Nile result in a proportionate increase in the production of food and fiber needed by and going to the Egyptian people? On the other hand, will the benefits go exclusively to large landowners? In its present form, does the dam cost more than it is worth? Can alternative undertakings be proposed which will be more effective in terms of well-being for each million dollars spent? If we are to arrive at useful solutions to this Mid-East problem, the well-being of the people of Egypt must be taken into account as a major factor.

What is not a proper purpose is the unseating of Nasser as a prime objective in itself. We cannot hope to support in power at Cairo a nonnationalistic puppet. It will be better to negotiate with a known ruler with known abilities and interests. It is legitimate to maintain economic pressure for the sake of persuading him to accept a generally beneficial solution, but we must have the solution in mind; and we must see to it that the pressure does not fall with particular force on the undernourished people themselves.

A decision on the course to which we would urge Nasser will require that we look at the problems of Israel and of the other Arab States as well as of Egypt. This will be the subject of the next installment of these talks.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH 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.)

PROTOCOL AMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT OF 1953—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive L, 85th Congress, 1st session, a protocol amending the International Sugar Agreement of 1953, dated at London, December 1, 1956, and that the protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to accession thereto on the part of the United States, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol amending the International Sugar Agreement of 1953, dated at London December 1, 1956.

The purposes of the protocol are explained in the report of the Secretary of State which is transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 1957.*

(Enclosures: 1. Certified copy of a protocol amending the International Sugar Agreement of 1953; 2. Report of the Secretary of State.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Thomas James Donegan, of New York, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

CHARLES E. BOHLEN

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is my information that we may be able to get action on the nomination of Mr. Bohlen this afternoon. It may be necessary to carry over the nominations of Mr. McLeod and Mr. Taylor until tomorrow. We do not expect a late session today.

Before I propound a unanimous-consent request in connection with the nominations of Mr. McLeod and Mr. Taylor, I desire that all Senators be on notice that the Bohlen nomination is presently about to be acted upon and, too, that shortly a unanimous-consent request will be made in connection with the other nominations.

Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is my purpose to ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the Bohlen nomination, and then to consider the other nominations on the Executive Calendar, in the order in which they appear on the calendar.

I had anticipated that we could act on the Bohlen nomination today and discuss the McLeod nomination as late this evening as any Senator might desire. Then tomorrow, following the morning hour, we could continue to discuss the McLeod nomination, and avoid a session on Friday, if we are able to complete action.

Some Senators had made plans to be out of town today and will not be here until late this evening. They had requested me not to ask for a vote on the McLeod nomination until after 5:30 p. m. Some Senators have plans to make speeches outside the Senate Chamber tomorrow. Therefore I had anticipated making a unanimous consent request that at 2 o'clock tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote upon the question of advising and consenting to the nomination of Scott McLeod to be Ambassador to Ireland, the time between the conclusion of the morning business and said hour of 2 o'clock to be equally divided and to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the minority leader.

I am informed, Mr. President, that there would be objection to such a request. Therefore, I do not wish to go through the motions of making it and having it objected to. Therefore I announce that the Senate is now free to discuss these nominations and act upon them in the order in which they appear on the calendar, and to vote on them as early as may be desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines?

The nomination was confirmed.

SCOTT M'LEOD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott McLeod, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Mr. Scott McLeod to be the United States Ambassador to Ireland.

For 4 years Scott McLeod has occupied an important and difficult position in the Department of State—a position which encompasses the direction not merely of one major area of operations, but of four such areas.

Mr. McLeod has been in charge not only of personnel security within the Department—a tremendous job in itself and one about which a storm has swirled during his first 2 years in office—but he has also had general overall responsibility for the Passport Office, the Visa Office, and still another division of which little is said but which is delicate and critical, namely the Office of Munitions Control. This latter office decides to whom we shall sell arms and munitions, when we shall sell them, and how much of them we shall sell.

Mr. McLeod is a modest man. He is not the kind to trumpet his own qualifi-

cations. His testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee demonstrates his qualities of self-effacement and the humility with which he views the prospective honor which has been offered him of the post of Ambassador to Ireland.

But any fair-minded person must conclude from an appraisal of Mr. McLeod's accomplishments of the past 4 years that he has demonstrated not only exceptional administrative ability, but tact and diplomacy as well. His job as Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs was a new one created by Congress with the rank of Assistant Secretary of State. It brought together under one chief, Mr. McLeod, a number of important operations.

In 1951 many young Americans did not want to enter the Foreign Service, and only 693 applied. The number of applicants was almost 5,000 in the fiscal year 1956. This fact attests to the increased public standing of the Department of State to which Mr. McLeod's efforts have contributed.

So far as the morale of the service itself is concerned, a careful reading of the Foreign Service's own publication which carried this information shows that resignations from the service are at a record low. Employees resign when morale is bad.

In the matter of passports, 560,711 passports were issued more expeditiously in 1956 than were the far lesser number, 381,302, issued in 1952.

Despite the attacks on Mr. McLeod by some uninformed persons for his handling of immigration matters, the truth is that in fiscal 1956 no less than 332,499 persons were issued immigrant visas, a record since World War II. Moreover, 190,000 out of a possible 210,000 refugees were brought into this country under the Refugee Relief Act, and the only reason the full quota was not filled was the lack of applicants in Germany and Austria.

Mr. McLeod has served as the United States representative to the 26-nation Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. He enjoyed the distinction of being unanimously elected chairman of this international organization during its sessions of 1956. This group has found new homes and jobs for more than 600,000 persons among Europe's surplus population. To accomplish this, great diplomatic talent has been required.

Mr. McLeod was in charge of the service of our two-hundred-and-fifty-odd consular establishments. An increasing workload was handled by employees better trained than ever before as a result of Mr. McLeod's efforts.

In his press conference on April 23, Secretary Dulles said with reference to Scott McLeod:

> I will say that Mr. McLeod, after 4 years of service in the State Department, has I think shown that he possesses the qualifications to be a good ambassador. He has grown in stature and understanding; his knowledge of world affairs is very considerable. And I believe that he is well qualified. Obviously such a belief rests upon my personal judgment, but my personal judgment is based upon very close contact with him during this period and with his growing understanding of problems. This leads me to believe that he will be a good ambassador.

Only this morning the President of the United States told me that he had full confidence in Mr. McLeod, and that he hoped his nomination as American Ambassador to Ireland would be promptly confirmed.

In connection with ambassadorial appointments, a peculiar responsibility rests upon the President of the United States. From the days of the monarchies and other types of government, the ambassador was the personal representative of the king or the sovereign. While, of course, to a great extent he represents the Nation as a nation, and the Government in its totality, to a considerable extent he still is the personal representative of the President of the United States. The President of the United States, who is charged with the responsibility under the Constitution for directing our foreign affairs, has sent to the Senate the nomination of Mr. McLeod, and has requested confirmation. This request is supported by the Secretary of State.

For several years I have been honored to serve as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Although I have some heavy responsibilities and duties as a member of the Appropriations Committee and of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, both of which committees were meeting simultaneously, I left those meetings and attended the sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee, because I wanted to hear all the testimony. I wanted to hear Mr. McLeod's own testimony, and any facts which might be produced.

The record of the testimony has been before the Senate, and has been available to all Senators. It is my own belief, after listening to the testimony, that not one scintilla of evidence was produced which was detrimental in the slightest to Mr. McLeod's character, to his loyalty, to his integrity, or to his ability.

I think I am not violating any confidence of the committee when I say that even some who had had some doubts raised in their minds regarding the handling by Mr. LcLeod of the refugee cases themselves admitted, after the testimony had been produced and the record had been examined, that he had done an unusually fine job in handling the problem under the law and under the requirements laid down by the Congress of the United States when it enacted the law.

I had a discussion with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is unavoidably absent. He is a member of the Judiciary Committee. He had a considerable hand in drafting and sponsoring the legislation which came before that committee. He stated that in his judgment, and on the basis of all the facts which had been presented to him, Mr. McLeod has done an outstanding job.

While I recognize that there are those who have an honest difference of opinion on this subject, I think the fact of the matter is that the opposition finally boils down to the fact that there is some criticism because this administration has made a number of so-called noncareer appointments. In this field there is certainly room for a difference of opinion. Perhaps, in the judgment of the Congress, it would be far better if the Congress were to lay down a rule that no one but a career employee should be appointed as an ambassador. I do not happen to agree with that point of view, but at least a plausible case might be made for it. Under that theory, regardless of what administration happened to be in power, it would have to name ambassadors from the career service. One might make a case for that point of view if he happened to believe that that would be in the best interests of the country. I do not agree with that point of view. I would not want to see the career service ignored; nor would I want to see a majority of appointments made from the noncareer service. Just what the percentage should be, I think, is a matter of judgment; and the judgment may vary from one administration to the next.

For those who wish to deal with this question in fairness and equity, not in a spirit of criticism, it should be remembered that some very able noncareer men have been appointed. There comes to mind the appointment of the distinguished Ambassador to Great Britain, Mr. Joseph Kennedy, a Democrat. He was a noncareer appointee. We also recall the appointment of the distinguished former Governor of Connecticut, Mr. Chester Bowles, another noncareer appointee. He was sent as our Ambassador to India, and many believe he performed fairly useful service in that appointment. He did not come from the career service.

Without going further into personalities—though I could name a great many more noncareer appointments—I should like to mention some percentages.

Under the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, a total of 123 career appointments were made, and a total of 121 noncareer appointments were made, or a percentage of noncareer appointments of 49 percent.

When we come to the administration of President Truman, we find that a total of 145 career appointments were made and a total of 75 noncareer appointments, or a percentage of 34 percent of noncareer appointments.

In the Eisenhower administration to date there have been a total of 78 career appointments and 49 noncareer appointments, or a percentage of 39 percent of noncareer appointments. That is 5 percent more than under the Truman administration, and 10 percent less than under the Roosevelt administration.

I submit that is not a departure from the procedure which has been followed in the past.

Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt believed in having almost a 50–50 division between career and noncareer appointments. I was not in the Senate at the time he was President of the United States; however, if, in performing the duties of the President of the United States, he felt that, in appointing men who peculiarly represent the President in foreign countries, there should be a 50–50 division as between noncareer and career appointments, I would have supported him in those nominations, if I had been a Member of the Senate at the time.

In the case of Mr. Truman, who apparently believed that there should be a greater percentage of career appointments, and made a total of 34 percent noncareer appointments, if he felt, in discharging the responsibilities of the high office of President, charged under the Constitution with the primary direction of our foreign policy, that that procedure should be followed, he was entitled to follow that course of action, and I believe I supported him in it.

Certainly I would have supported such decisions by the President of the United States unless the Congress in its wisdom had said that not more than 10 percent of the appointments may be noncareer appointments. However, inasmuch as Congress has left the question open, it seems to me that we should support the decision of the President of the United States, unless my inadvertence or otherwise the President nominates a person who in the opinion of the Senate lacks the integrity or the character to hold that high position.

That has not been demonstrated in this case, and I submit that not one scintilla of evidence was presented before the committee which would indicate that the Senate should withhold its approval of the nomination of Mr. McLeod on any such basis.

I do not know what the policy of the administration will be in the future, but up to date only 39 percent of the diplomatic appointments which have been submitted for confirmation to the Senate are noncareer appointments, which is approximately the percentage of the Truman administration, and 10 percent less than that of the Roosevelt administration.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate unduly, but I should like to mention some persons, appointed from the noncareer field, who may not be as well known as some of the other gentlemen I have mentioned.

I refer to Mr. Jack McFall, who was executive secretary to the House Appropriations Committee from 1928 to 1942 and from 1945 to 1946. He joined the State Department in 1947, was Assistant Secretary of State from 1949 to 1952, and Ambassador to Finland from 1952 to 1955.

Mr. Edward L. Roddan, who was administrative assistant to Senator McMahon, and was later appointed Ambassador to Uruguay, in 1951.

Francis O. Wilcox, who is well and favorably known to all of us, particularly those of us who have served on the Committee on Foreign Relations. He was chief of staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations from 1947 to 1955. He was made Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of United Nations Affairs in 1955.

Mr. Thurston V. Kalijarvi. He was consultant to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations from 1947 to 1953, and later became Assistant Secretary of State.

There is nothing unusual in connection with the appointment of Mr. McLeod. He has had a distinguished career. He was born in the State of Iowa, and was a newspaper man there. Subsequently he went to the State of New Hampshire and became a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in that State. Then he came to the Senate as Administrative Assistant to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. BRIDGES), the ranking Republican Member of the Senate and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Subsequently, Mr. McLeod was selected to perform the duties of his present position in the Department of State. He has held that position for 4 years.

The testimony of the Secretary of State, to which I have referred, clearly indicates that Mr. McLeod has done a good job. He has the confidence of the President, and he has the confidence of the Secretary of State.

The testimony before the committee is such that only the highest regard can be had for his character, his ability, and his integrity. I hope his nomination to the position of Ambassador to Ireland will be overwhelmingly confirmed.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on May 2 the Committee on Foreign Relations voted 9 to 6 to report favorably to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Scott McLeod to be Ambassador to Ireland. I voted against this favorable report to the Senate, and therefore cannot speak for the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations on this matter. However, I wish to record my individual point of view with respect to this nomination.

It may be useful to recall what the Constitution of the United States has to say about the appointment of officers of the United States. Article II, section 2, of the Constitution provides that the President "shall nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law."

The Senate has two functions to perform in connection with appointments. One function is to consent to an appointment or not to consent. The other function is to advise the President with respect to appointments.

It has not proved practical, considering the number of us in this body and the number of appointments which must be made, for the President to seek our advice in each case before he makes his nomination. The Senate, however, gives its general advice on appointments to the President in several ways.

Committees of the Senate have informal policies on nominations which are known to the executive branch. Individual Members of the Senate make speeches in connection with nominations in which they set forth their views. During hearings before Senate committees on nominations, the nature of questions asked of nominees provides additional guidance to the President. In these ways our sentiments as to the kind of nominations we expect to receive are conveyed to the executive branch.

Recently, Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and with the concurrence of the committee, I attempted in another way to offer advice to the executive branch on the subject of the appointment of ambassadors. Some of us have been concerned for some time about the quality of ambassadorial appointments. Many of the newspapers of this country in their editorials have also been discussing this problem.

On April 2, 1957, at a regular meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I raised this subject. I told the committee that I proposed to send a letter to the Secretary of State expressing my concern about the appointment of ambassadors. I read a draft of the letter to the committee and asked if the members wished to concur in it. Without any objection the committee agreed that I should send the letter to the Secretary of State, and I did so on April 3.

Since that letter sums up my views on the principles which should govern the appointment of ambassadors, I will read it now:

APRIL 3, 1957.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY DULLES: I desire to express to you in a completely nonpartisan spirit my deep concern about ambassadorial appointments.

In view of the heavy responsibilities of the United States throughout the world and the importance to us of relations with other countries, we should have first-rate ambassadors in every post. We choose ambassadors both from the ranks of the career service and from outside the Government service, and the benefits of this practice can be readily demonstrated. We should not, however, accept the conclusion that some years of satisfactory service, either in the Foreign Service, or in some nongovernmental activity, automatically qualify a man to be a good ambassador. The test in every case should be whether a nominee for a particular post is the American who can best serve the interests of this country there.

There are special problems arising from the fact that certain posts are very expensive. I am glad to have the Department's letter of March 6, 1957, stating that a study of the matter is under way. The Committee on Foreign Relations will no doubt give sympathetic consideration to such recommendations as you may make.

It is generally known that Presidents and Secretaries of State of both political parties have been under pressure from those who feel that an ambassadorship is a reward for past service or help. In my opinion, we can no longer afford to give way to such pressure in appointment making.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has always recognized the primary responsibility of the Executive in making such appointments and has been reluctant to refuse consent to a nomination unless there is an obvious reason to do so. The committee has on occasions given the benefit of the doubt to nominees. It seems to me, however, an insufficient reason that there is no real objection to the nomination, there should also be an affirmative reason for it—namely, that the nominee has outstanding qualifications for the position. It should be obvious in each case, whether the nominee is a career man or not, that his record, his intelligence, his background, and his attitude are such that he will ably serve our country in his assignment.

I have made this letter the subject of discussion in executive session by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and it represents the consensus of the views of all the members of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

This letter to the Secretary of State embodying the views of the members of

the Committee on Foreign Relations was sent on April 3. One week later, the nomination of Scott McLeod was submitted to the Senate.

One week still later on April 17 the Secretary wrote a reply to my letter, in which he began:

I have read your letter of April 3 relating to ambassadorial appointments. I agree that the responsibilities of the United States throughout the world have become so heavy and our relations with other countries so important that we must have "first rate" chiefs of mission in our diplomatic posts abroad.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to the making of political appointments to ambassadorial posts. Although the Foreign Service of the United States has many able men in it, the President of the United States should not be limited to the Foreign Service in selecting his personal representatives in other countries. He should be able to go anywhere in the United States to pick the best men he can find to be our Ambassadors. As a general rule, he should look first to the Foreign Service but, as I wrote in my letter to the Secretary of State:

The test in every case should be whether a nominee for a particular post is the American who can best serve the interests of this country there.

Is Mr. McLeod the best man in the United States available to represent this country in Ireland? That is the test. In my opinion, this appointment does not serve the interests of the United States. I do not believe his service there would promote friendship and good relations between our country and Ireland.

In this connection, I will read to the Senate a letter which I received from 21 Members of the House of Representatives on the subject of this nomination:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 2, 1957.

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: We have been deeply disturbed, as we know you have, at the mediocrity of some of our recent diplomatic appointments. Basically, of course, the administration must be allowed to make and take responsibility for its own appointments. But the proposed appointment of Mr. Scott McLeod as Ambassador to the Republic of Ireland shows such a disregard for the sensibilities of the Irish people that we regret deeply that the President did not name a more representative American for this important post.

Since 1927, when we sent our first diplomatic representative to Ireland, until today, our chiefs of mission in Dublin have been men of whom Americans could be proud. These eight diplomats include:

Frederick A. Sterling, 1927, Washington, D. C., career diplomat with more than 20 years service;

William W. McDowell, 1933, Montana, former lieutenant governor, prominent rancher and copper man;

Alvin M. Owsley, 1935, Texas, attorney and American minister to Rumania;

John Cudahy, 1937–1939, Wisconsin, industrialist, lawyer, and ambassador to Poland and Belgium;

David Gray, 1940, Buffalo, N. Y., editor;

George A. Garrett, 1947, Washington, D. C., bank and civic leader;

Francis P. Matthews, 1951, Nebraska, lawyer banker, and Secretary of the Navy;

William Howard Taft III, 1953–1957, Connecticut, teacher of Gaelic at Yale University.

Mr. McLeod's 'qualifications' for this important post, as urged by his supporters, appear to be twofold—that he has been chief security officer of the State Department, and that he is anti-Communist. His methods as security chief have drawn a protest from five distinguished former United States Ambassadors as "laying the foundations of a foreign service competent to serve a totalitarian government, rather than the Government of the United States as we have known it."

As to Mr. McLeod's second qualification, we do not believe that Mr. McLeod's anti-communism constitutes any unusual distinction. Communism is happily not popular in the United States, nor, for that matter in the Republic of Ireland. The State Department's Office of Intelligence Research reports that there are presently fewer than 150 Communists among Ireland's 3 million people.

Nor is it a valid reason for confirming Mr. McLeod's proposed appointment that the Republic of Ireland would probably refrain from declaring him persona non grata. Never before in this century has a foreign country declared persona non grata a proposed United States chief diplomatic representative. It is asking too much of Ireland to take the initiative.

We are proud of the political courage you have shown in announcing your opposition to Mr. McLeod's confirmation. We hope that the President, who stated at his April 17 press conference that he nominated Mr. McLeod on Mr. Dulles' recommendation and without personal knowledge of his qualifications or lack of them, will show similar courage and withdraw his nomination.

Respectfully.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that, in the customary procedures in the Department of State, before the nomination of an ambassador is sent to the Senate for confirmation, the Department communicates with the government of the country to which the nominee is to be accredited, and gets an agreement from that country that the person proposed as the ambassador is acceptable to it? And is it not true that that procedure was followed in this case, as it has been in all other cases, and that the Government of Ireland was consulted before the nomination of Mr. McLeod was submitted to the Senate?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know whether the Senator would call it a consultation. I think it is the custom to submit a proposed nomination to the country concerned, in order to give it an opportunity to remonstrate, if it should care to do so. But it would be very difficult for the Republic of Ireland to remonstrate to the United States of America against anyone whose nomination the President of the United States should submit. In this case, apparently the President had little or no knowledge of the name submitted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I submit that that statement is not a statement of fact. Today, the President of the United States told me that he had full confidence in Mr. McLeod. The nomination was handled in the way all such nominations are handled. It was undoubtedly made on the recommendation of the Secretary of State; but the President is fully familiar with Mr. McLeod's assignment to the Department of State and the work he has done in the Department of State, and the nomination came to the Senate on the appointment by the President.

Mr. GREEN. The words I read were quoted—as the Senator from California would know if he had been paying attention—from a letter addressed to me by certain Members of the House of Representatives. I have read the text of the letter, but I have not yet read the names of those who signed it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, not only have I been paying attention to what the Senator from Rhode Island has been saying, but I have not left the floor, although I have received several requests to do so. Instead, I have remained during the entire presentation by the Senator from Rhode Island. I know that he is reading from a letter signed by 21 of the Members of the House of Representatives out of a total membership of 435. The letter states the particular point of view of those 21 Members.

Mr. GREEN. That is quite true.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield, so that I may ask a question of the distinguished Senator from California?

Mr. GREEN. I believe I should continue with my statement, Mr. President.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me, for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, now speaking as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; or is he speaking as a Senator from Rhode Island, with no official connection with the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. GREEN. At the beginning of my remarks, I took pains to state that in the committee I was in the minority, and therefore I would not speak for the committee, but would speak as an individual Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then who does speak for the committee in this instance? Who made the favorable report on the nomination?

Mr. GREEN. I think the clerk sent in the report and the result of the vote.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the chairman of the committee is not speaking for the committee in this connection, is he?

Mr. GREEN. In what I am saying now, I am not speaking for the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island generally speak for the committee?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, generally. However, this case is an exceptional one. It is very seldom that the vote in the committee is not in accordance with the views of a preponderance of the members of the committee. There have been very few cases in which minority views have been submitted—as the Senator

from New Hampshire knows from his own experience.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, and my knowledge of him and my friendship for him go back many years, as he knows. I know that generally when he speaks, he speaks with the authority of the committee, or at least with the authority of a majority of its members, behind him. However, at this time he is not speaking for such a group, is he?

Mr. GREEN. No; I am speaking for a minority of the committee—6 members—as opposed to 9 on the other side. I think I began my statement with a statement to that effect.

Mr. President, I have read the letter, which is signed by the following: CHARLES A. BOYLE, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, WAYNE L. HAYS, MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, HENRY S. REUSS, CHARLES A. VANIK, BARRATT O'HARA, LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, EDITH GREEN, MELVIN PRICE, B. F. SISK, STEWART L. UDALL, FRANK M. KARSTEN, GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, AL ULLMAN, CHARLES O. PORTER, CHET HOLIFIELD, THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY, THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, GEORGE M. RHODES, and FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

Mr. President, the list, in the letter, of former Ambassadors to Ireland is impressive. They have been some of our finest men, and I believe this tradition should be continued.

Mr. President, it is a rare thing when nominations are reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations other than unanimously. It is a rare thing to have more than 1 or 2 negative votes on a nomination.

In one recent case, when two Members opposed a nominee to an ambassadorial post, the President withdrew the nomination. In another instance, when three Members opposed an important appointment, the committee agreed to leave the nomination before the committee without prejudice, and the nomination was not reported. Those of us who have doubts about a nominee usually resolve those doubts in favor of the President. There have been several recent appointments of men whom the committee would not have chosen, but we have not objected.

It is important that Ambassadors go out from the United States with the full backing of the Government of the United States, and that should mean with virtually the unanimous support of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The name of Mr. McLeod unfortunately comes to the floor of the Senate by a vote of 9 to 6. Six members of the Committee on Foreign Relations doubt that Mr. McLeod possesses the necessary qualifications. This is the first time in my experience that a name has been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations with so many votes against it.

Members of the committee questioned Mr. McLeod at hearings on April 30 and May 1. The record of those hearings is before the Senate. The committee heard one witness in opposition to Mr. McLeod. In addition, it received an unusually large number of letters in relation to Mr. McLeod—some 61 letters from persons opposed to him, as compared with 2 letters from persons favoring him.

I have also received letters from two organizations. I should like to read them into the RECORD at this point.

The first is addressed to me by the Lower Manhattan Republican Club, Inc., 90 Madison Street, New York 2, N. Y., and is dated April 27, 1957. It reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: The executive committee of the Lower Manhattan Republican Club unanimously voted to oppose the nomination of Scott McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland based upon a canvass of 1,000 residents in the area who voted 12 to 1 against McLeod.

The canvass taken by 20 people during the period of April 10 to 19, inclusive, posed the following question: Do you approve or disapprove the nomination by President Eisenhower, upon recommendation of Secretary Dulles, of Scott McLeod, security officer of the State Department, in charge of the refugee program, as Ambassador to Ireland?

Approve	69
Disapprove	830
Don't know	101
	1,000

The community canvassed has a mixture of all races and nationalities, with a heavy core of Irish-Americans, many of whom had strong feelings on the issue—such as—"Why stick Ireland with this guy?" Another said—"I respect President Eisenhower, but can't understand why he should accept McLeod on the recommendation of Dulles, after the mess McLeod created with the refugee program." Still another said, "I see where Dulles, who did not deny he once contemplated firing McLeod, now says McLeod has grown in stature. In my opinion, if McLeod has matured at all, he should just about have qualified for appointment as sergeant of police in Oshkosh, Wis.—with apologies to the people of Oshkosh."

The strong reaction against McLeod clearly indicates widespread grassroot opposition to the promotion of a man whose administration of the refugee program has given America a black eye throughout the Free World. Unless his appointment is rejected by your committee, the people of America and our friends abroad will think of America's diplomatic service as a shoddy political haven with the full approval of the Senate of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. LAMULA,
Executive Member.

The second letter is addressed to me by the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, Providence County Board, State of Rhode Island, under date of April 13, 1957. It reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the Ladies Auxiliary, A. O. H. of Providence County at a meeting held at the Sheraton Biltmore Hotel, Providence, April 12, 1957:

"Whereas President Eisenhower has announced the nomination of Scott McLeod, Administrator of the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, as Ambassador to Ireland; and

"Whereas the Irish people overseas through the Irish Times have expressed the hope that the United States Senate will block the appointment of Mr. McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland; and

"Whereas the Irish Times has stated: 'It is humiliating to find the United States Embassy in Dublin regarded as a dumping ground for a man whom his political party desires either to reward for dubious services rendered or, conceivably, to get out of the way of doing further mischief: Therefore

"We, the members of Providence County, Ancient Order of Hibernians and the Ladies Auxiliary, A. O. H., go on record that when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee meets to consider the appointment of Mr. McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland that the committee reject the appointment because of the widespread disapproval expressed by the people in Ireland; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to Senator John O. Pastore."

Respectfully yours,

JAMES F. MCPHILLIPS,
County President.

SUSAN LOUGHRAN
Mrs. Thomas P. Loughran,
County President, Ladies Auxiliary.

I do not argue that Mr. McLeod has a bad record. My contention is that any ambassador should have outstanding qualifications for the job. As I said in my letter to the Secretary of State:

It should be obvious in each case, whether the nominee is a career man or not, that his record, his intelligence, his background, and his attitude are such that he will ably serve our country in his assignment.

Mr. McLeod does not have, in my opinion, outstanding qualifications to be Ambassador to Ireland. He has had no special education in the field of foreign affairs. His only experience in this field has been 4 years which he has worked in the Department of State, where his responsibilities were confined to personnel security matters and to certain immigration questions. He has had no responsibilities in the formulation of foreign policy. Mr. McLeod speaks no foreign language. He knows nothing about Ireland. When he was asked by a member of the committee about current problems between the United States and Ireland, he said that he had not yet been briefed on such problems. In short, Mr. President, Mr. McLeod lacks many of the generally agreed on prerequisites to performing the duties of an ambassador.

There is another point I should like to make. It is that if the Senate should confirm Mr. McLeod in this appointment it may be approving a permanent career for him in the diplomatic service. In reply to a question about his future plans, Mr. McLeod said: "I don't expect to retire. I am relatively young. It just seems to me to be a good place to get your feet wet in the matter of diplomacy."

It is true that if Mr. McLeod is confirmed as Ambassador to Ireland he must then make application and be accepted by the Department of State before he can become a member of the career Foreign Service. Since the Secretary of State, however, has approved his nomination in this case, it is difficult to see how, if the Senate should vote to confirm him, the Board of the Foreign Service could deny to Mr. McLeod a permanent career in the Service, and he would then be subject to assignment anywhere in the world—a tragic, or rather a pathetic, outlook.

In conclusion, I wish to point out that this nomination has often been discussed as if there were only one man available for the post in Ireland, and as if the question for the Senate were whether

Mr. McLeod would do. In my opinion, there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of men who are better qualified to be Ambassador to Ireland. In my opinion, Ireland deserves the best. I therefore urge the Senate to give the President an opportunity to nominate someone else who is better qualified.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as in the case of the minority leader, I had heard so much discussion about Mr. McLeod that I took special interest in his nomination, and determined to attend all the hearings in connection with it in order to form an accurate a judgment as possible.

Mr. President, in rising to support the nomination of Mr. Scott McLeod to be United States Ambassador to Ireland, I must express my deep regret that the Committee on Foreign Relations was not able to bring his nomination to the floor with unanimous support. I believe that Mr. McLeod deserved such support. But, at the same time, I recognize that in decisions of this kind each member must be guided by his own best judgment.

It seems to me that the evidence received by the committee, in 2 days of hearing Mr. McLeod, supports the judgment that the Senate should confirm his nomination as Ambassador to Ireland. The Committee on Foreign Relations voted 9 to 6 in favor of his nomination, as has already been stated.

We must remember that the men who occupy the positions of United States Ambassadors are the personal representatives abroad of the President of the United States. This means that if there are doubts about the capacity of a man to serve in this type of position, the doubts should be resolved in favor of the President.

If the Senate is to refuse to confirm a Presidential nomination, it should do so only if in the judgment of the Senate the nominee is unfit to serve in such a post. It is not a sufficient objection for Senators simply to believe that they might have chosen a different nominee. It is not the Senate's function to nominate ambassadors.

Nothing which the committee heard during its executive sessions on this nomination leads me to believe that Mr. McLeod is unfit to perform the functions of this high office. Unfortunately, as the record will show, this nominee has been the victim of innuendoes, speculative stories, and even of outright slanderous statements. The statements have been made on the basis of emotion, and are not based on fact.

For example, it has been alleged that Mr. McLeod has failed as administrator of the refugee program. The refugee program is one of the subjects nearest to my heart, as a result of the study I have made of the situation abroad, and the alleged failure of Mr. McLeod as administrator of that program is completely false. As the record shows, the refugee law passed in 1953 authorized the granting of visas to some 209,000 individuals. When the program was concluded last December the Department of State, under the direction of Mr. McLeod, had issued 190,000 such visas—only some 19,000 short of the authorized figure. I might add that most of these visas were not used only because there were not sufficient applicants in the categories to which the visas had been assigned.

As the majority leader said a few minutes ago, I have also talked to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] with whom I have been closely associated in refugee matters, and he has assured me that one of the best jobs done in this field has been done by Mr. McLeod.

Another friend of mine, who lives in the State of New Jersey, and who a year was assigned by the Government to go to Switzerland to look into the refugee problem called me on the long-distance telephone to express the sincere hope that the Senate would confirm the nomination of Mr. McLeod, because of the magnificent job he had done on the refugee problem.

In other words, Mr. President, the statement that Mr. McLeod failed as Administrator of the refugee program has no basis in fact.

It has also been alleged that Mr. McLeod's activities in the Department and his appointment to this post will have a bad effect on the morale of the United States Foreign Service. Mr. President, in this connection, I must note that the committee did not receive any testimony to this effect. No member of the Foreign Service wrote to the committee to object to the McLeod appointment. The statement that his activities in the Department injured morale is one which cannot be supported by the evidence.

The job of seeking out persons within the Department who might be dangerous to the security of the United States is always an unpopular one. Mr. McLeod did it with great courage and effectiveness.

I believe, Mr. President, that there is nothing in the record to indicate that Mr. McLeod is not fit for this important post. Indeed, there is much in the record to indicate that he will serve faithfully and well. Mr. McLeod has had some 15 years of experience as a Government employee. He has worked in the Department of Justice, in the executive branch, and he spent a number of years in close association with the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. In that capacity he had opportunity to become familiar with many problems in the field of foreign affairs which have come before the Committee on Appropriations.

I do not believe that the only people who are qualified to serve as United States Ambassadors abroad are those who have spent their lifetimes in the Foreign Service. As a matter of fact, in many instances I believe the interests of the United States are served equally well by men who have had an intimate familiarity with American politics and business life—familiarity which cannot be obtained by service in the Foreign Service of the United States.

I have talked to members of the Foreign Service, who agree with that statement. Many career officers do not feel that only members of the Foreign Service should be appointed to ambassadorial posts.

Mr. McLeod's experience as a Government employee is, I believe, of the kind to qualify him for this position.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe that an examination of the record will show that Mr. McLeod has given unusually good evidence of his judgment. Time after time during the hearings he was asked most embarrassing questions which he handled with great good judgment. I am sure that the people of Ireland will find that Mr. McLeod will be an able representative of the United States to their country.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope this nomination will be confirmed by a large vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in considering this nomination it is important to understand the diplomatic climate in which it is made. Never before in history have the foreign relations of the United States been of greater importance to Americans. Never before in history has it been so essential that members of the Foreign Service should be highly qualified for the offices they occupy. Never before has the morale of our Foreign Service been so important. A high morale requires, among other things, an appreciation by all of us of the dedicated and skillful performance of duties characteristic of the overwhelming majority of members of the Foreign Service. It requires adequate compensation, representation allowances, and fringe benefits similar to those offered in other comparable careers where financial gain is not a primary motivation. Perhaps most important, it requires adequate opportunities for promotion in reward for meritorious service and a feeling from the lowest to the highest grade that the philosophy and standards of the service are in accord with the finest American traditions.

Yet we find a condition today where these requirements are being only inadequately met. Too many rich men with no prior training in diplomacy are being given ambassadorial appointments of importance simply because they are rich and have made political contributions. The administration has been unwilling to recommend—and the Congress has been too niggardly to force on a reluctant administration—representation allowances adequate to permit members of the Foreign Service without private means to fill not only many of the more important ambassadorships but a number of the lesser posts as well.

So long as this condition continues, no one can blame the Secretary of State for recommending, and no one can blame the President for nominating, wealthy men with inadequate qualifications for important diplomatic posts. Frankly, they have no alternative.

Mr. President, for that reason it occurs to me that the comments made by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] a few moments ago are irrelevant and immaterial to the issue before the Senate. Of course these nominations have to be made, until the President asks for more money and the Congress gives him more money, so that poor men will be able to fill ambassadorships of importance.

But this is not such a nomination. I should like to be scrupulously fair to Mr. McLeod and I shall try to discuss his background and alleged qualifications without bias. But I have come to the reluctant conclusion that whatever his assets and virtues may be—and I am sure they are many—he is not qualified to be our Ambassador to Ireland nor, indeed, to hold any other responsible diplomatic post.

I deem it important that the Senate should think hard about its role under the Constitution in giving its advice and consent to diplomatic appointments. Rare indeed have been the cases where the nominations of the President have been rejected. It is said, and I agree, that every presumption should be in favor of an executive nomination—for within very broad limits the President is entitled to select the agents he desires to carry out his important constitutional responsibilities in the conduct of foreign policy.

For that reason, Mr. President, I shall, somewhat reluctantly—but nonetheless I shall—vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Taylor as Ambassador to Switzerland, giving the President the benefit of what has been a very grave doubt in my mind.

Yet the requirement of Senatorial confirmation is not—and throughout history has not been treated as—a mere formality. Diplomatic nominations have been rejected from the earliest days of the Republic. Later on, Martin Van Buren was rejected as Ambassador to England through the joint efforts of three former Members of this body—Senators Clay, Calhoun, and Webster—who have just been nominated as 3 of the 5 most outstanding Members ever to serve in the Senate of the United States. Not so long ago the nomination of Edward J. Flynn to be Ambassador to Australia was withdrawn after it became apparent the Senate would not confirm him. And even more recently, strenuous efforts were made to withhold consent to the nomination of our great Ambassador to the Soviet Union—Charles E. Bohlen.

I suggest that the test which should guide the Senate in passing on executive nominations for ambassadorships is a very simple one: Will the nomination tend to bring the United States Government into disrepute with significant and important segments of opinion at home and abroad?

It is because I have reluctantly come to believe that with respect to Mr. McLeod this question must be answered in the affirmative that I am opposed to the confirmation of his nomination.

First, let us consider Mr. McLeod's personal background. He grew up in Iowa and graduated from Grinnell College, where he was a successful athlete. He worked briefly as a newspaper reporter, and then joined the Federal Bureau of Investigation, where he served 7 years. He then became administrative assistant to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. There has been not one iota of criticism with respect to Mr. McLeod's career up to this point. But I suggest his warmest friend could not contend that this experience qualifies him to be our Ambassador to Ireland, or, indeed, anywhere else.

Mr. McLeod's qualifications must, I submit, be judged by his activities during the period from March 3, 1953, to date. During these 4 years he served as Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State. In this newly created position, he had charge of the passport office; the visa office; the security office; the office of special consular services; the office of munitions control, and the office of refugees and migrants. During the first years of his service, he also had charge of the hiring, promotion, demotion, and firing of employees of the Foreign Service and the Department of State within the limits of applicable law and under the supervision of higher authorities. He has testified before the Foreign Relations Committee:

> Roughly I would say the first year I was in office, my attention was almost wholly devoted to security problems, to reorganization of the security office, the establishment of these procedures, the drafting and printing of regulations.
>
> Then to the monumental task of investigating all the personnel of the Department, which is required under the orders—

Parenthetically, it was not required under the order to investigate all personnel—"the evaluation of those investigations and the clearances."

> From that time on, I would say that I spent very little time on security, almost wholly devoting myself to two things—the Refugee Relief Act and the elevating of the position of the consular service.

Mr. McLeod takes some pride—perhaps justifiably—in his work in connection with the consular service, which he refers to as "activity of a constructive and permanent nature to which I have devoted myself for the last 2½ years." There is no testimony in the record other than Mr. McLeod's own declarations which permits us to evaluate his performance in connection with the consular service, and I raise no question as to the validity of his own appraisal of his achievements in this field.

My opposition to confirmation of Mr. McLeod's nomination is accordingly confined to five specific points.

First, his conduct of security and personnel programs within the Department of State brought the leadership of the Department into disrepute with important segments of public opinion at home and abroad, and lowered to a significant extent the morale of members of the Department of the Foreign Service.

Second, the extent to which he engaged in partisan politics while holding an office requiring political impartiality in its conduct cast grave doubts as to the maturity of his judgment.

Third, in his administration of the Refugee Relief Act he further brought himself into disrepute by clear evidence of a lack of sympathy with the legislation he was duty bound to implement. In addition, he evidenced such a lack of administrative ability that in the end the control of the program was turned over to others who eventually saved it from the disaster, toward which it was headed while Mr. McLeod remained in charge.

Fourth, his public philosophy, as well as his conduct, have brought him into disrepute with mature public opinion at home and abroad.

Fifth, and finally, his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee raises questions of candor and veracity which cannot satisfactorily be resolved without further testimony from those whose charges Mr. McLeod—not under oath—has expressly or by implication denied.

First, I turn to his administration of security and personnel programs. Mr. McLeod was charged by Executive Order 10450 with supervising the security clearance of employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service holding sensitive positions, existing and prospective. As all will remember, the climate in Washington in those days was hardly conducive to fair play toward employees. At that time, there had been created a widespread, though, in my judgment, quite unfounded, belief in the minds of many people that the State Department was filled with spies, Communists, and individuals of questionable moral character. It was a time for a clear head and a sound judgment in order to accomplish the objectives of the executive order without injury to the governmental service or injustice to individuals. It was a time for remembering the spirit of the constitutional safeguards of the person, which are a cornerstone of our American freedoms.

Yet, Mr. McLeod's approach to his task is well summarized in a statement he made to a reporter from Collier's magazine on July 9, 1954, after his task of screening security risks in the Department was accomplished: "Congress wanted heads to roll and I let them roll." He promptly, and quite without justification, decided that every employee in the State Department occupied a sensitive position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "What Price Security," written by Charlotte Knight and published in Collier's magazine of July 9, 1954.

The article appears at pages 79 and the following of the record of hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee.

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

WHAT PRICE SECURITY?

(By Charlotte Knight)

One of the major campaign pledges which helped sweep the present administration into power in Washington was the promise that it would clean out of Government all the spies, traitors, Communists, and fellow travelers who were said to exist there in frightening numbers—free to give away top secret and confidential documents, to formulate policies harmful to the national interest, and generally to carry out any orders of a foreign power. For a year and a half now, the Republicans have been translating that promise into action.

I have just spent 2 months in Washington in a comprehensive study of the Eisenhower security program and its effect on the Government—particularly on the State Department, which for years has been under withering Republican fire as a nest of incompetents and subversives. Aware that I was

treading on explosive political ground, I interviewed scores of officials and employees in every echelon of the State Department, Republicans and Democrats alike.

I met with the people administering the security program and with many of the people directly affected by it. Collier's reporters abroad rounded out the picture by checking at our embassies and ministries in Europe and Asia, and sending their findings to me.

The inescapable conclusion is that the new security program—intended to provide maximum protection for the Nation's secrets and for innocent Government workers as well—has been so often irresponsibly administered that it may have done more harm to the United States than to its enemies. Security has been tightened in certain respects—notably in the protection of classified documents—but only at tremendous cost.

Close observers of State for many years, including Democrats, agree that the Department needed a major overhaul, that there was a fair amount of deadweight among its personnel, and that the new administration could find plenty of employees who had been dragging their feet too long. Like every Government department, State had its inefficient and incompetent workers. More than most departments, it was beset by a hodgepodge of administrative practices that badly needed cleaning up. "There hasn't been good organization or discipline in the State Department since 1924, when Charles Evans Hughes was running it," one insider told me.

"But," he added, "the employees here are, by and large, devoted and hard working—even dedicated. Many of them have turned down well-paying business offers because they felt they could contribute more to the general welfare by staying in the Government. To a greater extent than in any other agency except the Armed Forces, they are careerists—people of both parties who have always looked forward to spending their lives in Government. Now * * *?"

Now, I found, a shocking proportion of them are completely fed up. Their morale is shot. Because of the way the security program has been administered, raw fear pervades all but the topmost levels—infecting even some of the security officials who created it. Hundreds of workers are disillusioned with Government service, dismayed at the trend toward conformity, discouraged and often downright disgusted with the practices employed in the name of security.

Worst of all, the handling of foreign affairs in the field has—in the opinion of some of our foremost diplomats and former diplomats—been greatly damaged.

One highly respected former ambassador told me: "We are witnessing today one of the most dangerous and un-American activities in our history. Suspicion has supplanted trust: 'You distrust me, I distrust you' has become the prevailing attitude."

He added earnestly: "Be sure you label this accurately, for this is something hideous and new in America."

The State Department is not the only agency affected, although the situation is probably at its worst there. "Today the morale of the Federal employee is at an alltime low." Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, told the Senate. "Employees so plagued with fear that they hesitate even to repeat their own names cannot be performing their work efficiently. It is almost impossible to ascertain the cost, the unnecessary waste of millions of dollars, created by this low morale."

How has this situation come about?

There are three basic causes for the lowering of morale in the Government, all of them—in the State Department, at least—inextricably intermixed. The first was the change of administration from Democratic to Republican, with major job shakeups for the first time in 20 years. The second was a 20-percent reduction in force (called RIF around Washington)—an across-the-board cut in personnel decreed for economy reasons. Between the two, Government workers got the jitters; many weren't sure from one day to the next whether their jobs were safe.

The third major cause of unrest was President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450.

Executive Order 10450, which a visitor to Washington hears mentioned constantly, is the Eisenhower security directive, supplanting the loyalty check set up by President Truman in 1947. The new directive was intended to strengthen the machinery providing for the dismissal of security risks, and to protect those dismissed for talking too much or for other improprieties from being branded as disloyal. Under the old Truman program, it was felt, too many innocent individuals had suffered from the lack of such a precaution.

"They whole key to the new order," said Robert W. Minor, first assistant to the Deputy Attorney General, and the man credited with being 10450's chief architect, "is that a man can be a security risk without being disloyal; and 10450 provides the means to get rid of him as expeditiously as possible—consistent with his rights."

The intent was admirable. But, in practice, 10450 has intensified precisely the injustices it was meant to prevent.

In the State Department, all three job policies—the political shuffle, RIF, and the security program—were placed in the hands of one man, 40-year-old Robert Walter Scott McLeod, close friend of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, and former administrative assistant to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, longtime State Department critic whose Appropriations Committee holds the Government's purse strings. Congress created a new State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs—and, it is believed by many, Congress dictated the choice of BRIDGES' aide, McLeod, as its administrator. It was a powerful post—and its importance was further enhanced by the Department when Personnel was added to its functions.

McLeod, by his own word, was brought in to "clean up the mess." The first man in State Department history to be equipped with the twin clubs of personnel and security (and possibly the last; he has now been deprived of personnel). McLeod lost no time in swinging them in all directions.

"Congress wanted heads to roll," McLeod told me, "and I let 'em roll. Blood in the streets and all that," he added jokingly. "I asked the security office what cases they still had pending in their files. They gave me the names of 'untouchables,' people too high up or too prominent to fire. I said nonsense to all that, and we brought 'em back fast and got rid of 'em.

"I may have acted unwisely in some instances. Now that I've been here longer I don't think I'd again order an ambassador quickly recalled and demand his resignation, as I did, without first checking upstairs."

To many people, McLeod seemed to draw a thin, almost invisible line between "security" and "jobs" for Republicans." He made no secret of his desire to sweep out as many of "the old Acheson crowd" as possible, and he apparently made little distinction between the holders of top policy jobs, who were fair game, and the rest of the State Department's 11,000 employees, who had always thought they were nonpolitical workers protected by civil service. McLeod complained, in fact, that civil service regulations were hampering his efforts to find jobs for Republicans. In a speech before the American Legion, he said:

"Sometimes it is extremely difficult, because of the Civil Service Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Foreign Service Act, to replace an individual whose viewpoint does not coincide with that of the Republican Party."

Around the Department he was heard on at least one occasion referring to those "civil-service slobs," and he applied the term of derogation, "Acheson holdover," so sweepingly that one Foreign Service officer with almost 25 years of service roared indignantly: "What does he mean, 'Acheson holdover'? Dammit, I'm a Stimson holdover."

CAREER DIPLOMAT'S REPUTATION DAMAGED

When President Eisenhower nominated career diplomat Charles E. (Chip) Bohlen to be Ambassador to the U. S. S. R., McLeod opposed the appointment so vigorously that he actually went over the heads of his State Department superiors to protest, behind the scenes, to a key White House aid. The Senate held up confirmation of Bohlen, and the word got out on Capitol Hill that there was derogatory information in Bohlen's security file. The President and Secretary of State Dulles supported Bohlen to the hilt, and the Senate finally approved him, but not before his reputation had suffered. Months later, while engaged in research for this story, I learned that security had nothing to do with McLeod's position regarding Bohlen. He had merely felt that Bohlen was so closely allied with the policies of the Truman administration that he was a "public relations hazard."

McLeod's ventures into politics reached a peak last February, when he made a series of highly partisan Lincoln Day political addresses around the country, touching off a roar of press and Congressional protest that crossed party lines and earned him, according to reports, a regular top-sergeant-style "chewing out" from Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, the Under Secretary of State. (Smith later referred wryly to that mid-February period as "McLeod Week.")

The effect of McLeod's sweeping security and personnel policies within the Department has been almost incredible, a word I do not use lightly.

For the first time on any assignment, I encountered not just a few, but literally dozens of individuals who were afraid to be seen talking to a reporter. These officials, below the top executive level, often urged me to go away and find somebody else to question. "Look," said one man, "I understand the problem, and I wish I could talk to you. I think my information would help. But I've got 10 years in the Department now, and I hope to stay in. I just don't dare take a chance."

Those who did consent to talk insisted on the safeguards of what could only be called clandestine arrangements; interviews away from the State Department, away from anyone who might be likely to report back that Mr. X was seen talking to a reporter. I discovered there was justification for such caution. One day I had lunch at my hotel with one of McLeod's severest critics. A few days later, I lunched with McLeod's confidential secretary, who said, "Oh, by the way, five different people have called to say that you have been talking to ———" and she named the man.

There seemed to be an almost pathological fear of tapped telephone wires. And although security officers will go to great lengths to tell you (even before you ask them) that telephones in State are positively not tapped, it makes little difference so long as the prevailing feeling is that they are.

The fear of wire taps extends even to State's own medical department. Just before leaving Washington, I rang a doctor to check a point in connection with one of the medical criteria in 10450. I had hoped my question could be answered by phone, but the doctor requested that I come to his office. When I arrived, he guided me to another office farther down the hall, where we were joined by one of his colleagues.

Then he explained: "It isn't safe to discuss things over the phone."

Security officers themselves sometimes become victims of their own cloak-and-dagger routine. One day I rang one such officer at his office to request a routine appointment. He was plainly irritated. "For goodness' sake," he admonished. "I thought this was a matter for some discretion. I can't possibly see you here. If you want to arrange an interview elsewhere, call me at my home. Please don't call me here."

On another occasion, I announced to one of McLeod's key aids that I would soon be returning to New York. He had been extremely cooperative, and assured me that if I needed any additional data I should feel free to ask him.

"Fine," I said. "I'll call you."

"No," he said seriously. 'Don't do that. The phones aren't safe."

"But I thought it was one of your jobs to make sure they were safe," I said.

"Long-distance is never safe. Write me a letter."

"O. K." I said, and turned to leave.

"Wait a minute," he said. "You'd better not sign your name. Let's work out something else."

So we decided on a suitable pseudonym, if and when I needed to communicate.

Most shocking, the atmosphere of fear extends even to the home. I called the wife of a State official who is now overseas and asked if I might come out and check a couple of minor facts about him for accuracy.

After I said I was writing a story, I could literally hear the fear come into her voice. I assured her that under no circumstances would I use her name, and begged again to see her for a few minutes. She reluctantly consented and I rode to her home in the suburbs outside Washington. When I arrived, I met a frightened woman. She pleaded with me to realize that her husband had been in the Department for many years, that his present position was possibly the only job a man with his experience could get, that they had several children, and wouldn't I please understand that she could not say anything to me at all?

I left at once, and started down the path. The door opened again and she suddenly ran after me. "Please," she implored, "will you please not tell anyone that you came to see me? You see, it could very well mean my husband's job."

What's everyone afraid of?

They're afraid, perhaps, that what happened to Dorsey Fisher—to cite just one example—may happen to them.

Fisher, a Foreign Service officer with 24 years' service, had been questioned and cleared in 1950 concerning allegations (some of them anonymous) involving people he had known in Mexico when he was information officer there. In March 1953, he was questioned on the same charges and—he thought—cleared. He was given a new appointment, as counselor of embassy in Jidda, Saudi Arabia, and prepared for it by taking inoculations, getting his orders, straightening out his travel tickets, and so on.

Four hours before his ship was to weigh anchor in New York, Fisher received a frantic phone call from Washington, explaining that there had been a mistake and that he hadn't been cleared after all. He was told to sit tight and await clearance.

Six nerve-wracking weeks later, Fisher was called back to Washington.

"I saw Robert Blank" (a pseudonym for one of McLeod's security officers) "for several hours. We went over the whole business again. Blank explained, and I know honestly, that cases under recent procedure are being decided very predominantly against the officers concerned, so that I could make up my mind to resign or let the case go through the full process and end in dismissal."

Fisher resigned. The quotation above is from his diary; afflicted with a long-time cardiac condition, he died of a heart attack a few months later. Today his friends are convinced that the security ordeal killed him; he had expressed fear that it would. That can never be proved one way or the other; the important fact is that people believe it, and are afraid.

They are also afraid of something else, which Fisher mentioned in a letter shortly before his death. "What took the heart out of me above all," he wrote, "was to find that everything in the way of work, devotion, and intelligence I had put into the service for 24 years, and the fact that office after office abroad had praised the job I'd done, was now regarded as completely irrelevant. They do not weigh against the most astonishing collection of rumors, allegations, and mystifications."

In addition to such disheartening personal experiences, there have been other reasons for uneasiness. The recent "numbers game" which aroused such a furor in Washington (with some Republicans claiming that all those dismissed under 10450 were subversives, when in fact only a small percentage were even remotely open to such a charge) has made it clear that the original intent of the order has been grossly distorted. The individual has received less protection from irresponsible charges than ever before. Many an employee separated from Government as a security risk simply because he has relatives behind the Iron Curtain (and could conceivably be vulnerable to Red blackmailers) has found that outside the Government the general belief is that all security risks fired from State are Communists or homosexuals, or both.

One result has been that some employees (possibly including some Democrats) who had been thinking of quitting for personal reasons have stayed on because they don't dare leave. A man with 8 years in the Department said: "I left a job with an oil company because I had a real interest in the people and customs of a certain part of Asia and I wanted to put this virtuosity at the service of my country. Now my years in State are actually held against me. Suppose I apply for a job in private industry. Resigned from the State Department? Why, they'd say, he must be a Commie, or at least a sexual deviate."

Absurd? Not at all. I heard of a man who resigned not long ago and applied for a job in a business organization. His prospective employers agreed that he was well qualified, but offered to hire him only on one condition: if the State Department would reemploy him, for just a month, to remove any onus that might be attached to his resignation.

In part, the trouble with the security program is inherent in Executive Order 10450; in part it's the result of the way the order has been administered.

Under 10450, a Government employee in a sensitive position—a term which embraces everyone in State—may be dismissed for a number of obvious security reasons with which there can be no quarrel. Originally outlined in President Truman's Executive Order 9835, the predecessor to 10450, they include such acts as sabotage, treason, espionage, Communist activity, disclosure of secret data, and so on. Where there's evidence of such activity, the investigation is handled by the FBI.

But 10450 also added a list of suitability criteria not involving subversive actions, some of them so loosely worded that almost anyone could become ensnarled in them. A man may now be fired, in the words of the order, for:

"Any behavior, activities or associations which tend to show that the individual is not reliable or trustworthy; any deliberate misrepresentations, falsifications, or omissions of material facts; any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess, drug addiction, or sexual perversion; an adjudication of insanity, or treatment for serious mental or neurological disorder without satisfactory evidence of cure; any facts which furnish reason to believe that the individual may be subjected to coercion, influence or pressure which may cause him to act contrary to the best interests of national security."

The principle of guilt by association was thus made a part of the official standards for judging a security risk. Even the security program's loudest critics acknowledge that a lifetime of association with proved spies (or the equivalent) would be a clear indication of untrustworthiness. But, they say, the principle is carried much further than that. I heard of at least one worker whose own file was absolutely devoid of derogatory information but who had to resign anyhow—because the man who had hired him had come under suspicion.

When you ask McLeod's staff what standards they use to judge guilt by association, they have a ready answer (I heard it half a dozen times): "We don't have to prove a man is a duck. If he waddles like a duck, quacks like a duck and associates with ducks, that's enough."

MR. DULLES' DISCONCERTING DEMAND

Other areas of 10450 also are open to wide interpretation. Scott McLeod told me that, when Secretary Dulles first read 10450, he called in the security administrator and, as McLeod walked in the door, snapped: "McLeod, define 'immorality'."

"I can't, sir," said McLeod.

"Then I suggest you cut this provision out."

Since the Presidential order had already gone out to other departments, the word was permitted to remain—along with other words and phrases which all but defied definition.

"How do you decide," asked one man, "what constitutes 'excessive drinking'? At what number of drinks do you draw the line? If you forgot to list on your employment form an arrest for a minor traffic accident in 1937, who decides whether it was a 'deliberate' omission?"

In the State Department, the basic decision is made by a group of evaluators working under McLeod. They check through what Dorsey Fisher called the "rumors, allegations, and mystifications" in the individual security files and recommend suspension if the information strikes them as sufficiently damaging. Theoretically, such a recommendation is always thoroughly reviewed before being acted on—clear up to the Secretary himself. Actually, the staggering number of investigations and reinvestigations made necessary by 10450 would make it physically impossible for any one man—McLeod or Secretary Dulles or anyone else—to delve into every scrap of derogatory information read by the original evaluator. (An exception was the personal review by Dulles of the 2,000-page dossier on veteran career diplomat John Paton Davies, who has been cleared 8 times, yet has had to go through the mill again.)

Since last October, McLeod's chief security aide has been Dennis A. Flinn, a Foreign Service officer with a wide investigative and intelligence background, including 8 years as an FBI agent. Flinn assured me that evaluators' reports are carefully checked by senior evaluators and by himself, and sent back if there seems to be any question. But Flinn added a significant qualification: "If, on the other hand, it's a clear-cut case for suspension or clearance, I sign the recommendation."

Obviously, an untrained, inexperienced, overworked evaluator could easily make a clear-cut case where none actually exists. And not all Flinn's evaluators are as well trained—or as numerous—as he'd like.

One of Flinn's predecessors under McLeod, confronted with the enormous task of investigation and reinvestigation imposed by 10450, is reported to have told his staff: "If you've got any friends or acquaintances we could hire, send 'em in—even if they can just walk and talk."

"It was a bad situation," admitted one of McLeod's assistants. "How can you make a proper investigation if you've never had any training? It was the blind leading the blind—investigations and evaluations, both being made by inexperienced people."

When Flinn took over last October, he says the security office was only two-thirds staffed—and he still feels he hasn't enough qualified evaluators. He believes evaluators should have a college degree, preferably in law, and several years of investigative experience. At present, his 12 evaluators include only 7 with law degrees—plus 1 who never went to college, 2 who didn't finish, 1 who has had no previous investigative experience, and 3 who have had less than 1 year's experience in evaluation.

It was such a staff which, in the 7 months between the time 10450 went into effect and the end of last year, accounted for the separation of 193 "security risks" in State—1 of whom was a suspected, but unproved, subversive.

By all odds the most bitterly criticized aspect of the present security procedure is that it is not necessary to prove a man guilty before recommending his suspension; the Government doesn't even have to prove "reasonable doubt" exists. The entire burden of proof rests with the accused.

McLeod has defended this reversal of the time-honored tradition that under democracy any man is innocent until proved guilty. "The common error," he has said in a number of public speeches, "is to feel that there is some analogy between the security system and the judicial system." The present theory—based on statements made by several Supreme Court Justices over the years—is that "Government employment is not a right, but a privilege" and that the Government is entitled to withhold the privilege from anyone it chooses.

Very often, for economic reasons, a man cannot afford to fight for this privilege (or his reputation). There is, to be sure, an elaborate procedure designed to protect the rights of the individual. But it is so cumbersome, so time-consuming, and in the end so financially costly that very few Government workers can avail themselves of it. Consequently, the resignations are absurdly high in proportion to the number dismissed.

Take a typical example: Joe Jones suddenly finds himself suspended without pay—and without notice. If he chooses to go through the appeal routine, he is given a written statement of charges, to which he may reply within 30 days. During that month, he must try to gather enough evidence to disprove these charges—and, if he can afford it, he gets a lawyer. If he has served abroad (and many in State are Foreign Service officers), lengthy depositions must be obtained from individuals outside the United States. In one case, the cost of obtaining such depositions alone was $1,500.

If Jones' written reply doesn't satisfy security officers, he is notified that his job is to be terminated. Weeks may have elapsed since his suspension—and in the meantime Jones has had no income. But if he and his wife, after counting their savings once more, decide they can hang on a little while longer, Jones announces that he wants to appeal before the hearing board—a panel of three Government workers from other agencies, taken from civil-service rosters. Jones and his lawyer prepare their defense, which very often includes bringing character witnesses from great distances—at Jones' expense.

Months go by and Jones is still waiting for his hearing. He wants to clear his name—but finally there comes a point where this natural desire must give way before mounting necessity to earn a living. Soon Jones may reach the point where proving his innocence becomes a luxury he cannot afford.

As of the time I arrived in Washington, not one security case in State had gone through the full appeals procedure under 10450. Only in the last few weeks have any hearing boards been called; five were convened in the late spring to make recommendations to Secretary Dulles on various cases, including that of John Paton Davies.

Knowing the cards stacked against them, the long months without pay, the anxiety of prolonged waiting, the excessive costs involved where the whole burden of proof falls on the accused, most State employees charged with being security risks quietly resign at the outset.

As one Department employee after another has gone down the security chute, those who remain have become more and more frightened—and less efficient. State Department morale had already been hard hit by the security hearings held by Senator McCarthy's subcommittee just before McLeod took over (they stopped, significantly, soon afterward).

It was reported in the New York Times that during the McCarthy hearings the head of one office said his staff "was able to do only about one-half its normal output of work," and another was said to have confided to a friend, "I am engaged in an intense effort to fade into the wallpaper."

THE CASE OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The worst damage caused by McCarthy and the subsequent 10450 security program was done to the Foreign Service.

The Foreign Service is an independent agency within the Department. Its members are chosen under a non-civil-service set of regulations and they must meet stringent requirements—including rigorous examinations and training. The service is a small, proud, intensely fraternal corps, not unlike the Marine Corps in many respects. Its 1,285 members, diplomatic officers at the American posts and missions around the world, are jealous of their reputations; what happens to any one of them is felt throughout the entire Service, from the big European Embassies to the remotest Asian outposts.

The Bohlen incident, which occurred shortly after McLeod became Security Administrator, shocked and disheartened them. What happened next—the hasty summons from overseas posts of one Foreign Service officer after another for security interrogation in Washington, and, with rare exceptions, their subsequent failure to return—plunged those who remained into a state approaching utter despair.

"I had a long talk with the Ambassador," wrote one of Collier's correspondents from a European capital. "He said that McLeod's antics are making us look like fools to people abroad. I got the impression that a foreign diplomat talks to one of our representatives now as if he half expects him to be gone tomorrow."

Among many Foreign Service officers, the impression grew that it wasn't safe to report the truth to Washington about any foreign situation when the truth didn't jibe with the preconceived notions of the people in Washington.

"The young Foreign Service officer now is up against it," a State Department official told me. "He knows what the views are at headquarters. Suppose he comes up against information that is contrary to those views. To play it safe, he tones down what he sends in, so he can't possibly be accused of being in sympathy with the wrong side."

Another man said: "Part of our job when we go abroad is to keep in touch with the opposition party, as well as with the party in power. Sometimes, in fact, most of the time the opposition is a leftwing group. Because they are the opposition, and because it isn't wise to let local officials see you talking to them, most such meetings are handled with some secrecy, usually at night.

"Can you imagine what some inexperienced evaluator with no knowledge of foreign affairs would make of those nocturnal meetings a few years later?"

A counselor of Embassy in one overseas capital stated the situation baldly. "Some reports," he said, "are being written so as not to give an accurate picture of conditions, but rather to keep the man writing the report in the clear * * *."

The fate of Foreign Service officers who served in China jolted the rest of the Service. Almost everybody who had anything to do with China before it went Communist has now been completely discredited. Today nobody wants the same to happen to him.

One Collier's correspondent heard of a diplomat who was offered an excellent post last year in a troubled southeast Asian country. Although he was exceptionally well qualified for the job (he spoke a number of oriental languages and had spent years in the Far East, he turned it down cold. In effect, he argued this way:

"If we lose that country to the Communists, as we may, I don't want it on my record that I served there. Why should I risk my career trying to convince McLeod and McCarthy that it wasn't entirely my fault? The best I could hope for would be the fight of my life just to prove I was a loyal American, and then, oblivion. No, thanks."

When Collier's reporter was told that story, he said. "But an officer in the Army couldn't turn down a tough assignment just because victory isn't guaranteed."

"You're right," said his informant. "But that's the Army. Someone in the Foreign Service who's been connected with a losing battle against communism, whatever the odds, is lucky if he isn't charged with treason."

Even the future of the Foreign Service—whatever remedial action might be taken for present ills—seems to have been threatened. Here are two almost identical quotes from college professors: "I find it almost impossible to interest able seniors in a Foreign Service career. They prefer to go to the Central Intelligence Agency, which few considered before, because it stood up for its own people"—that is, when it was under attack by Senator McCarthy. The second quote: "It is becoming steadily more difficult to draw able men into Government service * * *. I can interest students in the CIA, which stood firm against attack, but not in the Foreign Service."

Last January 17, the sad state of the Foreign Service was suddenly exposed to light by five of its most distinguished former members, in a strongly worded letter to the New York Times. The five men—former diplomats Norman Armour, Robert Woods Bliss, Joseph C. Grew, William Phillips, and G. Howland Shaw—referred to the attacks on Foreign Service officers, then declared:

"With rare exceptions, the justification for these attacks has been so flimsy as to have no standing in a court of law or in the mind of any individual capable of differentiating repeated accusation from even a reasonable presumption of guilt. Nevertheless, these attacks have had sinister results.

"The conclusion has become inescapable, for instance, that a Foreign Service officer who reports on persons and events to the very best of his ability, and who makes recommendations which at the time he conscientiously believes to be in the best interest of the United States, may subsequently find his loyalty and integrity challenged, and may even be forced out of the service and discredited forever as a private citizen after many years of distinguished service. A premium, therefore, has been put upon reporting and upon recommendations which are

ambiguously stated or so cautiously set forth as to be deceiving. When any such tendency begins its insidious work, it is not long before accuracy and initiative have been sacrified to acceptability and conformity. The ultimate result is a threat to national security.

A QUESTION JUSTIFIED BY CIRCUMSTANCES

They added that under the circumstances it seemed fair to ask "whether we are not laying the foundations of a Foreign Service competent to serve a totalitarian government rather than the Government of the United States as we have heretofore known it."

The response to the letter came fast and hard. Letters of endorsement poured in to the five signers from Foreign Service officers (from Ambassadors down) in every corner of the world. More important, the letter to the Times— having been signed by 2 former Under Secretaries, 2 former Assistant Secretaries, and a one-time Ambassador—was read within the Department at top levels which had previously been inclined to pay little attention to reports of low morale.

Few Secretaries of State have stepped into the job at a more difficult time than John Foster Dulles did when he assumed his duties a year and a half ago. Preoccupied with a seemingly endless series of foreign problems, Dulles had little time in which either to learn about, or to be concerned with, the welfare of the people serving under him. As it was once conceded to newsmen, the very topmost officials seldom get an opportunity to talk to anyone but other top officials. As a result, many State executives seemed convinced that everything was fine at the lower levels. One consequence of this attitude was a series of public statements on morale that probably hurt morale as much as anything could.

Secretary of State Dulles has said that morale in State is high.

Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, the Under Secretary, assured me personally that morale in the Department is good.

Scott McLeod has been quoted in print as saying morale is high.

Everybody in the State Department security office, to a man, insists morale is high.

I argued the point with McLeod. How did he know morale was good? I asked.

"Well," he said, "the Secretary said it is high. What more do you want?"

Earlier, some newsmen had asked how he justified his statement about morale, in view of the letter from the five diplomats. "These guys are on the outside now," he explained. "They didn't come and ask me, or Bedell Smith, or (Under Secretary) Don Lourie about morale."

I spoke to Robert Cartwright, McLeod's very capable deputy administrator, who, like McLeod, is a former FBI agent.

"You hear a lot about fear," he said. "I have had no feeling of fear. I don't know anyone who is afraid—except possibly those who have reason to be * * * like the felon who is apprehensive about being caught. I think the whole thing is terribly overdone."

Finally, I saw George Wilson, formerly Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND's right-hand man, later McLeod's Chief of Personnel. "All this fear business is simply self-induced hysteria, in my opinion," he said. "Anyway, the farther you get away from Washington, the better morale always is."

About as far from Washington as you can get, in the remote Foreign Service outposts, career diplomats were writing letters like this to colleagues in the United States:

"We have had the distinct feeling that we were not considered worth defending, and that perhaps the work of the Foreign Service is no longer thought to be as high a calling as we imagined it to be." (Foreign Service personnel, like other State Department personnel, come under the supervision of George Wilson.)

Wrote another: "Won't you please try to catch the Secretary in one of his less busy moments and convince him that his own personal intervention on behalf of his Department is now required? * * * Without mentioning my own feelings, I must say that wherever I travel these days I find a nearly unanimous feeling that there is little hope for us because the head of the family is not fighting for us * * *."

OPINIONS DIFFERED ON MORALE

Thus, while the Secretary and his immediate subordinates were insisting that morale was fine, the people whose morale was involved (including at least 185 Foreign Service officers, by actual count of letters sent to Americans from abroad and individuals interviewed overseas by Collier's reporters) were pleading to be heard on the subject of their own fear and dismay.

Last March, Secretary Dulles acted. He separated Scott McLeod's jobs, leaving him with Security and Consular Affairs, but removing personnel from his jurisdiction. Not long afterward, Dulles announced the formation of the Secretary of State's Public Committee on Personnel (called the Wriston Committee, after its chairman, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University) and said that one of its tasks would be to study "requirements to increase public confidence and fortify personnel morale."

McLeod frankly smarted over what he felt was a demotion. He told me:

"I didn't know anything about it until the day after Secretary Dulles left for the Inter-American Conference in Caracas. When he returned I went directly to his office and said, 'Are you mad at me? If so, I'll go quietly.' He assured me that was not the case, but now that most of the security cases had been handled, my job could be described as a change in mission; from cleanup to checkup. At least, that's the way we planned to present it at his next press conference. But nobody asked."

"Nevertheless," McLeod said, getting back to his clipped wings, "I think they should at least have shown Congress the courtesy of discussing this with the committees concerned before just bluntly coming out with an announcement."

McLeod disclosed that he had insisted on having control over personnel policies before he would consent to run the security program. "If you're going to clean up a mess," he said, "I think personnel is the big broom in the cleanup. There's a lot of mess here that isn't due to security alone. There are people who aren't sympathetic with Eisenhower's policies, for instance. Obviously, the only way you can correct that situation is to have authority over personnel."

McLeod was bitter over the press attacks which had characterized his first year in office. He spoke of an "inspired, planned campaign to 'get' me," and added: "Don't let anybody kid you. The ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) are calling the shots on this campaign."

Certainly the State Department security picture under McLeod has not been so black as a few people have painted it. Even many of his critics will admit that the security situation in State in the years preceding the present administration was long overdue for a general tightening up, and that McLeod's staff has at least accomplished that.

It is easy for a reporter to find numerous examples of bad, or careless, security practices in the past—including a secret cable that was once found on the floor of Washington's Union Station (how it got there nobody knows to this day), confidential papers left in open desks overnight, safes frequently left unlocked—and so on.

"A potential enemy in those days didn't need a high-level spy," admitted one former State official. "By giving some charwoman 10 bucks to bring him what she could find lying around loose, an agent could have made quite a haul almost any time."

Serious though these flaws were, however, they are chalked up to general administrative laxity (for years one of State's greatest overall weaknesses), and to the inherent carelessness of the average American—who, until fairly recently, has never been very espionage-conscious—rather than to a calculated attempt on the part of anybody to allow "traitors free run" (McLeod's words) in the Department.

A major handicap of previous administrations was a scarcity of trained, experienced security personnel. Low standards, poor salaries, and lack of inspired leadership did not make it easy to attract men of talent and training.

"Many really competent security officers—and there are few good ones anywhere—left to find something better," said one departee. "Ex-FBI men who ended up in State's security office nearly went 'nuts' with the slipshod way things were run. Security became a sort of waiting room for people looking for other jobs."

Said another: "Some of the goings on in security were strictly comic-opera: serious investigations conducted by telephone, evaluations made on people's cases (and whole futures) by untrained guys, some of 'em just kids who'd worked up from clerks and had no previous investigative experience. There were no training courses, no manuals, not even proper guidance."

It is to McLeod's credit that many internal ills within the security shop are being corrected as fast as time, congressional appropriations and the recruiting of veteran security personnel will permit. Tighter administration, improved filing and index systems, training and stricter disciplinary measures for infractions have resulted in a better physical security throughout all the Department's domestic and overseas installations.

In almost every public speech, McLeod is fond of citing one case in point: "We have a Marine guard system at our overseas missions," he explains. "The Marines go around at night to make sure that everything is locked up. I was astonished when I got a report from one geographic area sometime last year that there had been 233 individual security violations in that one area in 1 month. Documents left lying on the desks. Safes left unlocked.

"I wanted to know who were the people involved, how often they were involved," he continues. "Well, there was no information on that. None whatsoever. So we started a system of security-violation forms. Now a copy is attached to the personnel file of the officer * * *. After we started having a regular report on security violations, the number went down from 223 in a month to 15."

LAUNCHING A "CRASH" PROGRAM

Prodded by the White House and the Attorney General's Office to finish the initial cleanup under 10450 by June 30 of this year, State was forced to borrow 100 investigators from the Civil Service Commission this spring and launch into a "crash" program to meet the deadline—when all investigations or reinvestigations of the 11,000 employees were supposed to be completed. I asked McLeod if he could assure the President that the job was all wrapped up. He prudently replied that it was "substantially" finished. "Security is never entirely finished," he said. "The day I say it's finished, the next day we'll find a spy."

Just how well is the Government equipped to find a spy under the present security setup?

I consulted counterespionage specialists who presumably would know. They expressed serious reservations about the ability of any security program built around Execu-

tive Order 10450 to stop a really determined and expert enemy agent. More than likely, they said, 10450 would merely alert him to the obvious pitfalls.

One of McLeod's consultants, a retired FBI inspector of 30 years' experience, told me a spy wouldn't have a chance of penetrating State now. But McLeod himself gave a somewhat contrary impression in secret testimony before a House Appropriations Subcommittee last January 25. He was asked whether the Department's present investigative procedure would have turned up Alger Hiss, sent to prison for having lied about his connections with an espionage ring. He said that it would not.

There is even a certain amount of confusion over what security risks McLeod's office has turned up.

During the big numbers-game row there was talk of 534 security risks found in State, then 590. Democrats and the press clamored for a breakdown: precisely how many had been fired as subversive and how many for less significant reasons? "I don't think the people are concerned with any breakdown," said Scott McLeod. "They don't care if they were drunks, perverts, or Communists—they just want us to get rid of them."

Nevertheless, the newspapers—including Republican journals—demanded the figures, and finally Civil Service Commissioner Philip Young supplied them to the House Civil Service Committee. For State, the figure of 590 shrank to 117 security-risk separations under 10450, of whom no less than 112 had resigned.

Shortly afterward, McLeod called in his chief of security, Dennis Flinn, and said that if they were going to play the numbers game they'd better get some figures they could stick to. Flinn and his staff reviewed their files again, and came up with the latest figures: 309 security risks separated from State for all causes in 1953 (including 148 whose files contained derogatory information concerning alleged Communist associations or activities). Of the 309, 193 have been separated since 10450 went into effect, including 1 suspected subversive.

On January 25, Under Secretary Smith testified before a House committee that "no Communists had been found in the State Department and that as far as he knew there had never been any Communists there with the exception of Alger Hiss and a minor official fired long ago.

On February 10, 2 weeks later, McLeod told a Lincoln Day rally at Worland, Wyo.: "In the 20 years from 1933 to 1953, traitors had free run in high places and in low. It is not for me to tell you why—it is up to those who permitted it to tell you why. I wish they would. I wish they would stop squalling 'smear' and stand up like men and offer an explanation if they can * * *"

One month later, McLeod was asked by House Members whether he had found fewer or more people with subversive tendencies than he had expected to find when he assumed office. He conceded: "I think I have found fewer than I expected to find."

Said one Washington newsman: "Sure, many of the adverse press stories about Scotty are inspired. He inspires 'em."

As an additional indication that not only the left-wing papers have found fault with McLeod, there is the reaction met by Morehead Patterson, a prominent businessman and member of the Wriston Committee, when he held a private conference some weeks ago with 15 Washington newsmen long familiar with the internal problems of State. Patterson explained that he'd been named head of a subcommittee to concentrate on the morale problem and that he would appreciate concrete suggestions from the reporters. All 15—including representatives of so-called right-wing papers—recommended unanimously that the very first act should be to fire McLeod.

OUSTER WOULDN'T SOLVE PROBLEM

Patterson made no commitment and it is not known whether the suggestion was seriously considered. But it is probably safe to assume that before their study was completed the members of the Wriston Committee realized that although McLeod's ouster might cause rejoicing in certain quarters, it would certainly not alone solve the problem. In the end, the Wriston Committee confined its recommendations almost exclusively to administrative matters.

"In the final analysis," one State official commented, "McLeod and Executive Order 10450 and all the other aspects of the security ruckus are manifestations of a nationwide emotional phenomenon which can't be solved by a single committee of citizens, nor by the firing of one man.

"While it lasts, all we in the Department can do is try to hang on—and hope that the evaluators succeed in picking the truth out of the stuff supplied by the informers, malcontents and the paranoids suffering from persecution complex * * *"

I might have thought his last sentence was greatly exaggerated had I not come across Mrs. Sue Clegg in the course of my research in State. From time to time I kept hearing about a woman employee who had gone to the home of Secretary Dulles one weekend, rung his doorbell, and handed him a long list of Communists who were in her office—a list which she later sent to the security office.

I decided to get the facts firsthand, if possible. I phoned Mrs. Clegg, a clerk-stenographer, and asked to see her. She came to my hotel, armed with a briefcase full of typed memoranda, correspondence and photostats concerning her case, and spent the next half day trying to convince me "they" were "out to get rid of her."

Who were "they"? Her bosses, of course—all those Communists and fellow travelers who hated her for her own efforts to fight communism, and who resented her for not taking their orders. "Typical," she said, "of the sacrosanct hierarchy of Communist officials, who can say: 'I'm your boss. You're to do as I say.' "

REASONS GIVEN FOR DISMISSAL

Mrs. Clegg produced the most recent insult: official notice from the chief of the Personnel Operations Division concerning her proposed removal (which occurred some weeks later), for reasons stated in writing. The personnel officer alleged instance after instance of Mrs. Clegg's refusal to follow proper channels, of an insolent and uncooperative attitude toward her supervisors, and of many acts of clear insubordination.

"These are simply excuses to get rid of me," said Mrs. Clegg, who then went on to relate the "ill treatment" she had received from one of her former bosses. It appears that, in accordance with the standard Washington custom, he had been in the habit of asking one of the stenographers to bring him coffee from the cafeteria. Mrs. Clegg felt this chore was too time-consuming; she announced that she would no longer bring coffee to him. There followed an argument with Mrs. Clegg making so much of a fuss that the man sent a memo to her personnel supervisor, pointing out that her continued difficulty with the staff seemed to "stem from her failure to face the fact, which apparently is unpleasant to her, that her position is only that of stenographer. * * *"

Mrs. Clegg made a copy of the memo, and then decided the time had come to take action. That day, she typed a formal letter on an official State Department letterhead to Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., requesting that the FBI inquire into the background of the man with whom she'd had the dispute (Mrs. Clegg gave me a copy of the letter). Later in the day, she sent a telegram to the Attorney General advising him that the situation was urgent and that she needed help.

Mrs. Clegg didn't say what the outcome had been. I guessed that there had been none.

"Can you tell me about your visit to Secretary Dulles' home?" I asked.

"Oh, yes," she said eagerly. "That was a day I shall never forget. Before I brought him the scroll, I took a day of my annual leave; I spent the whole day in our Department library, checking through the official Biographical Registers. Then I went home that night and stayed up very late copying down on a long scroll a list of names of the people I believe to be Communists."

"But why a scroll?" I asked. "Why not just regular paper?"

"I didn't have any in the house so I had to use shelf paper," she said. "I used a strip about a yard long, and when I was through I rolled it up in scroll form. It was imperative that the Secretary get it at once."

"Why?"

"Well, the Secretary was to address one of the Congressional committees on Monday morning and I felt it important that he should be warned in advance that the material on which his testimony was to be based had been prepared by these Communists in my section."

"What evidence did you have that they were Communists?" I pressed.

"Well, I suppose you'd call it evidence through deductive reasoning."

"Could you be more explicit?"

"As I told you, I spent hours looking through the Biographical Registers. I checked off all the people in my section, what years they were in State, and so on, and then I looked up the exact period that Alger Hiss had been there. Naturally, everyone who was there with, or under, Hiss was in a position to be influenced by him, so those names went down on my scroll. Besides, most of them had favored the International Trade Organization and the lowering of United States tariffs.

"I made three copies of the scrolls—one for Secretary Dulles, one for the Chief of Security, and I kept the third," continued Mrs. Clegg. "I didn't finish it the way I wanted it until 3:30 Saturday afternoon. Then I dressed in my best black suit, for I sort of hoped that Mr. Dulles might invite me in to have tea to discuss this issue with him.

"Anyway," she said, "I grabbed the first cab I could and drove over to the Secretary's house. I rang the bell. The Dulles' car was by the door and it seems they were leaving for a reception, so I gave the scroll to the butler and told him that it was urgent and that the Secretary must have it personally. No, I wasn't asked for tea.

"Then on Monday, I took annual leave again and took a cab over to the security office, and gave the names to an official there."

DIAGNOSED AS A PARANOIAC

Later, when she received the charges against her, Mrs. Clegg typed up a 24-page reply and sent it to the personnel office. She furnished me with a copy. In it she describes with astonishing frankness several examinations by the State Department's psychiatrist, Dr. James P. Scanlon, who, it seems, had diagnosed Mrs. Clegg as a paranoiac. At one point, Mrs. Clegg writes:

"Dr. L——— (her own physician) told me that Dr. Scanlon's report on my condition as he diagnosed it had so alarmed him that he had telephoned my stepdaughter to help in finding my husband. * * * Dr. Scanlon had advised him that I was suffering from paranoia."

Mrs. Clegg was given sick leave for the purpose of getting treatment, and when the sick leave expired, she was returned to duty. When I talked with her in April she was still on active duty in the Department—a year after starting her personal campaign

against Communists in State. A few weeks later she was dismissed, as a result of the charges brought against her by the Personnel Operations Division.

How many Sue Cleggs are right now busily writing letters to the Attorney General, to the FBI or to security officers, naming fellow workers as Communist or fellow travelers, no one can tell. Nor can anyone outside the Department's own security office know for certain how many suspensions or resignations may have resulted from similar charges. But this much is certain: even a letter with as little foundation as Mrs. Clegg's finds its way into an individual's file which is thereafter tabbed as "containing derogatory information" and is placed at the mercy of an evaluator who must judge between fact and fancy. And it is a safe assumption that the accusers do not attach psychiatrists' official diagnosis of paranoia to the letters they write.

Was it possible that some of the "security risks" may have been separated from the State Department for reasons not entirely valid? I put the question to a key member of McLeod's staff.

"Grenades go off and sometimes hit a lot of people," he said, "maybe some they weren't intended to. But this is a war * * *."

Last year, outlining the administration's security plans in his first state of the Union message, President Eisenhower said:

"All these measures have two clear purposes. Their first purpose is to make certain that this Nation's security is not jeopardized by false servants. Their second purpose is to clear the atmosphere of that unreasoned suspicion that accepts rumor and gossip as substitutes for evidence."

There was no mention of war—particularly a war in which many of the casualties appear to be on our own side.

Mr. CLARK. He further stated, as reported by the New York Times on May 23, 1953, that he had ordered his aids to be completely ruthless in passing on new job applicants. On July 21, 1953, he was quoted in the New York Times as stating—note this carefully—that he saw no connection between Government employment and civil liberties.

Whether the results of his activities actually did uncover a significant number of security risks in the Department of State will probably be a matter of controversy for some time to come. Mr. McLeod was one of the principal players in the numbers game designed to persuade the American people that large numbers of disloyal and untrustworthy employees had been rooted out of the Government service by the new administration. Those who disagree with the police-court methods used are of the opinion that the results, to the extent to which they were beneficial, could have been achieved by calmer methods and more private procedures within the framework of civil liberties, the fundamentals of good administration, and sound personnel management, and that the methods used brought Government service in the State Department and elsewhere, at least temporarily, into public disrepute.

This latter contention, I submit, cannot successfully be denied.

I quote from four well-informed authors and commentators, each speaking about Mr. McLeod's activities in connection with the security checks. First, I quote from that distinguished reporter of Time magazine, Mr. John Robinson Beal, latest biographer of the Secretary of State:

How many individuals were done injustice [by Mr. McLeod's methods] * * * is something known only to the men in charge of the personnel records.

Mr. Joseph Alsop said that he has "done more harm to the Foreign Service than any other man in recent memory."

Miss Doris Fleeson:

The effect on Foreign Service morale was immediate, unfortunate, and lasting.

Mr. William Harlan Hale, in the Reporter magazine, August 1954:

Today, the total price of not having done something about McLeod—and of taking him and his team in the first place—can be reckoned. Figures do not tell the story since security distorts them; the price is written down in the breakdown of the integrity of the Government's No. 1 civilian department.

Mr. William Huskey was for 12 years a trusted employee of the State Department in charge of the security of distinguished foreign guests during their visits to the United States. It was his job to protect them. In many respects his duties were not unlike those in which Mr. McLeod had theretofore been engaged.

Mr. Huskey resigned in January of 1954 telling the press that Mr. McLeod was creating "an atmosphere of fright," bullying employees under investigation, referring to Government employees as "muttonheads," going "around from office to office, looking in files and questioning people. They would get the girls crying. Employees became so frightened they would not even say hello on the elevators."

That these quotations did not reflect the idle speculations of partisan reporters and personal enemies appeared clearly from a letter published in the New York Times on January 14, 1954, signed by 5 veteran and universally respected members of the Foreign Service: Norman Armour, Robert Woods Bliss, Joseph Clark Grew, William Phillips, and G. Howland Shaw. The letter read in part——

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

Mr. CLARK. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have just heard the Senator quote someone as saying that Mr. McLeod had thrown such a scare and such fear into employees of the State Department that girls wept and did not even dare to say hello to each other on the elevator. I realize that the Senator is quoting the statement, but I should like to ask him this question: He does not really believe it is true, does he?

Mr. CLARK. I will say to my good friend from New Hampshire, that I was not in Washington in 1953 and 1954 during what I, with all deference, call the reign of terror. I observed it only from a distance. However, the statement has been widely publicized and, although so far as I am concerned it is hearsay, I do know of my own personal knowledge that friends who were in the State Department at the time said that the conditions I have described were not very far from the truth.

I quote from the letter:

It is obvious, of course, that candidates for the Foreign Service should be carefully investigated before appointment and that their work should at all times be under the exacting scrutiny of their professional superiors. But when initial investigation attaches undue importance to such factors as even a temporary departure from conservative political and economic views, casual association with persons holding views not currently in fashion or subscription to a periodical labeled as liberal when subsequent investigation is carried to the point of delaying a promotion list for a year and routine transfers from one post to another; when investigations of individual officers must be kept up to date to within 90 days; when an easy path has been opened to even the anonymous informer; and when the results of these investigations are evaluated not by persons experienced in the Foreign Service or even acquainted at first hand with conditions abroad, but by persons of quite different experience, it is relevant to inquire whether we are not laying the foundations of a Foreign Service competent to serve a totalitarian government rather than the Government of the United States as we have heretofore known it.

This complaint from senior officers of the Foreign Service stirred Secretary Dulles to action, but only after irretrievable damage had been done. He appointed a public commission, headed by president Henry Wriston, of Brown University, to investigate and report on the management of the Foreign Service. The commission recommended in June 1954 that Mr. McLeod be stripped of his responsibilities for hiring, promotions, and inspection.

This curtailment of Mr. McLeod's duties was carried out during the following 6 months, although I must admit that the able junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], then Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Congressional Liaison, is quoted as having said that Mr. McLeod's powers over personnel were not greatly reduced, although they were at a later date.

Unfortunately, Mr. McLeod's responsibilities were not curtailed until an aroused public opinion finally forced the President and the Secretary of State to repudiate his methods. But, by this time, the great damage had been done.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that I commend him for the address he is now making. It had been my own personal feeling that the nomination of Mr. McLeod ought not to be confirmed by the Senate, because it was unwise and did not serve the best interests of my country abroad.

However, I must admit that until very recently I was inclined to vote for the confirmation, even though I personally disapproved of the nomination, upon the theory that the President had the primary responsibility of conducting our foreign policy.

However, I have come to doubt the validity of that position, and I am won-

dering whether the Senator from Pennsylvania would assist me in my analysis of that position by giving me his answers to the following questions:

It is true—is it not—that the Constitution of the United States gives to the Senate the power to pass upon the President's nominations for the post of ambassador, and requires the consent of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Does it not follow that because the Senate is a collective body, consisting of 96 Members, it can express its consent or its refusal to give consent only by the collective judgment of its Members, and that, therefore, each Member must register his personal feeling by voting either for or against confirmation?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. If the Senate contents itself with merely protesting the nomination, or if each individual Senator contents himself with an expression of his personal views in the form of a protest, and then votes to confirm the nomination anyway, is not such conduct an abdication of the responsibility which has been conferred upon and the authority which has been given to the Senate under the Constitution?

Mr. CLARK. That would be my view. I will say to my friend from Idaho that there is an addition I should like to make to his statement. Ordinarily those of us, such as the Senator from Idaho and I, who have come to the Senate only recently, should be reluctant to put our judgments ahead of those of our colleagues who are more senior in service; and that the reports of committees should be given the greatest weight, and even more weight by those of us who are junior than those who are in a more senior position.

I should also like to call to the attention of my friend from Idaho the fact that the four ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Relations on this side of the aisle have voted adversely to confirming the nomination of Mr. McLeod.

I desire to make it very clear that I am not being motivated by any partisan objectives in this regard. I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Taylor. However, the views of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] have carried great weight with me, because they heard the testimony of the witnesses. I believe that under those circumstances, the Senator from Idaho and I should be inclined to follow the position taken by those Senators.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I notice that the Senator has referred to the position taken by the four ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and has stated that that position carries great weight with him.

Mr. CLARK. That is on the Democratic side.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. Had the Senator from Pennsylvania not made up his mind and expressed it publicly before those members of the committee issued their statement? Therefore their statement merely supplemented the Senator's original position. Is that not correct?

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe the Senator has quite accurately stated what I said. My recollection is that in putting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some editorials adverse to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McLeod—and the Senator will correct me if I am misstating the fact—I said I thought the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations should give very careful consideration to the nomination before it approved it.

I am not aware of the fact that I made any final or irrevocable determination with respect to the nomination before the report of the committee was issued.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say that only the Senator, and he alone, knows whether he had made a final determination. Certainly the impression which he gave to the public and to the Senator from New Hampshire was that he had made up his mind. However, as I say, only he could say whether he had made up his mind.

Mr. CLARK. It is a fortunate thing that we still have a little privacy in this country.

One measure of the havoc Mr. McLeod wrought is the fact that during the entire year 1953 not a single beginning grade Foreign Service officer entered the service. This is very much as though the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps did not commission a single second lieutenant or ensign during a comparable period. What such damaging action would have done to the efficiency of our armed services, Mr. McLeod's activities did actually do to the Foreign Service. It is still staggering under the blows he delivered against it in 1953 and 1954.

It is astounding, in the light of the present climate, which is so much improved, to read, as we did in the New York Times of November 8, 1954, that an American Ambassador no longer dared to report the truth because of the hysteria which then prevailed.

A few moments ago, the highly respected minority leader, the distinguished and able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] spoke of the fact that in 1956 there were almost 5,000 applicants for admission to the Foreign Service. I am happy to know that the reign of terror is over. I am happy to know that the methods which Mr. McLeod utilized in 1953 and 1954 have been rejected. I am happy indeed to know that the young men and women of our country are now prepared to apply in large numbers for the Foreign Service.

But I suggest that the test which the Senate should apply is not what the situation is now, when Mr. McLeod has been, I will not use the word repudiated, but when, let us say, a little bit of restraint has been placed upon him. That is not the test. The test is, What was the situation with respect to the morale of the Foreign Service at the time when he was in the saddle?

It is not necessary to defend in detail—and I do not intend to do so—the careers and activities of such men as John Paton Davies and Charles W. Thayer in order to support the assertion that when they were hounded out of the Service the effect on the morale of those they left behind in the Foreign Service was disastrous.

In the text of my speech as released today, I have said that they were hounded out of the Service by Mr. McLeod. I am not at all certain that I am correct about that. I am not sure that Mr. McLeod was the person responsible for forcing their resignations.

I pointed out that Mr. Davies had been cleared eight times of the charges hurled against him, and that the ninth time Mr. McLeod was in the saddle. It may be that Mr. McLeod personally had nothing whatever to do with the ninth effort to get rid of Mr. Davies, but the ninth effort was successful, and it was carried out successfully in the climate which Mr. McLeod did so much to create.

One can imagine the attitude of those over whom Mr. McLeod held sway in the light of a statement made by him about the diplomatic corps and the Foreign Service reported in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register:

> It should be remade into a mold more American and less European. United States diplomats imitate the dress, accents, mannerisms, and even the thinking of foreigners.

A writer in the Reporter magazine states that he said:

> They think they can make policy in a vacuum. They're happy when they get the next pay check.

He further quotes a statement to one of his own security lieutenants stationed in mid-Europe, who had reported that Foreign Service officers were growing restive about their delayed promotions. Mr. McLeod remarked:

> If they don't like it, they can get the hell out.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. A moment ago the Senator from Pennsylvania quoted a statement which, I believe, Mr. McLeod was alleged to have made, in which Mr. McLeod said, referring to the diplomatic corps:

> It should be remade into a mold more American and less European. United States diplomats imitate the dress, accents, mannerisms, and even the thinking of foreigners.

I do not know whether or not Mr. McLeod said that; but, based upon my travels around the world, I wish that American diplomats were a little bit more American, a little more conscious of this country, rather than to fall into the mannerisms, the thinking, and all the other customs and practices of some of the countries to which they are accredited. That is one of the reasons why I believe American Foreign Service officers and other Americans serving overseas

should be brought back to this country and required to stay here for periods of time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I was under the impression that I had yielded to my distinguished colleague for a question. I shall be happy to yield for that purpose; but since I understand the Senator from New Hampshire intends to obtain the floor to speak at some length in his own right, I should prefer not to yield further at this time, but to yield to him when I finish my speech.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania agree with the statement attributed to Mr. McLeod, whether Mr. McLeod made it or not?

Mr. CLARK. I, too, have traveled abroad a little. I know that, as in all walks of life, there are some persons in the Foreign Service and in other branches of the State Department who do not conform to the standards of conduct which I am certain the Senator from New Hampshire and I would agree upon. I think, however, that they are in a very small minority. I believe the members of our Foreign Service, from the initial days of the Republic, have rendered valiant service in the support of their country. I am proud of them. I think any man who attempts to drag them into disrepute is not qualified to be an Ambassador.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Pennsylvania has answered my question by paying a tribute to the foreign diplomatic service in which, in general, I might join with him. But the Senator did not answer the question whether the personnel of the Foreign Service should not, in many cases, be made a little more into the mold of Americans rather than of foreigners.

Mr. CLARK. My feelings, to answer my good friend from New Hampshire, is that those who occupy positions in the Foreign Service are under considerable temptation and pressure when they are away from home. They tend to lose their contacts.

I think one of the best steps which has recently been taken by the State Department is to require that those gentlemen and their wives come home every so often to touch home base, perhaps to go to a farm in New Hampshire or Pennsylvania and have an opportunity to sit around in a country store and to see and hear what is going on. I think that is an excellent plan. I think there has been a tendency on the part of the Department some times in the past not to keep in as close touch with the personnel abroad as it should.

But I suggest to my good friend from New Hampshire that the way to remedy that situation is not by firing broadside at them with a shotgun, but by a somewhat less public method of reforming the conduct of some of those gentlemen.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am delighted to know that the Senator from Pennsylvania agrees with me and also with Mr. McLeod.

Mr. CLARK. I will make no comment on the last statement, but will, if I may, resume my remarks.

Were the effects not so serious upon the morale of the Foreign Service, the case of Mildred McAfee Horton would seem laughable. The accomplished former president of Wellesley College and the wartime commander of the Waves was recommended by Secretary Hobby, herself a distinguished young veteran of World War II, for nomination by President Eisenhower to represent the United States at sessions of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The regulations under which Mr. McLeod was operating required him to give her security clearance. Whether deliberately or inadvertently, no one will ever know—I make no more effort to look into the mind of Mr. McLeod than does the Senator from New Hampshire, who was kind enough to say he had no intention of looking into my mind—the clearance of this patriotic American, with her splendid service in World War II, was held up by Mr. McLeod until the date of the session was so close that another person had to be appointed.

That may not be a vital matter so far as United States foreign policy is concerned; it might not be an earth-shaking thing. But I suggest that that activity on Mr. McLeod's part showed either arrogance or a lack of judgment such as would disqualify him to hold a position of high ambassadorial rank in the Foreign Service of the United States.

I, accordingly, suggest that Mr. McLeod's conduct in connection with security clearance clearly disqualifies him for the position of Ambassador to Ireland.

Second, Mr. McLeod demonstrated the lack of judgment needed in our Ambassador to Ireland when, while holding an office requiring the exercise of political impartiality, he openly engaged in political partisanship.

In February 1954, Mr. McLeod was requested by the Republican National Committee to make a series of speeches over the Lincoln Birthday weekend in support of candidates and policies of the Republican Party. A similar request was made to a substantial number of other officers and employees in the Department of State. Mr. McLeod was the only one who accepted the invitation. Before doing so, he requested the legal opinion of Mr. George M. Moore, a Republican member of the Civil Service Commission, as well as that of Herman Phleger, of the Department of State, as to whether such action on his part would violate the provisions of the Hatch Act. On January 29, 1954, in an opinion which seems most persuasive to me, as a lawyer, and which appears in the record of the hearings at pages 125 and 126, Mr. Moore advised Mr. McLeod that such activity would violate the Hatch Act. Mr. Phleger's opinion does not appear in the record. I understand it differed from that of the Civil Service Commission.

I do not raise the issue of the legality of Mr. McLeod's action or of which lawyer was right. I merely call attention to the lack of sound judgment which his conduct exhibited. Here is a man given the sober task of passing on the security of over 10,000 employees in the Foreign Service and the civil service. Here is a man given the job of inspection of the conduct of the same employees. Here is a man given substantial authority over the hiring, promotion, demotion, or dismissal of such employees. Here is a man working in a Department where bipartisanship has been the established policy for many a year. Here is a man who, alone of all his colleagues of equal rank in that Department, chose to ignore that tradition of bipartisanship, in the face of conflicting opinions regarding his right to do so.

Mr. McLeod's unseemly partisanship is further revealed in a speech he made to the American Legion Convention, at Topeka, Kans., in the summer of 1953:

> In a sense, I am a politician, in that I was appointed by the present administration to a political office.
>
> The Department must be purged of traitors, homosexuals, and bad risks, certainly, but also of Democrats.
>
> Sometimes, it is extremely difficult because of the Civil Service Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Foreign Service Act, to replace an individual whose viewpoint does not coincide with that of the Republican Party.

And, Mr. President, thank goodness that it does not. Thank goodness that those acts protect our civil service against the partisan raids which this gentleman would only have been too happy to lead.

I submit that Mr. McLeod's efforts to bring political partisanship into the State Department reflects a lack of sound judgment that disqualifies him to be Ambassador to Ireland.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. In his speech the Senator from Pennsylvania has quoted Mr. McLeod as saying:

> The Department must be purged of traitors, homosexuals, and bad risks, certainly, but also of Democrats.

I simply cannot believe that Mr. McLeod stopped there; he must have referred to Democrats about whom there was some question. I cannot believe that he mentioned Democrats in the same breath with bad risks, traitors, and homosexuals. The Senator from Pennsylvania and I are on opposite sides, politically; but certainly I have great respect for the Members of the opposing party; and I doubt that Mr. McLeod would have referred to all Democrats in the way that has been indicated. I wonder whether the Senator from Pennsylvania will state the full context, instead of stating only a part of it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say that the quotations included in my speech are taken almost entirely from the record made before the Foreign Relations Committee, including a number of articles which were placed in that record; and the quotation referred to comes from that record, and the quotation stops at the point I have indicated. It may well be, as the Senator from New Hampshire suggests, that the statement actually had some qualification to it. I

shall be happy to investigate the matter further; and if there is a qualification which will be helpful to Mr. McLeod, I shall only be too happy to have it inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. He will agree, will he not, that the Department should be purged of traitors, homosexuals, and bad risks?

Mr. CLARK. I certainly do.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Department should be purged of bad risks, as such. I should like to have the entire quotation presented.

Mr. CLARK. I heartily agree with the Senator from New Hampshire, and I shall be happy to obtain the entire quotation for him.

Mr. President, third, I turn to my contention that Mr. McLeod's record in his administration of the Refugee Relief Act revealed such serious shortcomings as to disqualify him to be Ambassador to Ireland. The Refugee Relief Act, signed by the President in August 1953, was under the exclusive administrative supervision of Mr. McLeod from the time of its passage until December 1, 1954. It called for the admission of some 209,000 refugees during a period of 3 years and 8 months. While the act contained restrictions which made it very difficult indeed to administer, the consensus of informed opinion is that Mr. McLeod was not anxious to see it succeed. And certainly prior to the end of 1954, the accomplishments were minimal. By that time, only 13,000 immigrants had been admitted; and of those, only 500 could actually be classed as refugees under the act. Moreover, there was an umistakable tendency on Mr. McLeod's part to play the "numbers game" with the Refugee Act, as he had done earlier with securities investigations, to which I shall refer a little later, when I discuss Mr. McLeod's veracity and candor.

It is not necessary to go into the controversy between Mr. McLeod and the distinguished public servant, Edward Corsi, in order to conclude that Mr. Corsi was filled with zeal to make the Refugee Act a success; that Mr. McLeod did not share this zeal; and that after 90 days as assistant to both Secretary Dulles and Mr. McLeod in administering the Refugee Relief Act, Mr. Corsi was fired. Mr. Corsi's side of the case is well stated in an article he wrote for the Reporter magazine on May 5, 1955, which appears on page 101 of the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee.

I submit that a fair summary of Mr. McLeod's activities as administrator of the Refugee Act would be:

1. His preoccupation with security and his lack of skill as an administrator brought the program to the verge of failure by the end of 1954.

2. Public clamor against Mr. McLeod reached such a point that Mr. Corsi was called in as an expert, to straighten out the mess.

3. For reasons irrelevant to the present issue, Mr. Corsi was discharged, after laying the foundations for remedying Mr. McLeod's mistakes.

4. In order to carry out the Corsi recommendations, without causing Mr. McLeod to lose face, he was retained in nominal charge of the program, while actual authority was turned over, in June 1955, to an experienced and devoted administrator, Mr. Pierce J. Gerety.

Mr. President, the New York Times of June 10, 1955, stated that as of that date Mr. McLeod told reporters he had delegated complete policy and operational responsibility to Mr. Gerety, and that he—Mr. McLeod—remained in charge only technically.

For that reason, Mr. President, were the Senator from New Jersey still in the Chamber, I would ask my distinguished friend whether in speaking, as he did, so favorably of Mr. McLeod's administration of the Refugee Act—which in the end was a success—he was aware of the fact that when Mr. McLeod was removed from control of the administration, the administration of the act was on the verge of collapsing, and it was only because others were put in charge that they were able to admit before the deadline the vast majority—although not all—of the refugees who were authorized to enter the United States under the provisions of that act.

I also submit that it is fair to state that:

5. Mr. McLeod now takes credit for the final success of a program he did so much to render ineffective.

I suggest that Mr. McLeod's administration of the Refugee Act shows a lack of capacity that disqualifies him to be Ambassador to Ireland.

Fourth, Mr. President, in my opinion, Mr. McLeod's confirmation will bring our Government into disrepute at home and abroad, because he has become a symbol of a philosophy and of a method of conduct which are alien to the principles on which our Government was founded and on which it has operated for over 150 years.

No one, for a moment, questions the insidious evil of international communism or the sincerity of many Americans who, in the recent past, were so immobilized by fear of the Communist threat that they, in panic, seemed ready and willing to throw away our basic American freedoms in the effort to protect them.

Fortunately, today more and more Americans recognize how truly un-American that period of our recent history really was.

Mr. McLeod was very much a part of that recent history. He was one of the leading actors, so often on stage in front and center, that he became—whether consciously or unconsciously—the symbol of the witch hunter. Americans, and Europeans, too, despise the witch hunter.

There is an Irish proverb which goes: "What he is speaks so loud that I can't hear what he's saying." Mr. President, Mr. McLeod's past has spoken too loud for us to hear him any more.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Perhaps it is my own Irish blood that causes me to rise at the quotation of the old Irish proverb. I think the quotation of that proverb, "What he is speaks so loud that I can't hear what he's saying," is the capsule of the case against Scott McLeod. I do not know the man personally. I do not question his character. I do not question his motives. I say nothing personal against him. But if I may do so in preface to a question, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that a little more than a year ago I was in Western Europe. I was in Germany and I was in France, not as a Senator but as a citizen. Perhaps there are advantages to visiting there as a citizen, because I had an opportunity to speak with a great many French and German people from all walks of life, and they asked me many questions, because they were interested in what was happening inside the United States. Their questions were of great concern to me. Many French and German people, each in his different way, asked me this kind of question: "Is it any longer possible in the United States for a citizen to express a view that is contrary to the orthodox or respectable or approved point of view on any important public issue and not be condemned for disloyalty or something even worse?"

I suggest what they were saying is that they felt, deep down inside, that something was amiss with the health of freedom in the United States, that something was wrong, something they feared, that many of them had had personal experience with in their own recent past.

I am sure the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will agree with me that their conception of what was going on in the United States was distorted.

Mr. CLARK. I agree.

Mr. CHURCH. I am sure he will also agree that, even though they had a distorted conception, it was caused by this period of political inquisitions, mostly politically motivated, and that the fact that they did have such a feeling toward the United States was a factor of great significance in the following of our foreign policy.

Mr. CLARK. I will say to my friend from Idaho my concern was identical with his. I had occasion, while mayor of Philadelphia, to go abroad on several trips, some on official business and some purely for fun. Whether I was in England, France, Turkey, or Italy, I found the same reaction my good friend from Idaho found. Every time the question came up I tried to correct the misconception. I said, "It is not true. We are not that kind of a government. This is a temporary period. It will come out all right."

Thank goodness, it has come out all right, but I am afraid the nominee before us has not contributed to that happy result.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the Senator agree that the success or failure of our foreign policy abroad depends to a large degree on the prestige of the United States among the free nations of the world?

Mr. CLARK. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the Senator further agree that the confirmation of the

appointment of Scott McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland would give new currency to the feeling of distress and dismay abroad about the state of health of freedom in the United States?

Mr. CLARK. It is because I agree so thoroughly with my friend from Idaho that I have taken on myself the most unpleasant task, as a junior Member of this body, of arising to oppose the confirmation of this nomination.

Mr. CHURCH. It is for that reason that I must concur with the Senator from Pennsylvania, because it is my strong and abiding conviction that the appointment will be regarded as a symbol, and that the symbol can only do great damage to our prestige among the people of Western Europe and throughout the free world, and that it will work against the interests of our country in this time of ferment in the world.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Idaho for expressing my views, which he has done far better than I could do.

Mr. President, I should like to make my fifth and final point, and that is that the testimony given by Mr. McLeod before the Foreign Relations Committee raises issues of candor and veracity—and I say this with regret—which cannot satisfactorily be resolved without further testimony from those whose charges Mr. McLeod—not under oath—has expressly or by implication denied. Let me list only a few of those questions:

1. On page 9 of the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, the following exchange between the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and Mr. McLeod is reported:

Senator FULBRIGHT. I ask you these questions to try to clear up the record. We read in the paper, I believe it is said, that you authorized the investigation of the people who read the Reporter magazine or something to that effect. Is there any truth in that?

Mr. MCLEOD. I have never been able to find out what that had reference to.

Mark that. I repeat:

I have never been able to find out what that had reference to.

I encourage people who are in positions where knowledge of whatever one's enemy is saying and thinking is useful, to acquire it wherever they can. I think that more people ought to subscribe to the Daily Worker, and so on.

Senator FULBRIGHT. You never did criticize anyone because they took the Daily Worker?

Mr. MCLEOD. No, I think if they have use for it, if they take it surreptitiously so to speak, I think it might be a factor in evaluating their security potential, but if they have use for it in their daily work, I think they ought to read it. I think all bankers ought to read the Daily Worker so they know what their enemies are saying about them.

Now, the fact of the matter, as I understand it, is that sometime late in 1953, or early in 1954, investigators from Mr. McLeod's office called, during the luncheon hour, on the secretaries of members of the policy planning staff of the State Department and inquired as to which members of that group were reading the Reporter magazine and the Daily Worker. The clear implication of the inquiry was that the reading of these magazines raised a question of security and loyalty. Members of the policy planning staff were so incensed that they protested to Mr. Robert Bowie, then and now Director of the policy planning staff. Mr. Bowie carried this protest to higher authority, and Mr. McLeod's investigators were called off.

I quote from page 141 of the latest laudatory biography of our Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, by that able reporter from Time magazine, Mr. John R. Beal:

McLeod attacked his job with what might charitably be called an excess of zeal. His men discovered, for example, that members of the Department's policy-planning staff were receiving copies of the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker. They questioned staff secretaries to learn what officers were represented by the initials on the list to which it was circulated. Reading Communist publications is, of course, an essential job for anyone seeking to follow the twists and flipflops of the party line, and especially so for a group charged with advising on formulation of policy to combat it. Had McLeod's men invaded the Secretary's office they would have found not only Stalin's Problems of Leninism within reach of Dulles' desk, but numerous other pertinent writings and speeches by Soviet figures. Dulles had devoted one entire chapter of his book, War or Peace, to the high importance of knowing your enemy. But Communist publications were not the only target of McLeod's underlings. When they began inquiring which members of the planning staff read the Reporter, a non-Communist liberal periodical, the staff chairman, Robert Bowie, protested to Under Secretary Walter Bedell Smith, who put a stop to it.

Mr. President, in this regard I am not speaking on the basis of hearsay, because within the past week two former members of the policy-planning staff, in whose integrity I have complete confidence, have confirmed what I have just said, and what Mr. Beal just wrote.

I believe it would be helpful if Mr. McLeod's nomination were recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further hearings, in order that Mr. Bowie, who is still in the State Department, might testify.

If the facts are as I believe them to be, I suggest that Mr. McLeod's testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations is singularly lacking in candor.

Second. I have already referred to the extent to which Mr. McLeod engaged in the "numbers racket" with respect to both his security and refugee activities. The following are two typical examples, which I suggest indicate his lack of candor:

(a) From the Providence Journal, April 12, 1955: Corsi says less than 1,000 refugees were admitted under the act, while McLeod testified 20,000 visas issued with 14,031 persons admitted. But under pressure, McLeod admitted only 500 had been admitted as refugees with visas for 1,000 issued.

(b) In 1954, Mr. McLeod told the House Appropriations Committee that he had fired 604 "security risks and others." But under pressure in closed session, he admitted that only 11 persons had been separated under the security procedures, and 7 of these were persons against whom charges had been preferred under the prior Democratic administration. This is from the New York Herald Tribune of April 22, 1954.

I suggest that both these examples raise questions as to the candor of the nominee.

Third. On page 12 of the hearings, the questioning of Mr. McLeod by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] with respect to the Bohlen nomination, is reported as follows:

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. McLeod, there have been some allegations made. One is, did you at any time 4 years ago consider going over the head of Mr. Dulles to block the appointment of Mr. Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia?

Mr. MCLEOD. No, sir. That is a greatly misunderstood matter. I did go to the White House and talk to General Persons about this matter, but I was in the Secretary of State's office talking to him at the time General Persons called me to come over. The Secretary saw me and heard me take the call and I explained what the purpose of it was; so I don't think there was ever any question of my going over his head in the matter.

Senator MANSFIELD. You went to the White House on that occasion at the request of General Persons?

Mr. MCLEOD. I talked to him on the phone and I had a discussion with him about the matter. Then he subsequently called me to come over and talk about it, so I don't know whether it is fair to say it was at his suggestion, since I had originally called him about it. But certainly you don't go to the White House on any occasion unless somebody over there is prepared to receive you.

Yet Mr. Dulles' most recent biographer, John Beal, states that Mr. McLeod did go over the head of the Secretary of State to appeal to the White House against Mr. Bohlen's appointment.

Mr. Beal says, on page 142 of his book:

McLeod, with information which by his standards he considered derogatory to Bohlen, went over Dulles' head to the White House with his protest. He cooled off after learning from a close aide of the President's that Bohlen, who had been a golfing partner of Ike's at SHAPE headquarters in Paris, was Ike's personal selection for the job. McLeod's explanation was: "I just wanted to be sure they knew what they were doing."

McLeod's insubordination was so flagrant that Dulles spent one whole evening discussing what do about it with several advisers he called to his home. Still undecided next morning, he was skimming the papers when he ran across a story about the Bohlen case in the Washington Times Herald containing information which could only have come from McLeod. Dulles went to work feeling the proper course was to fire McLeod. The only thing that saved him was the fact that Undersecretary "Beedle" Smith dropped in to see Dulles that morning before McLeod arrived at the Department, and argued Dulles out of taking the action on the ground that it would embarrass the new administration to fire so quickly a man who in his opinion should not have been hired in the first place.

Mr. President, I suggest that before accepting the unsupported word of Mr. McLeod in this regard it would be desirable for the Committee on Foreign Relations to question the Secretary of State, to question Mr. Beal, to question General Persons, and to question the former Under Secretary of State, General Smith, as to what actually occurred, because if the allegations in that book are true this

man is not only not qualified to be Ambassador to Ireland, but he has not told the truth to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I do not wish to pass judgment in advance, Mr. President. I reserve judgment. But on the present record, I do not feel that the Members of this honorable body have sufficient information on the basis of which adequately to pass on the nomination of this gentleman, as to his veracity and candor.

Surely we do not want to send as our Ambassador to Ireland or anywhere else an individual whose candor and veracity have been so clearly brought into question, without hearing those who have raised the questions.

Mr. President, in my judgment the very least the Senate should do is to refer this nomination back to the Committee on Foreign Relations in order to take further testimony to determine whether Mr. McLeod possesses qualities of mind and heart which qualify him for high rank in our diplomatic service.

Mr. President, it is an unpleasant thing—believe me, a sincerely unpleasant thing—to stand before this body and oppose the nomination of an individual for high office in the Foreign Service of the United States. I do so only because in my considered judgment a clear question of principle is involved in this nomination. I would be the first to concede that Mr. McLeod was an able administrative assistant to the distinguished Senior Senator from New Hampshire. I have no doubt he could serve again with credit in such a position. I am confident that Mr. McLeod conducted his work as a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with competence. Were he to resume his employment in that distinguished organization which has done so much to protect the lives and safety of Americans, I should applaud the employment.

But, Mr. President, we are dealing with a more important and more serious question than the future of R. W. Scott McLeod. We are dealing with the quality, the morale, and the character of the Foreign Service of the United States at a time when the responsibilities of that Service have never been so crucial. We are dealing with the question of whether a man whose public record is filled with evidence of bad judgment and lack of capacity and understanding, whose conduct in the State Department has been condemned by informed persons within and outside the Department, who has been said to have done more to lower the quality and the prestige of the Foreign Service than any other living man, and whose testimony before our own committee was apparently lacking in candor, should be rewarded with a place of honor, distinction, and responsibility in the Foreign Service of our Government.

Finally, we are dealing with a moral issue. We are dealing with a clear-cut question of whether the Senate of the United States is going to turn its back on an unsavory chapter in the recent history of the United States, or whether we are going to carry forward that chapter by confirming a man whose public activities over the past 4 years have identified him with a philosophy of government which is alien to the highest ideals of the American people.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the nomination of Scott McLeod to be Ambassador to Ireland be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations for the purpose of taking further testimony.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Oregon.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I wanted the yeas and nays ordered so that there would be a record vote on the motion when the time came.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps after the quorum call we can renew the request.

Mr. BRIDGES. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire for a moment, I was also about to ask for the yeas and nays on the final vote on the nomination, in case the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania should be rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator has not too much optimism. I agree to the request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MORSE. I am only preparing for the future.

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out to the Senator that he is out of order.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator is correct. I withdraw the request, but I have made my point.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania further yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. A second to the Senator's motion is not required, but I want him to know that in spirit I am seconding his motion.

I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for what I think has been a very fair, judicious, and analytical consideration of the question before the Senate. The Senator's speech commends itself to me very much. I think it is deserving of the approval of the majority of Members of the Senate, by their votes against the nomination when the vote is taken.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Oregon for his kind remarks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to recommit to the Committee on Foreign Relations the nomination of R. W. Scott McLeod to be Ambassador to Ireland.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in connection with the pending nomination the President of the United States carries a great deal of responsibility in sending ambassadors abroad to represent our country.

In theory, anyway, he should have complete and personal confidence in such individuals. I do not think it is too unreasonable to expect him to be pretty well acquainted with them and with their views before he nominates them.

In the case of Scott McLeod, however, the President stated in his press conference of April 10, as printed in the New York Times, that he is "not so well acquainted with him. He was taken on Secretary Dulles' recommendations, and I assure you again I have the utmost confidence in Secretary Dulles."

Mr. President, this would seem to damn Mr. McLeod with some very faint praise, indeed.

There is one advantage, as I see it, to Mr. McLeod's appointment as Ambassador to Ireland. It will get him out of this country.

But, Mr. President, should we do this to the Irish? I shall vote against the nomination.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks with regard to Mr. McLeod's nomination, I wish to call attention to a statement which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] made in his speech, and which bothered me. He quoted Mr. McLeod as having stated, in a speech made before the American Legion Convention at Topeka, Kans., in the summer of 1953:

> The Department must be purged of traitors, homosexuals, and bad risks, certainly, but also of Democrats.

I question whether Mr. McLeod would say such a thing. Perhaps the Senator from Pennsylvania can tell us where he obtained the quotation. I do not agree with it. I agree that the Department should be purged of traitors, homosexuals, and bad risks, but I have the greatest respect for members of the opposing party.

However, I certainly do not agree with the statement quoted, and I do not believe Mr. McLeod made it. I do not believe there is any such statement in the speech of Mr. McLeod. I have asked that it be sent here by messenger. When it arrives, I will ask that it be placed in the RECORD. However, I believe that so long as the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised the question, it would be well to inquire where he obtained the quotation, because it is a pretty serious statement.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I am thumbing through the speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania to find the exact phrase referred to in the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Pennsylvania, having to do with traitors and homosexuals.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is on page 8.

Mr. CARROLL. I think the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire might wish to correct the RECORD. The Senator from New Hampshire quoted, from the speech of the Senator from

Pennsylvania, a statement attributed to Mr. McLeod, as follows:

The Department must be purged of traitors, homosexuals, and bad risks, certainly, but also of Democrats.

Was the reference to Democrats intended to identify them with the preceding categories?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire intended to quote, and did quote, as the Senator will remember, the exact statement which bothered the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CARROLL. As I understand, the Senator from New Hampshire is merely referring to the fact that all who come within the categories first mentioned should be purged, whether they be Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly—whether they be Communists, Socialists, Republicans, or Democrats. If they come within the first categories, of course, they should be purged. But the mere fact that a man is a Democrat or a Republican has nothing to do with his qualifications to serve in the State Department, except as he may be in a top policy position, in which case he should be in concurrence with the policy of the administration of which he is a part. However, that does not place him in any of the other categories. Nevertheless, it involves the question of judgment of the administration upon which the responsibility for foreign policy rests.

Mr. CARROLL. I thought the Senator from New Hampshire would not permit to stand a statement which might be misconstrued.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire never casts any reflections on members of the opposite party.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have now found the reference in question. I invite the attention of the Senator to page 96 of the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of Mr. McLeod. I read beginning with the last paragraph on that page, if the Senator has no objection.

Mr. BRIDGES. What is this?

Mr. CLARK. I am referring to page 96 of the hearings. This is a part of an article entitled "Big Brother in Foggy Bottom," written by William Harlan Hale. The article begins on page 92 of the record.

Mr. BRIDGES. And it was published in the Reporter magazine for August 1954.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire would be very glad to have that statement read into the RECORD. The Senator from New Hampshire may have something to say later about Mr. Hale, of the Reporter magazine, as an authority, but he is glad to have the Senator from Pennsylvania read the statement into the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. I have not the slightest doubt that the Senator from New Hampshire will make such comments.

I quote from the article:

But what actually is the purpose of the system, as McLeod and his clan see it? "In a sense, I am a politician," he stated in his first major speech, given before the American Legion convention at Topeka a year ago, "in that I was appointed by the present administration to a political office"—which surprised those who thought he had been appointed to a security office. Then he went on to state his object clearly: The Department must be purged of traitors, homosexuals, and bad risks, certainly, but also of Democrats. "Sometimes," he lamented, "it is extremely difficult because of the Civil Service Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Foreign Service Act to replace an individual whose viewpoint does not coincide with that of the Republican Party. * * * Until such time as we can reeducate those employees or replace them with proper personnel the progress which we make is sometimes very slow."

I do not deny for a moment that the published text of Mr. McLeod's statement before the American Legion convention does not contain the statement which appears here. However, I suggest that even the Senator from New Hampshire, mature though he is in the ways of politics, sometimes becomes a little enthusiastic and departs from his prepared text. I would suggest that this report is probably accurate.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I believe he wants to be fair.

Mr. CLARK. I do.

Mr. BRIDGES. I refer to the Senator's prepared speech on page 7 of the text, where he states:

Mr. McLeod's unseemly partisanship is further revealed in a speech he made to the American Legion convention at Topeka, Kans., in the summer of 1953:

"In a sense, I am a politician, in that I was appointed by the present administration to a political office. * * *

"The Department must be purged of traitors, homosexuals and bad risks, certainly, but also of Democrats."

The Senator from Pennsylvania was not quoting Mr. McLeod. He was quoting the Reporter magazine, specifically Mr. Hale of that magazine.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Unhappily I cannot agree with my friend from New Hampshire. I was quoting from Mr. Hale's paraphrase of Mr. McLeod's speech.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. However, the Senator from Pennsylvania wants to be fair and he does not want the RECORD to stand that what he quoted was from Mr. McLeod's speech. I am sure he wants it to appear that he was quoting from Mr. Hale and the Reporter magazine as to what Mr. Hale interpreted Mr. McLeod as saying, or imagined what Mr. McLeod had said.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield to me one more time, perhaps we may come to an agreement on this point. I would be happy to have the quotation marks removed from my comment about Democrats in the text of my speech. Frankly, they were not in the first draft of the speech; they got into it in typing the second draft. I should like to have the RECORD indicate that this is what Mr. Hale says, in substance, Mr. McLeod said at the American Legion convention.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is satisfactory to me to have it appear that that is what Mr. Hale said Mr. McLeod had said, because I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania does not want the RECORD to show that he quoted Mr. McLeod.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to make one other comment. There was some colloquy during the Senator's remarks in which he said that the opinion and the report of the four ranking Members of his own party on the Committee on Foreign Relations had had a great bearing on his making his decision in this matter.

I pointed out to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that he had arrived at a position against McLeod long before those four Senators had made their report.

To substantiate my statement, I quote from the hearings on the nomination of Mr. McLeod, at page 146:

THE "FIGHTING IRISH"—THE MCLEOD APPOINTMENT

(Extension of remarks of Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, in the Senate of the United States, Friday, April 12, 1957)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the Washington Post and Times Herald for April 11, 1957, there appeared an editorial entitled "Fighting Irish," in which it is contended, with reference to Mr. McLeod's appointment:

"To appoint such a man to a diplomatic post is an insult to the recipient nation and a degradation of diplomacy. How can the Senate, which is at frequent pains to demonstrate its friendship for Ireland, view this as a friendly act?"

Was that the Senator's opinion?

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am afraid the Senator from New Hampshire is under a very severe misconception in that regard, because if he will look again on page 146 of the committee report he will see that I was not stating my own personal opinion, but was merely reading from the editorial.

On an earlier appearance in the Senate, I had taken no position at all, except to introduce some adverse editorials, and to say that I hoped the Committee on Foreign Relations would give very careful consideration to the nomination before it was approved.

Had my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and his colleagues unanimously reported favorably the nomination of Mr. McLeod, I, as a junior Senator, would never have had the effrontery to rise in opposition to it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I am glad to learn that he is open minded. I thought when he put such a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he concurred in the views expressed. Naturally, I concluded that he would not put into the RECORD something with which he did not have at least some semblance of agreement.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kindly comments, and I again assure him that I always attempt to keep an open mind until the final vote.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I had to attend a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations and have only just now returned to the Chamber. I wonder whether the Senator would permit me to place in the RECORD a very brief editorial, in view of some statements which have been made in the press relative to certain alleged opposition in Ireland to the appointment of Mr. McLeod. The editorial to which I refer appeared in the Irish Independent, of Dublin, on Monday, April 15, 1957.

First, as has been pointed out previously in debate on the floor, it is customary procedure for the State Department, in suggesting appointments of ambassadors, to sound out the government to which an ambassador is to be appointed as to whether the appointment is acceptable to that government. I am informed that this course of procedure was followed in this case, and that the Irish Government, which, after all, is the only proper spokesman for the people of Ireland, and the agency to which such an inquiry would be addressed, indicated that the appointment, if made, would be acceptable.

There has been some discussion about opposition in certain newspapers abroad to the appointment. Therefore the editorial I have in my hand becomes pertinent to the subject under discussion. The editorial reads:

THE AMBASSADOR-DESIGNATE

Some controversy has arisen in the United States concerning Mr. Eisenhower's nomination of Mr. Scott McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland. An English newspaper has taken up the subject. On Saturday last it gave some prominence to a message from its Dublin correspondent to which it put the heading, "Irish Hostile to United States Envoy." It would appear that some of the American newspapers also accept the notion that there is some feeling in this country against Mr. McLeod's nomination to Dublin.

It would be well that these ideas should be dispelled. In accordance with diplomatic usages and international courtesies, we expect that a person appointed as Ambassador to Ireland should be a man against whom Irishmen could make no objection on any reasonable grounds. If no such objection appears the choice of ambassador is entirely one for the United States; it would be wholly contrary to Irish courtesy to attempt to interfere in such choice or to seek to influence it.

As far as Ireland is concerned we are aware of no grounds on which exception could be taken to Mr. McLeod's nomination and appointment. The suggestion that there has been any outcry against it is, as the Irish public is well aware, quite unfounded. The statement in the English newspaper to which we refer that the Irish people are hostile to Mr. McLeod is equally baseless.

I thought the Senator from New Hampshire would not mind having the editorial included in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield so that I may ask a question of the minority leader?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. A short time ago the distinguished minority leader asked the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], to yield in the middle of his speech in order to make the point that, while this is a nomination recommended by the Secretary of State, it has behind it the full force of Presidential authority. I am wondering if the distinguished Senator from California is in a position to inform the Senate whether President Eisenhower has ever met Mr. McLeod; and if so, when?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of my personal knowledge, I have no information in that regard. I mentioned of my personal knowledge that the President only this morning, when I was at the White House, spoke highly of Mr. McLeod, had knowledge of his record, knew of his service in the Department of State, and hoped that the nomination would be early confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. But the Senator from California is not able, is he, to tell us whether the President and Mr. McLeod have ever met to discuss this appointment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; of my own recollection, I do not recall ever having been at the White House at a meeting in which Mr. McLeod was personally present at the time.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from California for his reply, and I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for yielding.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. It so happened that I was in the State Department for a little more than 3 years. During 4 or 5 months of that time I was acting as the chief administrative officer of the Department and was Mr. McLeod's immediate superior. I also worked very closely with Mr. McLeod, implementing the refugee relief program. I can answer the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I have been at the White House on many occasions with Mr. McLeod. I have been in the President's office with Mr. McLeod. I did not introduce them, because the President said, "Good morning, Scotty," or "Good afternoon, Scotty," when we walked in, so I thought they knew each other.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I think that clears up the point raised by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

May I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania personally know Scott McLeod?

Mr. CLARK. No; I do not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then the Senator from Pennsylvania has been acting wholly on hearsay and on the opinions of others.

Mr. CLARK. I think not. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me to say so, I do not think the record made before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is hearsay. I think the record is known pretty widely to the American people.

While I would be happy to meet Mr. McLeod—and I understand that if I did so, I would find him to be a most charming gentleman—I have not had that privilege.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, the man whose nomination the Senate is being asked to confirm as Ambassador to Ireland was recommended by the Secretary of State and nominated by the President of the United States.

In 4 years of running one of the toughest jobs in the Federal Government, he has demonstrated rare administrative ability and a tact and diplomacy that can be claimed by few.

He is not from the ranks of the wealthy. His name will not be found among the contributors to the political campaigns.

He has earned his reputation the hard way in nearly 15 years of loyal and dedicated service to his country.

Scott McLeod was born in Iowa of hardy pioneer stock. He worked his way through Grinnell College. He became a newspaper reporter. He passed the exacting tests of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and spent 7 years as an agent of that organization. He worked for several years on Capitol Hill as my administrative assistant. I knew him in New Hampshire when he was an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He was an outstanding agent. He performed his service with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in such a manner that he came to my attention, and I employed him as my administrative assistant. In that capacity, he did a most competent job.

For the past 4 years he has conducted the biggest and most complicated operation of anyone with the rank of an Assistant Secretary of the Department of State. His job has been Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs—a post which I should like to remind the Senate was created by Congress in 1952 in order to bring order out of the chaos that reigned in that Department at that time.

Scott McLeod was handed a herculean task. He was placed in charge not merely of 1 beleaguered and baffling office, but of 4: Security, passport, visas, and munitions control.

On top of this, Congress, in an extraordinary show of confidence in the man, conferred on him a fifth duty, the dubious honor of directing the Refugee Relief Act of 1956, a piece of legislation that even some of its friends thought was unworkable.

Scott McLeod has earned an international renown as an anti-Communist, and thus he has won the everlasting hatred of the comrades and their assorted camp followers—the pinks, some self-styled liberals, the eggheads, and Soviet apologists, all over the world.

In recent weeks he has been the target of a vicious smear campaign of a type that has become all too familiar in this country.

But in a few hours before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations last week, McLeod himself, with politeness but with devastating candor, destroyed every phony charge laid at his door and hurled it back in the teeth of its author.

I wish every American would read the record of that hearing; it would restore his faith in the integrity of public servants. But McLeod is a modest man. He did not tell the full story of his accomplishments.

What are some of the typically baseless accusations made against McLeod?

That he destroyed the morale of the Foreign Service.

But more young men applied for admission to the Foreign Service last year than has been the case for a decade. Practically none resigned. The Foreign Service itself supports his nomination as Ambassador to Ireland.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Foreign Service News Letter, which gives the official record of the increase in the number of persons who have applied for the Foreign Service. That does not look as if Scott McLeod has destroyed the morale of the Foreign Service.

The second charge is that he frustrated implementation of the Refugee Relief Act of 1956. But as Administrator of that most complicated of laws, Scott McLeod achieved virtually total success, admitting to this country over 190,000 of the 210,000 refugees authorized.

The third charge is that he is opposed to immigration. But in the fiscal year of 1956 the visa office which McLeod heads issued no less than 332,499 immigrant visas, a record since World War II.

The fourth charge is that he has hamstrung the passport operation. But the Passport Office has been completely overhauled and last year a record breaking 560,000 passports were issued promptly and efficiently in keeping with the tremendous upsurge in travel.

It is charged that he was ruthless and reckless in the implementation of the State Department security program. But in 4 years every State Department employee has undergone a full field investigation, many of them for the first time in their careers. Every case has been carefully and fairly evaluated, and the obvious result is that public confidence in the State Department is higher today than for many, many years.

What does all this add up to? It adds up to a remarkable 4-year record made by an unusually talented public servant. Cold facts prove that in his handling of security, passports, and visas, McLeod has achieved a new high in the State Department.

Why, before McLeod took office, was public confidence in the State Department so low?

The Alger Hiss case occurred before his time. So did the Amerasia case, the Lattimore case, and the whole sorry history of the sellout in China.

But in an interview in February 1954, McLeod told the U. S. News & World Report of an incident that occurred after he took office, which in my opinion helps explain the general apprehension in which the State Department was held at that time.

"I was astonished," McLeod said, "when I got a report from one geographic area that there had been 223 individual security violations in that area in 1 month."

Question. "What do you mean by 'security violations'?"

Answer. "Documents left lying on the desk, safes left unlocked—physical security. I wanted to know who were the people involved, how often they were involved in these violations, how serious they were. Well, there were no data on that whatsoever. So, we started the system of security-report-violation forms. Now there is a copy of that form designated to the personnel file. The astonishing result was that there were about 15 violations in that area about a month after we started the practice."

Mr. McLeod continued:

I use this as an example of what I feel was the basic difficulty in the Department, and that was bad administration. When people know that they are going to be held accountable for what they do, then they stop doing the wrong thing.

In the light of the situation that existed in the State Department when McLeod took over in 1953, I feel sure that Americans will take comfort in a remark which he made to the Foreign Relations Committee last week.

Mr. McLeod told the committee that investigations of all State Department employees had now been completed and that to the best of his knowledge there were no subversive elements now in the Department. He added, however, that vigilance in this regard must never cease.

SUPPORT FOR M'LEOD IS NATIONWIDE

It is characteristic of the group who have waged the smear campaign against McLeod to scream loudest when the charges are weakest. But in vain have they tried to give the impression of widespread public opposition to his appointment.

All across the country, newspapers and commentators and leading Americans in all walks of life have spoken out in behalf of McLeod. They recognize the great service which he has rendered his country. For the great majority of Americans, Scott McLeod is the type of individual they want to have representing them overseas, and they will not allow any scurrilous campaign against him to thwart their desires.

Curiously, one of the strongest endorsements has come from Ireland itself. And it has annihilated the completely phony charge which the anti-McLeod element had tried to promote that the Irish people resented his appointment.

The distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], read an article from the April 29 issue of the Irish Independent, a leading newspaper of Dublin, which gave the following account of a speech made by the Honorable James Dillon, Minister of Agriculture in the former Irish Cabinet:

A favorite method employed by Communists was to attack on every possible occasion the character of anyone who had successfully challenged them in the past and recent instance of that was the case of Mr. Scott McLeod, said Mr. Dillon, T. D., national presfdent, AOH (Ancient Order of Hibernians) at the golden jubilee dinner of St. Patrick's division 566 of the AOH, Dundalk.

Every Communist, every fellow traveler, every pink, and the Irish Times had combined to raise their hands in holy horror professing to regard Mr. McLeod as wholly unsuitable for the high position as American Ambassador in Ireland, he added.

The truth was that Mr. McLeod was a distinguished public servant who did his job and the Communists did not like it and they would now be very happy to assassinate his public reputation for all sorts of high-sounding reasons.

He was not the first and would not be the last victim of that conspiracy of slander and vituperation of which the Communists were past masters.

Previously, on April 15 last, the same newspaper carried an editorial which declared as follows:

As far as Ireland is concerned we are aware of no grounds on which exception could be taken to Mr. McLeod's nomination and appointment. The suggestion that there has been an outcry against it is, as the Irish public is well aware, quite unfounded. The statement in the English newspaper to which we refer—that the Irish people are hostile to Mr. McLeod—is equally baseless.

On April 12, the New York Daily News editorialized as follows:

SEND MCLEOD TO IRELAND

Scott McLeod has been known for years as one of the Nation's more effective anti-Communists.

As State Department security and consular administrator, he has been a mortal enemy of Reds in government, and has done his best to weed them out. Before taking that post in 1958, he was most helpful to Senators McCarthy and BRIDGES in their war on the domestic Reds.

President Eisenhower has now nominated Mr. McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland, and all of the Nation's anti-anti-Communists, Reds, fellow travelers, and phony liberals are in full bellow to get the Senate to reject the nomination.

That, we thing, is reason enough for the Senate to confirm, unanimously.

In California, the Sacramento Union had this comment:

MCLEOD APPOINTMENT

Last week, Scott McLeod was nominated to be ambassador to Ireland, upon recommendation of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles.

The leftwing papers revived the long-dead issue of "McCarthyism," and those on the extreme right hailed the appointment as an excellent one. Said the New York Times: "No one man has represented in the public mind more than Scott McLeod all the evils of McCarthyism as applied to diplomacy. * * * It would be hard to imagine a worse blow to the diplomatic corps or a worse example of playing politics with the foreign affairs of the United States."

Said the New York Daily News about the same man and the same appointment:

Scott McLeod has been known for years as one of the Nation's more effective anti-Communists. As State Department security and consular administrator, he has been a mortal enemy of Reds in government, and has done his best to weed them out. Before taking that post in 1953, he was most helpful to Senators McCarthy and BRIDGES in their war on domestic Reds. President Eisenhower has now nominated Mr. McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland, and all of the Nation's anti-anti-Communists, Reds, fellow travelers, and phony liberals are in full bellow to get the Senate to reject the nomination. That, we think, is reason enough for the Senate to confirm, unanimously.

We hope the appointment is confirmed and that McLeod is given a chance to demonstrate his ability.

Here is another editorial from the San Francisco Examiner:

MCLEOD HAS EARNED AMBASSADORSHIP

As nearly as we can gather, the opposition to the appointment of Scott McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland is that he has been tough on Communists, fellow travelers, and similar security risks. Since when has that been a mark of demerit?

When Mr. McLeod took office as security chief of the State Department he remarked he expected to be smeared. He was. He still is. The leftist press took after him chiefly because this former FBI man was scrupulously careful in screening aliens in his administration of the Refugee Relief Act.

Yet we notice that none of his detractors chose to comment on the urgency and efficiency with which Mr. McLeod moved in issuing visas to thousands of Hungarian refugees who fled to Austria from the recent Soviet butchery. Nor have his enemies acknowledge that the United States has issued more immigration visas than any other nation in the last several years.

It is unfortunate that the leftist smear treatment has rubbed off on some well-intentioned people. That is the advantage propaganda holds over fact. That fact is that Mr. McLeod was nominated by President Eisenhower on the basis of the endorsement of Secretary Dulles. Mr. McLeod should be confirmed by the Senate.

The New York Journal-American wrote, on December 10 of last year, that Scott McLeod was closing out the Refugee Relief Act in a cloud of glory.

He has managed—

This newspaper said—

to issue 6,200 American visas within 3 weeks to the heroic Hungarian refugees in Austria and is also set to take care of an expected score or more defecting Olympic Hungarian athletes as soon as they reach Manila.

Let me turn to a report from the Inter-Mountain Jewish News, of Denver, Colo., of last April 26. This newspaper quotes the distinguished jurist, Judge Charles Rosenbaum, to the effect that he found Scott McLeod a wonderful, fair-minded, capable man.

The Dublin correspondent of the Catholic newspaper, the Tablet, of Brooklyn, N. Y., wrote recently:

The sole dissenting but very vocal outburst here against Mr. McLeod's nomination and appointment has come from the Irish Times and the so-called Irish Association of Civil Liberty. Some American newspapers have erroneously interpreted this hostile action as indicative of Irish opinion generally. Such an assumption is entirely baseless.

George Sokolsky, the distinguished columnist, in an article published in the Washington Post of April 24 last, reported a conversation he had had with a so-called intellectual on the subject of McLeod. He said the intellectual complained that McLeod was responsible for having many fine men driven out of the State Department. Sokolsky added:

Who are these fine men? I asked.
Silence.

The columnist goes on to show that his interlocutor mouthed slogans, sentences, and stereotypes against McLeod, but had not actually the slightest conception of what McLeod did in the State Department or why what he did was necessary. Later I shall submit Mr. Sokolsky's column for the RECORD.

Another noted commentator, Mr. Constantine Brown, whose column appears in the Washington Star, wrote on April 16 last:

McLeod's bosses, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, appear to have been fully satisfied with his work. Otherwise they would have fired him. He is not a "sacred cow," and there is no reason to believe that his friends in the Senate would have put up a howl if Mr. Dulles had eased him out in due course. Instead the Secretary, who has never been sympathetic to "witch hunts," recommended him for the ambassadorship. Then the Chief Executive approved this choice.

While on the subject of Secretary Dulles, I believe it particularly appropriate to quote the Secretary's own words about McLeod, given at his press conference last April 23:

I will say that Mr. McLeod, after 4 years of service in the State Department, has, I think, shown that he possesses the qualifications to be a good ambassador. He has grown in stature and understanding; his knowledge of world affairs is very considerable. And I believe that he is well qualified. Obviously such a belief rests upon my personal judgment, but my personal judgment is based upon very close contact with him during this period and with his growing understanding of problems. This leads me to believe that he will be a good ambassador.

The Secretary was asked:

Mr. Secretary, can you tell us if at any time during the past 4 years you considered firing Scott McLeod?

Secretary Dulles said, in response:

Well, there was a point at the very first days of our administration when we did not always see eye-to-eye about everything, but those days have passed; and I really think that he has done an extremely able job on important matters upon which he has been engaged—the Refugee Act, for example, and things of that sort—and I merely repeat what I said before, that I have gained very great confidence in his ability and judgment, his human understanding. I think he would be a good ambassador.

I have another article here which illustrates some of McLeod's qualities as a diplomat. An article from the New York Times of February 25, 1956, reports that he personally solicited contributions amounting to $2,400,000 from member countries of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration, which has enabled that organization to carry on its work in finding jobs and homes for Europe's surplus population.

It is worthy of note, in this regard, that this same organization, comprising 26 nations, unanimously chose McLeod as chairman of its council in 1956. It was recognition of the fact that 26 nations of the world, instead of having the opinion of Mr. McLeod which has been expressed by some Senators on the Senate floor, recognized his diplomatic ability. It was because of such recognition by those governments that, after 3 years of his dealing with refugee problems, McLeod was so chosen.

I have cited numerous examples of public support for McLeod from a wide variety of sources. In my opinion, however, he is his own best defender. We all know that many reckless and contrived charges have been made against him, perhaps principally in the security field.

I should like now to quote from an address he made to the American Political Association, an organization of distinguished professors and statesmen which specifically invited him to appear before them. The speech from which I quote was so popular and was accepted as being so definitive in the Government security field that 25,000 reprints were requested by the military and distributed to their security personnel. I quote:

PREMISES OF EXISTING SECURITY PROGRAM

As Administrator of the State Department's security program there are certain premises on which the program is based of which I must be cognizant.

1. There exists a clear and present danger to our society. This danger is caused by the existence of a criminal conspiracy called communism which aims to overthrow our Government and change our society by whatever means it may find available including force, violence, and subversion.

If this danger did not exist it would be difficult to justify any security program, or at least one as thorough as that which we have. That it does exist has been established by law, by Executive order and by judicial interpretation. Congressional mandates and Executive orders to combat this danger have been cited previously.

The courts have upheld this finding. In sentencing the Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act of 1949, Judge Medina stated, "These defendants were not convicted merely for their political beliefs or ideas or for belonging to the Communist Party. I made it plain in my charge the jury could not convict for anything like that but they had to find there was specific intent to overthrow the Government by force and violence and to use words as a rule of action. * * *"

2. That Federal employment is a privilege. This premise is stated in the two whereas clauses on which the President predicated Executive Order 10450.

3. That maximum protection must be afforded the employee of the Government against unfounded accusations, rumor, gossip, and unreliable information. This premise is also stated in the whereas clause of Executive Order 10450. The two clauses embracing these two premises are as follows:

"Whereas the interests of the national security require that all persons privileged to be employed in the departments and agencies of the Government shall be reliable, trustworthy, of good conduct and character and of complete and unswerving loyalty to the United States; and

"Whereas the American tradition that all persons should receive fair, impartial and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government requires that all persons seeking the privilege of employment or privileged to be employed in the departments and agencies of the Government be adjudged by mutually consistent and no less than minimum standards and procedures among the departments and agencies governing the employment and retention in employment of persons in the Federal Service."

In recognition of these premises the State Department issued regulations, which, when they were published on July 27, 1953, had the effect of law. Our regulations were modeled in the Department of Justice. They have been tested by 2 years of use. Moreover, under the terms of Executive Order 10450 the Civil Service Commission makes a "continuing study" of the implementation of the

order and reports "deficiencies" and "tendencies" to the head of the department and the National Security Council.

Thus, unless the laws, the executive orders, or the regulations issued thereunder are changed by the duly constituted authorities they form the frame of reference for a security administrator and should not be presumed to be illegal, unreasonable, or unjust.

In the absence of change, I conclude that the security program is adequate to (1) prevent Communist penetration of our Government, and (2) protect the inherent rights of Government employees.

Yet, no one contends that this program is sacrosanct. In addition to the review provided in the order itself we find that the program is under constant scrutiny in the Congress, the courts, and the press.

As a result of this scrutiny and review many thoughtful persons have come to grips with the question of what a security program does to the rights of an individual American. It has been stated that civil rights are infringed, that legal rights are abated, that inherent rights are involved.

Every American, according to our tradition, is entitled to a square deal from his Government. I hope I can demonstrate, through discussion of our procedures, that the Government is endeavoring to insure this basic right.

It is difficult to argue that a security program, like other governmental programs based on law, does not in some instances and to some degree affect civil rights. It is evident, for example, that investigation of an individual can be to some extent an intrusion on that individual's privacy. Many of the rules of society translated into laws necessarily constrain individual tendencies or purposes which, except for the fact that people must live in close proximity to each other, would not be in themselves wrong.

Our laws and our courts have always taken cognizance of the matters of intent and degree. There is an obvious distinction between being jostled by an unruly passerby and being pushed to safety from in front of a speeding vehicle. The first act is at least bad manners and possibly disorderly conduct. The second is a normal human reaction which can be heroic.

Our Constitution and traditions are delicately balanced between the necessities of the basic responsibility of Government to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number and, at the same time, to clearly observe and respect the sovereign rights of the individual. It is this delicate position with its great potentials of dilemma that requires constant scrutiny, criticism, and evaluation of our laws, procedures, and programs, including this one under discussion today. There are three questions which, among others, must be asked. First, Is the danger real and present? Second, Do the results justify the effort? Three, Do the benefits exceed the disadvantages?

No thoughtful American wants to achieve absolute security in Government at the cost of sacrificing our traditions or by adopting the very forms of totalitarian conduct which we seek to guard against.

We should discuss briefly the theory of a security program. It seeks to prevent Communist penetration of the Government. It is not designed to prosecute such penetration. It seeks to protect the public interest before and not after the commission of an overt act. Such, indeed, is one of the definitions of security.

This theory is an important consideration in assessing this problem. If a person commits an overt act of disloyalty he may be indicted, tried and convicted under our judicial procedures. Under our theory of law he is innocent until proven guilty. The burden of proof rests on the Government and the jury is instructed to resolve reasonable doubts in favor of the accused. This is a system developed through centuries to ensure fair play in establishing guilt.

A security system is not intended to establish guilt since no act against the public interest may have occurred. If such has taken place the transgressor could be prosecuted in court. The system is intended to prevent such an act. There can be no proof since future events are not susceptible of present proof. A security risk under our procedures is not necessarily guilty of any illegal act. He is a person who has been adjudged unsuitable for Federal employment.

Scott McLeod has made an outstanding record. The samplings of public opinion which I have quoted show it.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my speech, certain favorable articles with respect to Scott McLeod. I noticed that in the Foreign Relations Committee report, many unfavorable articles were used. I send these articles to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have them printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BRIDGES. Because it has come into question, I should like to have the speech of McLeod referred to earlier printed in the RECORD. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that I have just had sent down from the State Department the speech which Mr. McLeod made in Topeka, Kans., to the American Legion, which has been in question. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire and I are in accord that the speech itself does not reveal the statement about Democrats which the Reporter article stated was made. I should like to have the RECORD also show that in my judgment, at least, there is a very good chance the statement was made during the course of the remarks. I personally am having the newspaper accounts checked to determine that, and I shall be happy at a later date to insert in the RECORD anything that may turn up.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. On that particular point, does the Senator know whether or not a tape recording was taken of Mr. McLeod's actual remarks?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I do not. If there was one, I should be glad to hear it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have a transcript of a tape recording, if one was taken.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not have any record of a tape recording. I do not know whether one was taken. I was referring to the speech itself.

I do not have too much faith in the authority quoted. I pay every compliment to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for his integrity in inserting the remarks in the RECORD, but I question his judgment as to the authority from which he quoted.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield briefly, it was not I who put the remark in the RECORD. It was a record made by the Committee on Foreign Relations from which I was merely quoting.

Mr. BRIDGES. I again point out I am not questioning the integrity of the Senator from Pennsylvania or of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I merely question the source from which they quoted.

Scott McLeod has made an outstanding record. The American people are satisfied with Scott McLeod. So is Secretary Dulles, and so is the President of the United States. Scott McLeod has run not 1 but 5 difficult offices and programs. He has represented this Government in complicated international negotiations. Throughout his career in the Department of State he has worked in the glare of public scrutiny. It is amazing to me that he has been able to accomplish his various tasks with so little criticism, and that from a quarter long since exposed and discredited.

I sincerely believe the great majority of thinking people in Ireland will consider themselves fortunate to have a man of high rank and qualification, like Scott McLeod, assigned to their country.

A cablegram was received today from the editor of the Irish Independent, Dublin, Ireland. Its contents are as follows:

Opposition McLeod negligible. Unrepresentative minority. No political party, deputy, or senator opposes. Vast majority people welcome enthusiastically.

I might say in closing, Mr. President, that I have sat in the Senate for nearly 21 years. I have seen many people confirmed as ambassadors and sent to foreign nations. I hope that in the years to come the men and women who are sent to foreign nations to represent our country will have the basic integrity, basic qualifications, the interest in and the love of this country that Scott McLeod has. I think we will in that case be well represented.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New Hampshire Sunday News of April 21, 1957]

MCLEOD VICTIM OF DIRTY HATCHET JOB BY LEFTIST CLIQUE, BUT APPROVAL OF AMBASSADORSHIP IS EXPECTED

(By Herman Lowe)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The dirtiest hatchet job that's been done on anyone down here in a long time is being done today to Scott McLeod, of New Hampshire, administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs for the State Department, who has been nominated to be our next Ambassador to Ireland.

(Editor's note: President Eisenhower asked at his most recent press conference why he had nominated McLeod and whether he felt the latter could do an effective job "in view of the criticism provoked by his appointment," said: "I took—I appointed Mr. McLeod on the serious and earnest recommendation of Secretary Dulles, who is held responsible by me for the successful functioning of all our embassies. And when he rec-

ommended him and he did it, not in a perfunctory way but in a very serious, direct way, which he does all those, I approved him.)

A select crew of State Department experts, veterans at the chore of secretly leaking poison to certain newspapers to be used against those whom the clique hates, have been pouring it out in the large economy size packages.

They've accused McLeod of being the cat's paw and tool of Senator Joe McCarthy whom they hate.

They've accused McLeod of being the handpicked choice of Senator STYLES BRIDGES (whom they hate) for his present job in the State Department.

They've accused McLeod of wrecking morale in the State Department Foreign Service by his control over consular and other officials.

They've accused McLeod of leaking information about Ambassador Charles Bohlen to Senator McCarthy.

They've accused McLeod of being responsible for the information leak which was followed by the recent suicide of Canadian Ambassador Norman, in Egypt.

These stories have been printed. They've been mouthed by indignant liberals.

Let's take a look at some of these charges which are as phoney as wooden nickels.

Back in January 1953, shortly after the Eisenhower administration took over, Donald B. Lourie, then executive vice president of the Quaker Oats Co., became Under Secretary of State, in charge of administration. In 1952, Congress had voted to add a new job to the State Department, that of administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Congress was up in arms about the strong leftie clique in the Department. It wanted this crowd, largely concentrated in the Far Eastern division, cleaned out.

It wanted a security officer for the State Department who would be tough, conscientious, and unable to be swayed by that influential gang of Moscow apologists.

Lourie was the man assigned by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to find the man. Through a mutual friend from Iowa, he heard about McLeod, a native of Iowa, a former FBI agent and newspaperman, and in 1953 administrative assistant to Senator BRIDGES.

Lourie checked on McLeod, then sent for him and offered him the post.

McLeod thought it over and decided to accept. Then he told his boss, BRIDGES, about it. At about the same time, he had a talk with this Union Leader and Sunday News correspondent.

He told me the above story and when I asked whether BRIDGES had suggested him for the post, McLeod said BRIDGES hadn't known anything about it. Later, I put the question to Senator BRIDGES. He admitted frankly that, while he was delighted at the opportunity for advancement for his top aide, he had nothing to do with getting McLeod the job.

So, this correspondent can state from his personal knowledge that the stories about McLeod being put into the State Department by BRIDGES as a stooge for him and McCarthy are faked and planted merely to do McLeod harm at this time.

The Norman case broke when McLeod was in Europe. The alleged leak of information from the State Department Security Office took place when McLeod was out of the United States. He had nothing whatsoever to do with it. Yet the hatchet men in the State Department have planted the story with leading liberal newspapers that have swallowed it whole and without properly checking the facts.

The other printed whispers—that the morale of Foreign Service officers is shot and that McLeod's office has provided a leak to Senator McCarthy (who is, indeed, an old friend of McLeod)—are unproven gossip.

These stories, and others like them, are a mass of generalities. There are no specific cases, no specific proof, offered. Just the phony charges.

That reputable newspapers and broadcast correspondents have swallowed them whole and repeated them is no credit to the newsgathering business.

But the following are facts:

While some Members of the Senate may try to give McLeod and his nomination to Ireland a bad time, the Granite Stater will be approved for the post.

The friends of McLeod have a very good idea of just who in the State Department is leading the hatchet bund. And it's a long road that has no turning.

ANTI-MCLEOD DRIVE SCORED—IRISH TIMES DOES NOT REPRESENT IRELAND; CALLED BIASED

(By Eugene Goulding)

DUBLIN, Ireland.—Commenting editorially on President Eisenhower's nomination of Scott McLeod to be the United States' Ambassador to Ireland, the Irish Independent (April 15) stated: "As far as Ireland is concerned we are aware of no grounds on which exception could be taken to Mr. McLeod's nomination and appointment. The suggestion that there has been any outcry against it is, as the Irish public is well aware, quite unfounded."

On the contrary, Irish public opinion is acutely perplexed and disturbed to read the extracts in the Irish papers of the bitter campaign now being waged against Mr. McLeod by such newspapers as the Washington Post, the New York Times, the New York Post, the Baltimore Sun, the London Daily Telegraph, and others.

The sole dissenting but very vocal outburst here against Mr. McLeod's nomination and appointment has come from the Irish Times and the so-called Irish Association of Civil Liberty. Some American newspapers have erroneously interpreted this hostile reaction as indicative of Irish opinion generally. Such an assumption is entirely baseless.

The Irish Independent further stated: "It would appear that some of the American newspapers also accept the notion that there is some feeling in this country against Mr. McLeod's nomination to Dublin. It would be well that these ideas should be dispelled. In accordance with diplomatic usages and international courtesies, we expect that a person appointed as Ambassador to Ireland should be a man against whom Irishmen could make no objection on any reasonable grounds. If no such objection appears, the choice of Ambassador is entirely one for the United States; it would be wholly contrary to Irish courtesy to attempt to interfere in such choice or to seek to influence it."

SMALL BUT INFLUENTIAL

The Irish Times is a small but influential daily. It represents the somewhat frayed remnants of old-time West Britonism and is generally regarded as the mouthpiece of the Masonic Society in Ireland.

It conducts a veiled and subtle policy of anti-Catholicism and when the opportunity presents itself it does not hesitate to engage in a local form of Blanshardism.

In the last few years it has argued consistently in its columns for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations; and, despite the repeated protests of members of the Maynooth mission to China who have suffered at the hands of Chinese Communists, it has opened its columns to a smear campaign against the heroism of priests and nuns in Communist China.

This, then, is the Irish paper to which hostility against Mr. McLeod is confined. In today's issue (April 16) it charges Mr. McLeod's "unwholesome department" with the responsibility for the suicide of Herbert Norman, the late Canadian Ambassador in Cairo.

Accuracy has never been a strong point with the Irish Times, and though it likes to wear literary spats it very often betrays its real feelings by undignified and reprehensible expressions.

Today, for example, it had the following objectionable passage: "It is urged in favor of Mr. McLeod that he has done a good job, discharged a socially valuable service to his country—even if, in the process, a few innocent people may have had the bad luck to have suffered. So, in the view of many, does the hangman. But we do not welcome the hangman into our midst, and it is not customary to reward his services with an ambassadorship."

The grand alliance between the Irish Times and the Irish Association of Civil Liberty has been forged for several years and whenever the dictates of Liberal-Socialism demand it the alliance expresses itself as a noisy and clamorous duet. The nomination of Mr. McLeod has been no exception.

True to form the council of the association has asked the Government to reconsider their reported agreement to the proposed appointment of Mr. McLeod. Though it did not hesitate to make such a request, nevertheless it admits that it is in no position to pass judgment at this stage.

Let us glance, then, at this so-called Irish Association of Civil Liberty which has which has been reported in sections of the American press as opposing Mr. McLeod's nomination. It is a numerically small body composed or roughly 100 dues-paying members and its activities are conducted by less than a dozen members.

Its president is Sean O'Faolain.

[From the New York Times of February 25, 1956]

TWENTY-FIVE LANDS PLEDGE REFUGEE FUNDS ON BID THAT CASH MATCH PRAYERS—$2,400,000 TOTAL IS REACHED—MCLEOD POLLS DELEGATES AT GENEVA CONFERENCE

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, February 24.—In a session reminiscent of a prayer meeting 25 governments pledged enough extra funds yesterday and today to keep the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration From Europe in full operation at least through 1957.

Scott McLeod, of the United States, was chairman of the organization's council at its semiannual session, which ended today. As the official responsible for refugee and migration problems in the State Department, he was also the chief United States delegate.

Earlier in the session Mr. McLeod observed that he would expect those who "prayed" the longest and the loudest in favor of the committee's continued existence to reach the deepest into their cash boxes. By going around the table delegate by delegate he elicited a total of approximately $2,400,000 in new pledges.

THREE MILLIONS HAD BEEN SET

While this is not the $3 million figure that had been set, migration committee officials feel it will be ample to meet requirements when certain minor adjustments in expenditures are taken into account.

The committee aids people desiring to migrate from Europe to overseas countries. It furnishes transportation when necessary and money (through nongovernmental and religious agencies) and performs a large number of processing services in emigration and immigration. It is moving people at the rate of about 125,000 yearly at present.

The financial crisis, which now seems to have been overcome, arose from the fact that for 3 years the committee had been able to draw on accumulated "carryover" funds amounting to nearly $3 million yearly. These funds are exhausted.

Technically, the money now pledged will go into a "special fund." Some of this will consist of money that can be used anywhere in the committee's operations and some will be in the form of payments by governments within their own frontiers toward the cost of emigration or resettlement.

The principal pledges were those of Australia, $514,000; Italy, $285,000; the Netherlands, $250,000; Austria, $170,000; Chile, $155,000; West Germany, $120,000, and Switzerland, $120,000.

The United States, as was known in advance, stands ready to meet the contributions of other governments up to an amount equal to one-third of the total or $940,000, whichever is smaller.

The success of Mr. McLeod's pledge drive has delighted the United States delegation which believes this evidence of support from other governments will ease the task of persuading Congress to continue American participation in the organization.

TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND ASSURED UNITED STATES ENTRY

FRANKFURT, Germany, February 24.—Plans have been announced here for resettling 25,000 persons in the United States under the United States Refugee Relief Act.

James J. Norris, European director of the Catholic Relief Service-National Catholic Welfare Conference, told a meeting of directors here that homes and jobs had been assured for all the emigrants as required under the Refugee Act, which expires December 31.

[From the New York Times of October 26, 1956]

M'LEOD SAYS UNITED STATES GIVES MOST VISAS—STATE DEPARTMENT AIDE CITES 968,000 ISSUED IN LAST 4 YEARS AS WORLD HIGH

The United States has issued more immigration visas than any other nation in the last 4 years, Scott McLeod said here yesterday. He is administrator for the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

Apparently in answer to recent domestic criticism of United States immigration policies, Mr. McLeod said that this Nation had issued 968,109 immigration visas of all kinds in the 4 fiscal years ended last June 30.

As for the workings of the Refugee Relief Act, authorizing the entry of 209,000 refugees, he said that as of last week 155,000 visas had been granted. By the end of the year, when the act expires, he added, a total of 180,000 visas are expected to have been issued.

Mr. McLeod thus indicated that the expected deficit would be 29,000 immigrants and not 40,000, as critics of the act had said.

One of the main reasons for the nonfulfillment of the total authorized in the law, he said, is the fact that many prospective immigrants from Germany and Austria have been turning down visas at the last minute because of improved economic conditions in those two countries. The two countries have a quota of 90,000 under them act.

Ten of the fourteen special categories under which visas are being issued have been completely filled, Mr. McLeod reported. Immigration visas under the act, he added, are now being issued at the rate of 2,000 a week, with a higher number to be granted in the weeks to come.

Mr. McLeod returned aboard the American Export liner *Independence* after attending the annual conference of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at Geneva, Switzerland.

He said the United States should adopt specific immigration provisions for escaped persons during the cold war period and should also try to make it possible for victims of tuberculosis among displaced persons to come to this country.

Also aboard the liner was Senator Walter F. George, Democrat, of Georgia, and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He returned from a European trip as personal representative of President Eisenhower and special ambassador on North Atlantic Treaty Organization development.

[From the Washington Star of April 16, 1957]

MORE ON THE MCLEOD APPOINTMENT—EDITORIALS IN BRITAIN'S NEWSPAPERS RANGE FROM MILD TO LESS THAN MODERATE

(By Constantine Brown)

Our good friends and distant cousins in Canada and Britain have added to the present world confusion by taking up a quarrel with the United States on purely internal American matters.

President Eisenhower has designated the State Department's security chief, Scott McLeod, as Ambassador to Ireland. This official became a controversial figure after he assumed office in 1953. He was entrusted with the job of removing a number of American diplomats who, under the law passed in 1952, represented a loyalty or security risk. He was then severely criticized at home and abroad for the dismissal or retirement of a number of career officers.

McLeod's bosses, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, appear to have been fully satisfied with his work. Otherwise they would have fired him. He is not a "sacred cow" and there is no reason to believe that his friends in the Senate would have put up a howl if Mr. Dulles had eased him out in due course. Instead the Secretary, who has never been sympathetic to "witch hunts," recommended him for the ambassadorship. And the Chief Executive approved this choice. Yet British newspapers, including the so-called conservative press, went on a binge of indignation over the appointment.

The sedate London Daily Telegraph asked in an editorial "whether the fact that most American policemen are Irish is a good enough reason for the choice of a former FBI agent to be Ambassador to the Irish Republic." It added that "Mr. McLeod succeeded in spreading suspicion and fear throughout the ranks of the Foreign Service as well as making possible major injustices to individuals."

There were other less moderate editorials in the British press about an individual who had committed injustices not against any British personnel but against those of his own country.

The British, despite the pride they take in their police, seem to treat the FBI with scorn. They describe it as a police force and consider the appointment of a former cop as American Ambassador to the Irish Republic as a slur despite the acceptance of Mr. McLeod by the Dublin Government. Even the well-informed British editorial writers seem to ignore the fact that the FBI is a part of the Justice Department and is not a police force in the European sense of the world. Only a branch of the once famous Scotland Yard could possibly be vaguely compared with the FBI.

Similarly the Canadian Government and especially the Canadian press stirred up a hornet's nest when they attacked violently the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee over its disclosures of Communist incidents in the early life of Herbert Norman, Canadian Ambassador to Cairo. The Canadian diplomat, who committed suicide for reasons which have not yet been fully disclosed, was described as a victim of the American senatorial witch hunt.

The Internal Security Subcommittee was investigating alleged past Communist affiliation of John K. Emerson who was counselor of embassy at Beirut, Lebanon. Although the name of the Canadian diplomat had appeared a number of times during the investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1951 and 1952, Foreign Minister Lester Pearson became loudly indignant when Mr. Norman's name appeared incidentally at the recent questioning of Mr. Emerson.

Senator JAMES EASTLAND, chairman of the subcommittee, does not believe that our own or allied security can be helped by sweeping under the rug matters connected with foreign diplomats. It is recalled that when Klaus Fuchs—a British subject—arrived in the United States, the FBI did not investigate him since he had been cleared by all British security services. Yet his betrayal of A-bomb secrets to the U. S. S. R. is partially responsible for the mess in which the world finds itself now. Had it not been for Fuchs the Russians might be far behind the free world in developing nuclear weapons.

Similarly the American security agencies were told to keep hands off the two British diplomats, Donald MacLean and Guy Burgess. It was only after they fled to Moscow, where they are believed to be guiding lights in the present Soviet policy in the Middle East, that their true activities were partially revealed. Yet there are strong reasons to believe that the two men, by passing on to Moscow top-secret information obtained in their official capacities in Washington and London that we did not intend to bomb Manchuria, gave the Chinese Communists the news that they could intervene en masse in the Korean war without fear of effective aerial retaliation.

Under these conditions, the Internal Security Subcommittee feels that its investigations serve the real interests of America as well as of her allies.

[From the New York Journal and American of December 10, 1956]

IMMIGRATION ACT IN HIGH

(By David Sentner)

Scott McLeod, State Department security chief, is closing out the Refugee Relief Act in a cloud of glory.

He has managed to issue 6,500 American visas within 3 weeks to the heroic Hungarian refugees in Austria and is also set to take care of an expected score or more of defecting Olympic Hungarian athletes as soon as they reach Manila.

The former FBI agent got the full-scale smear treatment from the left-wing Americans for Democratic Action when he began to administer the refugee act in 1953.

The act runs out in a few weeks and I dropped in to see the square-rigged McLeod to hear how he thought it had worked out and what Congress could do about the gallant self-exiled Hungarian freedom fighters.

McLeod is worried about Soviet agents working on the Hungarian refugees after they are flown over here.

The new Congress should quickly do something to alter their status as parolees, an insecure position which Red agents will surely exploit, McLeod believes.

The Hungarian athletes can come to the United States under a provision of the Refugee Act, McLeod added.

From his security sources in Europe, McLeod reported that the naked-fist revolt of the Hungarians against the armored might of Red Russia was brought on to a major extent by the foolish use of Mongolian troops by Moscow.

The history-minded Hungarians were not only inflamed by the bestiality of the Mongolian troops but were reminded of the Asiatic hordes who laid waste their nation centuries ago, he said.

On the subject of his leftwing critics, McLeod declared he had told them that "we have to build a railroad, construct a track, and train the crews" before the Refugee Relief Act could work.

"It came about just as I said," remarked McLeod, "and it turned out to be a pretty

good railroad to take care of those 6,500 Hungarian refugees in 3 weeks."

The act called for 200,000 American visas to be issued, outside the regular immigration quota, to victims of Communist oppression.

With only a few weeks to go before the law is ended, 171,393 visas have been issued, McLeod said.

[From the Washington Post of April 27, 1957]

THE CRITICISM AIMED AT SCOTT MCLEOD

(By George E. Sokolsky)

I met a young fellow who does not like Scott McLeod. The reason: Scott McLeod, said the young fellow, is a friend of Joe McCarthy.

"Is that not guilt by association to which you and your professors object?" I asked.

"True, but McLeod is responsible for having many fine men driven out of the State Department."

"Who are these fine men?" I asked.

Silence.

One does not remember names, dates, places. It is only necessary to remember sentences, slogans, stereotypes. This is regarded as education. If the student remembers the professors' phrases, he gets a good mark. In time, he believes them.

I pursued the argument: "Do you know what Scott McLeod's job has been in the State Department?"

The answer was ambiguous.

"Well," I said, "his formal title has been Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. This has to do with screening personnel to avoid the employment of blabbermouths, homosexuals, and subversives. Blabbermouths are bad because, give them a drink or two, and they talk their heads off. Often they quote their superiors. Blabbermouths are beloved by newspapermen because while they may be wrong in detail they provide tips that can be followed up. There are more male than female blabbermouths. I know a blabbermouth who always says more than he ought to and then worries for weeks whether he has not wrecked his family. A fellow in the code room of an Embassy must not be a blabbermouth. If he prefers being the wise guy in a bar or at a cocktail party, he ought to apply for some other job than in the State Department. He could do less harm at the hardware counter of a department store.

"The homosexual, male or female, is always subject to blackmail. So is the married man who chases after other men's wives. This may be some kind of indoor sport but it is no good for the State Department. Such people have to be screened out. The subversive is obviously out of order.

"Somebody has to do the screening. If it is not one man, it will be another, and the job changes with the times. For instance, when this country was at war with Germany, those who were pro-German were dangerous for the State Department; when we were at war with Japan, anyone who was pro-Japanese became a menace. Now we are in a state of a cold war with Soviet Russia and therefore the pro-Russian and the pro-Communist are a menace. Somebody has to do the job of checking personnel in this sensitive agency and, I suppose, whoever does it will make a lot of personal enemies."

So again, I asked the young man where he heard that Scott McLeod, our new Ambassador to Ireland, is such a bad man. Well, it all came out in college. The word had gone forth to smear a public official because he did his duty, whatever his duty happened to be.

Bad thinking is involved in all this because whereas none of us are perfect and the probability is that if one searched hard enough, he would find much that is unsatisfactory in each one of us, here was a conclusion, held with vehemence and blushing anger but without any effort to get at a single fact to uphold a point of view.

It is the avoidance of facts to which I object; the repetition of sentences and phrases, of charges and conclusions spoken in classrooms and repeated everywhere. That certainly is not an intellectual approach to anything. While many of these young men refer to themselves as intellectuals, they reject the work that an intellectual must do to catalog facts, to screen out unrelated matter, to avoid subjective reactions and not to reach a conclusion based on nothing but hearsay. Since the 1930's American intellectuals have been willing to be led by stereotypes, by phrases which may apply to some things but which are not generalizations applicable to all human problems.

BON VOYAGE, MR. MCLEOD

Mr. Scott McLeod had been around, and he knew, in January of 1953, when Mr. Dulles offered him the post of chief security and personnel officer for the State Department, that he was being asked to become one of liberaldom's principal targets. He took the job nevertheless, and for 4 years he discharged his duties with conscience, humanity, intelligence, and dignity. For his pains he has been abused throughout the land. Herblock counts it a week lost when he does not portray him in some ignoble posture in the act of doing his best to render our society uninhabitable; the Alsops worked hard to cast McLeod as the prototype of a new species of administrative executioner; and the New York Times, of course, wept that he was ever born.

The President has now appointed Mr. McLeod Ambassador to Ireland. The appointment, needless to say, has evoked a deafening chorus of hisses from the little men who a few years ago were defending the nomination of Mr. Bohlen on the grounds, pure and simple, that the Constitution gives to the Chief Executive the power to appoint Ambassadors, period—and criticism of his choice is accordingly out of order.

Well, Mr. McLeod will soon be off to Ireland where, predictably, he will perform as faithfully as he has here. We will miss him at the State Department. It is regrettable he cannot be both places at once. Or, better still, a hundred places at once.

[From the Washington Star of April 15, 1957]

IRISH REACTION

It is beginning to look as though reports of hostile reaction in Ireland to the designation of Scott McLeod as Ambassador have been exaggerated.

The Irish Times has protested, primarily on the basis of accusations against Mr. McLeod which it says have been denied but not disproved. And the Irish Association of Civil Liberty, taking note of the outcry from reputable and presumably well informed newspapers, has asked the Dublin government to reconsider its reported agreement to accept the McLeod appointment.

There are indications, however, that the newspapers whose outcry has impressed the civil liberty group may not have been very well informed after all. At any rate, the Irish Independent, the country's largest daily newspaper, has been unable to detect the outraged Irish reaction reported in some English and American papers.

The Independent thinks that these reports were inaccurate and that they should be corrected. "As far as Ireland is concerned," the paper says, "we are aware of no grounds on which exception could be taken to Mr. McLeod's nomination and appointment. The suggestion that there has been an outcry against it is, as the Irish public is well aware, quite unfounded."

For our part, we continue to believe that the selection was unfortunate to the extent that it may have been designed to ease Mr. McLeod out of his controversial place in the State Department. The fact that Mr. McLeod is disliked and distrusted by some people in this country, however, does not necessarily mean that he is unacceptable to the Irish Government or that he is not competent to serve as Ambassador. On such points as these the record should be kept straight.

[From the Intermountain Jewish News (Denver, Colo.), of April 26, 1957]

JUDGE ROSENBAUM WINS CASE AT GENEVA FOR WORLD HELP TO SAVE EGYPT JEWS

(By Robert S. Gamzey)

Judge Charles Rosenbaum won the biggest case of his life at Geneva. It was a plea for world assistance to save thousands of dispossessed Egyptian Jews.

The Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration, meeting in Switzerland, where Rosenbaum was a United States delegate, voted to finance the transportation of 12,500 Egyptian Jewish refugees from Greece and Italy to Israel. The Jewish agency brought them from Cairo and Alexandria to Greek and Italian ports with UJA-Allied Campaign Special Rescue funds now being raised throughout the country.

The story behind this life-saving decision by the 27-nation Inter-Governmental Committee, known as ICEM, is the story of how Judge Rosenbaum won his biggest case, with the help of sympathetic and understanding American delegation colleagues, and an impassioned 11th-hour speech about a second Passover Exodus from Egypt by the Israeli representative, Erin Laor.

Judge Rosenbaum accepted the United States Government appointment to the Geneva Conference under pressure from Phillip Klutznick, B'nai B'rith president, and Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman, UJA chief, who prevailed upon the noted Denver attorney and community leader to present the case for intergovernmental aid to Egyptian Jewish refugees.

He had to overcome a major technicality. The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration was established to relieve European countries suffering from overpopulation, and was confined to European problems. Egypt was outside its legal scope.

Rosenbaum, aboard ship en route to Switzerland, convinced his fellow delegates that Egyptian Jews became eligible for ICEM assistance when they landed at Greek and Italian ports with UJA-Allied Campaign transportation money. The allied past president cited a precedent of ICEM assistance in resettling Netherlands refugees from Indonesia after they returned to overcrowded Holland.

SOLD WALTER

In Geneva, he had breakfast 3 days in succession with Representative FRANCIS WALTER, House Immigration Committee chairman, whose powerful influence would be decisive on American congressional policy. WALTER was impressed with the American Jewish Congress Black Book on Nasser's pauperization of Egyptian Jewry. On ship, he found the American delegation chief, Scott McLeod, to be "a wonderful, fair-minded, capable man."

With the cooperation of ICEM Chairman George Warren, a distinguished and revered American, Judge Rosenbaum succeeded in placing the Egyptian issue on the Intergovernmental Committee agenda. The State Department was cabled for instructions. Three days passed without reply from Washington. United States support was all-important because our country provides 40 percent of the ICEM budget.

UNITED STATES APPROVAL WON

On the final day of the Geneva Conference, the State Department informed its delegation

that the United States approved Warren's proposal for a $950,000 budget. The stage was set for the final session of the 27-nation committee.

With delegates from all parts of the world listening through their earphones to simultaneous translations in many languages, the Israeli Erin Laor took the floor.

In a dramatic appeal, the Israeli described how Nasser stripped Egyptian Jewry of all their possessions, homes, businesses, jobs, and other means of livelihood. Laor declared, "I have just received a cable from the Red Cross that the steamer Mecca has arrived in Greece with 962 Egyptian refugees. There are 262 children on the ship. There are 38 sick and maimed. Two are paralytics.

PASSOVER APPEAL

"Today is Friday. On Monday night, the Jews of the world will sit down to their ancient Passover seder. This is what the Christian world calls the Last Supper of Jesus.

"Three thousand years ago, the Jews of Egypt were led by Moses in another Exodus. Instead of eating their Passover seder in the desert, this exodus will enjoy the hospitality of the people of Greece and other havens, who themselves are overcrowded and short of funds.

"I speak on behalf of my government offering to accept all the Egyptian Jewish refugees. I hope and pray that you will enable them in this modern exodus to come to the promised land."

OFFER HAVENS

Judge Rosenbaum said the assembly room remained silent for moments after the Israeli sat down. Then the Greek delegate arose to thank him for his kind remarks about the hospitality of Greece, and offered to take downtrodden refugees from Egypt.

Next, the Netherlands delegate offered a haven despite Holland's overpopulation.

Chairman Warren climaxed the session by announcing American support of ICEM transportation of 12,500 Egyptian Jews from Greek and Italian ports to Israel. The Inter-Government Committee of 27 nations voted approval and adjourned.

FLIES TO SEDER

Judge Rosenbaum, who had laid the foundation for this mass lifesaving action, said he was so overcome with emotion that he decided then and there to abandon plans for another 2 weeks stay in Europe, and fly home for seder. He left Friday and arrived in Denver Sunday night, presiding at his seder for 30, including GI guests, who heard this dramatic story from the man who helped achieve a modern exodus for 12,500 Jews.

Judge Rosenbaum arrived in time to greet the arrival of his new grandson, Steven, son of Mr. and Mrs. Stanton Rosenbaum.

[From the Irish Independent Daily Newspaper (Dublin, Ireland) of April 29, 1957]

ATTACK ON MR. MCLEOD DEPLORED BY MR. DILLON

A favorite method employed by Communists was to attack on every possible occasion the character of any one who had successfully challenged them in the past and a recent instance of that was the case of Mr. Scott McLeod, said Mr. Dillon, T. D., national president, A. O. H., at the golden jubilee dinner of St. Patrick's Division 566 of the A. O. H., Dundalk.

Every Communist, every fellow traveler, every "Pink" and the Irish Times had combined to raise their hands in holy horror professing to regard Mr. McLeod as wholly unsuitable for the high position as American Ambassador in Ireland, he added.

The truth was that Mr. McLeod was a distinguished public servant who did his job, and the Communists did not like it, and they would now be very happy to assassinate his public reputation for all sorts of high sounding reasons.

He was not the first, and would not be the last, victim of that conspiracy of slander and vituperation of which the Communists were pastmasters.

Mr. Dillon, continuing, said he hoped the A. O. H. would always be vigilant to see that those fighting against that deadly kind of attack would always be assured of a fair and honest judgment from its members and, if necessary, of vigorous support and defense.

TECHNIQUE OF REDS

There was never a time when the influence and work of the A. O. H. was more important, as it could provide a bulwark of defense for their young people against the zealous efforts of international communism. The technique which the Communist Party ordinarily employed in a country like this was to appear in public under all sorts of high-sounding titles implying patriotism, love of freedom, and democracy, but never describing themselves as what they were—Marxian Communists. In England, they presented themselves to young Irish people as "Connolly Clubs," and published a paper called "The Irish Democrat."

Stating that the A. O. H. was carrying on the work of conciliation begun many years ago with a view to enabling Orange and Green to live and work peaceably together in a united Ireland Mr. Dillon added that so long as partition continued, full cooperation and good will could not exist between Ireland and England. He was certain that with the disappearance of partition not only could good will be firmly established but a united Ireland could play a not insignificant role in promoting what the world now needed—a new commonwealth of nations.

COMMONWEALTH LINK

Due to the fact that their people had contributed in no small measure to the creation, and maintenance of the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and many of the British colonial possessions, Ireland could form a unique link in a new Anglo-American commonwealth, comprising the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Great Britain with her colonies, and such other free communities as choose to adhere to such a commonwealth—with free passage for men, money and goods throughout their respective territories.

Such a commonwealth would dispose of resources, human and material, so great that no other combination in the world would dare to challenge it. It would also constitute a citadel of peace inasmuch as it would not seek aggrandisement by conquest.

Senator J. G. Lennon, Armagh, National Vice President, said that if it became necessary that arms should be taken up by anybody in this country for the abolition of partition it could only be done by an Irish Army as the instrument of the Irish people. The A. O. H. had given to the bishops their complete and wholehearted loyalty. The unity of the country could only be attained by the willing cooperation and mutual understanding of all the Irish people.

Very Rev. T. F. MacDonald, Adm., Dundalk, and Messrs. G. Coburn, T. D., F. Matthews and L. Byrne also spoke.

Five founder members were presented with medallions by Mr. Dillon. They were Messrs. Robert Watters, Thomas Matthews, John Finnegan, Henry Clinton and Peter McArdle.

[From the San Francisco Examiner of April 14, 1957]

RUGGED FIGURE ENVOY CHOICE

(By Tom White)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—Granting Congressional confirmation of his appointment, a rugged, controversial, former FBI agent is soon to become the Honorable R. W. Scott McLeod, United States Ambassador to Ireland.

President Eisenhower's naming of McLeod to succeed William Howard Taft III to the post in Dublin has revived the storm of arguments that raged when McLeod provided fast and strong action following his appointment as head of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in 1953.

Already old enemies are going for his scalp, but the appointment adds up the fact that the administration is rewarding McLeod for what it believes was a job well done.

The President confirmed this at a press conference when he said that McLeod's appointment had been recommended by his boss, Secretary of State Dulles, and that he (the President) had the utmost confidence in Dulles.

A 42-year-old native of Davenport, Iowa, McLeod spent his early days as a newspaper reporter, then became an FBI agent and later administrative assistant to Senator BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire.

His transfer to the State Department in the role of security chief came at a time when sensational stories were breaking about subversion and disloyalty in the Government.

It was McLeod's job not only to tighten up the Federal Government's security system for its own employees but to provide tighter checks on the political background of refugees coming to this country.

In this troubleshooting role it was natural that he would be a target for liberal and left-wing groups.

When his appointment comes up before Congress his enemies will charge that he undermined confidence in the State Department and lowered morale in the Foreign Service.

The State Department, however, will argue that as a result of McLeod's regime Foreign Service morale has increased to the extent that applications for membership have now reached an alltime high.

It also will be argued that the remarkable United States handling of Hungarian refugees last year was another result of McLeod's efficiency.

In private life, chunky, crew-haired styled McLeod is an amateur trap drum player who likes to play along with Benny Goodman records. He is an ardent sports enthusiast and still has his name in the record books for a 74-yard punt he made in a college football game. McLeod says it happened because he stepped in a gopher hole while he was kicking the ball.

His attractive wife is nicknamed "Pappy" because she is the former Edna Van Pappelendam and McLeod says he refuses to call her Edna. They have 3 children, Anne, 13; Donald Van, 11; and Daniel Benton, 10.

[From the American Weekly of June 3, 1956]

SCOTT MCLEOD—JEEP-DRIVING DIPLOMAT

(By Frances Leighton)

Every weekday morning about 8:30 o'clock, a spruce, strong-faced man drives a 1947 jeep across Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D. C. He maneuvers the little old car among the sleek, long limousines, parks near the new State Department Building and walks briskly inside.

You might take him for an audacious visitor, intent on beginning his sightseeing early, but this jeep driver belongs in the State Department. His name is Scott McLeod and he is the crew-cut, straight-talking Security Administrator whose job is to screen the State Department men—our national salesmen—whom we, the American people, send abroad to represent us.

He's trying his best to make sure that the State Department shall not again be under fire as a hotbed of communism and misconduct.

He's an Iowan, an FBI-trained investigator, and is married to a charming young

woman he calls "Pappy." They have three children and live in Bethesda, Md., outside of Washington, remote from the striped-trousered formalities of affairs of state.

When he took this job 3 years ago, almost anyone working for the State Department was in danger of being labeled "pink." Very few wanted to enter the Department's Foreign Service. He began a security check of all employees. Today 8,000 persons are waiting to take exams for Foreign Service posts.

From the start McLeod has been a storm center. He was branded as a "Fascist," a "smear artist" and a "character assassin." But this hasn't bothered him much. He's been straightforward and impartial.

"I knew I'd take a public shellacking," he says. "As an FBI agent I'd had a chance to investigate security problems. Here I saw an opportunity to correct some of them. This job was important because the prestige of the United States was being diminished and the reputations of fine people were being hurt.

"Only a small percentage of State Department employees were found to be security risks. Of those separated from their jobs, some were fired but most chose to resign. The Department now has an up-to-date appraisal of everyone working for it."

Anyone can take a State Department job now and not feel that he is among questionable associates. He can feel sure that State Department representatives command respect.

"I still can't get used to the pomp of Washington," says the jeep-driving diplomat. But he believes that he can serve his country well if he never buys a pair of striped trousers.

EXHIBIT 2

I was very pleased to receive the invitation to speak to the Kansas American Legion.

Most of you are probably not aware that I was born and raised in the neighboring State of Iowa, and that essentially I am a mid-westerner in my thoughts and actions.

I enjoy speaking to the American Legion because I feel that you understand the problems which I am attempting to work out, because I feel that we share the same desire to improve and perfect the processes of our Government.

In addition to the fun which comes when I leave my desk in Washington, D. C., my visit to Kansas brings back very vividly boyhood memories of my trips to the home of my grandmother in Rosedale, Kans. I shall never forget the stories which my grandmother and my father told me of the Kansas of another century.

It has always seemed to me that the people of the vast Middle West had a balanced philosophy which is genuinely American. It is refreshing to merely mingle with you people and to clear my mind which I must admit can easily get muddled in the day-to-day crises which take place in Washington, D. C.

Briefly and rather informally I would like to tell you about some of the problems which confront the new administration in Washington—particularly the task which has been entrusted to me and the manner in which I am trying to accomplish my assignment.

I was told not to make a political speech, and I am going to try to be very good and obey my instructions.

But, it is almost impossible for me to talk about the State Department, without talking about politics. In a sense, I am a politician in that I was appointed by the present administration to a political office. I suppose my job could be described as a rather obscure junior vice president in the biggest business on earth—your Government.

I personally object to the connotation that has been put on the word "politics" by some people. To me politics is the science of government. Our government is a political system. It was planned that way. The government can only be as good as the politicians who are elected to public office by the people.

Under this political system, the noblest ideas of man have been brought to fruition. The only "nonpolitical" government I know of is a dictatorship. So, it seems to me when we talk about government we have to talk about politics.

I suspect that I owe my present position to the fact that I had a rather extensive political education, when I served as the Administrative Assistant to Senator BRIDGES of New Hampshire.

While I worked in the United States, I was privileged to know rather intimately the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Kansas, ANDY SCHOEPPEL. To me he represents the best characteristics of the Middle West, and I hope all of you realize what an outstanding job he is doing for your State in the United States Senate.

It was my further pleasure to know Senator CARLSON, an equally distinguished gentleman. Unfortunately, for me, I never knew him quite so well as I did Senator SCHOEPPEL, partly because Senator CARLSON was not a member of the committees on which my boss served, and partly because Senator CARLSON had not been in Washington as long. Senator CARLSON is tremendously admired and certainly deserves honor and recognition for his efforts in the nomination and subsequent election of our new President Dwight Eisenhower. It seems to me the people of Kansas should be very proud of the Senators they have sent to Washington, D. C.

Almost a year ago the people of the United States voted for a change in Washington. Periodically I believe it is up to us in the Government to submit a program report as to how we are coming along in effecting the change in the management of your Government. My talk to you will be in the nature of such a report. Naturally it concerns the State Department and its problems, but I suspect that the problems which I have encountered are quite similar to those in other executive agencies.

Very frankly, I would say that the progress toward change has not been as rapid as many of us had hoped it would be. Many of us apparently had a sort of childlike belief that we could reverse the entire trend of the last 20 years overnight.

Instead, despite our efforts, the best that we have seemed to accomplish so far is a gradual beginning of a sweeping U-turn. When we measure accomplishment, therefore, in terms of anticipation, we are inclined to feel disappointed.

We had all hoped that the results of our efforts would be more perceptible. Sometimes we see fundamental changes which have been made, but we realize that to the general public as a whole the changes are imperceptible.

In securing the change which the American people voted for, the Eisenhower administration faced obstacles which have never before confronted a new team taking over the operation of our Government. For example: the last time an administration was changed in this country in 1933 there were less than 500,000 employees on the Federal payroll. When President Eisenhower took the oath of office on January 20, 1953, there were over 2½ million Government employees.

There is a great tendency to compare the first 100 days of President Eisenhower with the first 100 days of the Roosevelt administration. Such comparisons are inaccurate and unfair.

As a matter of fact, if all other conditions were exactly the same and of course they are not when President Eisenhower took over as they were when President Roosevelt took over, except for the number of Government employees, it would, in my judgment, take the Eisenhower administration 500 days in 1953 to accomplish the same results as were accomplished in 100 days in 1933.

But obviously, conditions are not the same. When the Democrats took over they completely dominated the Congress. President Eisenhower has a Congress which is almost equally split with the Republican control of the Senate now in jeopardy.

The Roosevelt administration solved its problem of bringing new people into government by simply imposing them on top of those who were already employed. They continually expanded the size of the Federal establishment during the last 20 years. The Eisenhower administration, being committed to sound Federal fiscal policies, must of necessity reduce the size of Federal employment.

A few Americans realize the importance of one of the first acts which President Eisenhower took. It was to issue a freeze order against placing new persons on the Federal payroll. This was an unprecedented move, and officially precluded the operation of any so-called spoils system. This action on the part of the President was necessary to reduce the swollen bureaucracy. Nevertheless it has made it extremely difficult to place Eisenhower's followers in responsible Government positions.

I don't think it is a politically partisan statement for me to point out to you that after 20 years of an administration by one political party, it is normal to find in the employ of the Government persons who are partisan in their views with respect to the policy of the old administration. Very frankly, if the Republicans were in power for 20 years I would expect to see most people in Government sympathetic to the Republican point of view.

We are now faced with the situation where most people in Government are holdovers from the two decades of Democratic administration. What this adds up to is that the crux of changing policy in Government is primarily to be found in changing the personnel in the top echelons. Let us examine my own situation in the State Department to illustrate the point.

The job which I have is that of Administrator of the Bureau of Security, Consular Affairs and Personnel. This position was established by a law passed by Congress just a year ago. I am responsible for the conduct of consular affairs which is chiefly the issuance of visas and passports, and the protection of Americans who are traveling abroad.

In the field of personnel, I have the responsibility for the recruiting, training, promotion, and transfer of departmental personnel. As far as security is concerned, it is my duty to supervise the physical and personnel security of the State Department and its farflung overseas operations. There are hundreds of employees under my direct supervision and most of them have been there for many years.

Sometimes it is not only extremely difficult but also downright impossible because of the Civil Service Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Foreign Service Act to replace an individual whose viewpoint does not coincide with that of the Republican administration. In the second, third, and fourth echelon of employees the policy which originates at the top must be implemented. Until such time as we can reeducate those employees or replace them with proper personnel the progress which we make is sometimes very slow.

In a private business organization the decisions can be made and implemented by the executive. In many instances this is not true in Government. For example, the Bureau of the Budget determines how much money I can spend in my particular operation; basically the Congress solves the matter of finances; as the money is being spent

the General Accounting Office checks up to see if it is done properly in accordance with the expectations of Congress and the Bureau of the Budget; the Civil Service Commission exercises the final decision as to who may be employed or discharged.

As a result of the controls which are peculiar to Government on those in executive positions, there are times when one feels as though he might just as well take the afternoon off and go to the ball game, because actually the decisions which he would like to make have already been made by other agencies.

I develop this point so much because it is important for the American people to realize that in many instances the two major management problems of money and personnel are in many cases solved for a Government executive by persons outside his agency over whom he has absolutely no control.

The third management problem normally met in business operation consists of the housekeeping task and the acquisition of supplies. You would think that the average government executive could decide whether or not it was necessary to paint or to install air conditioning, or to buy new rugs, or to mop the halls at night, or to buy desks or typewriters, or other equipment. You in this audience who run businesses make these decisions every day. I assure you, however, that in government the General Services Agency handles all the decisions of maintenance, and the rules and regulations for the procurement of supplies are totally outside the purview of the Director of the Agency.

Sometimes the piling up and duplication of personnel over which you have no control becomes very complicated. One of the famous stories told around Washington concerns a dead mouse in the Pentagon. As the story goes, a colonel came to work one morning and observed a dead mouse on the floor of his office. He telephoned the custodian of the building, informed him that he had a mouse in his office, and asked that they send someone up to take care of the problem.

The party receiving the call stated that that came under the duties of the General Services Agency, and transferred the colonel's call.

The General Services Agency inquired whether the trouble with the mouse occurred during the daytime or at night. The officer explained that apparently it happened at night because the mouse was in his office when he came to work that morning. He was immediatey transferred to another extension where it was explained to him that he would have to contact the day representative of the night shift who, of course, had responsibility in such matters.

He got the new number and requested that someone be dispatched to remove a mouse from his office. Presently an amiable fellow strolled into his office and announced, "I'm the mouse man, boss; you got trouble with mice?"

The Colonel indicated the dead mouse lying on the floor and said, "Yes, there it is."

Whereupon his caller shook his head dolefully and said, "You got the wrong man, boss, I'se the live mouse man, you got to get a dead mouse man."

Perhaps conditions are not quite this bad, but I think eventually we have to reach the place where one man can handle both the live mice and the dead mice.

I have tried to explain to you the general nature of the problem, and now with your permission I would like to tell you of some of the things which I have attempted to do to carry out the wishes of the American people to the end that confidence in the integrity and security of the State Department and its employees be reestablished.

At the National Convention of the American Legion a year ago you took note of "failure to deal in a most forceful manner with the obvious determination of the Communists to continue their grim and bloody advances throughout the world—failure to recognize the Communist leanings of men within the Department of State." At your convention you demanded that the disloyal, the "political puppets," the weak, and the incompetent be replaced by "God-fearing Americans" of "character and integrity."

I took office on March 3d of this year and began immediately to move in the direction of the recommendations which the American Legion advocated. I found that most employees of the State Department were good, honest, loyal Americans. I found there was a minority of individuals within the Department which had blackened the reputation of the foreign policy branch of our Government.

Under the instructions of John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, General Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, and Mr. Don Lourie, Under Secretary of State for Administration, a policy of complete cooperation with congressional committees was instituted. The decision was made, and so far in my tenure of office has been upheld, that the executive branch of the Government will never utilize its power to shield or to suppress the facts from the Congress concerning any individual who has been engaged in subversive activities, and who should be brought to account for his conduct. For the first time in 20 years I can assure you that the House Committee on Un-American Activities under Chairman VELDE, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, under Senator JENNER, and the Special Investigating Subcommittee under Senator McCarthy have received the complete and unequivocal support of the State Department.

I have the greatest admiration and respect for J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Bureau. I am honored to be numbered among his friends, and I lean on him for counsel and guidance at all times.

When I took office, I found over 2,000 personnel cases in which there had been no investigation at all, and another 2,000 in which the check had been inadequate. Steps have been taken to rectify this situation. In the reasonably near future I hope to be able to report that a full field investigation has been made on all State Department employees.

We are not conducting a "witch hunt" at the State Department. But, we are attempting to eliminate from public service any person upon whom, after investigation, there is a reasonable doubt as to their security potential. In accordance with the instructions contained in President Eisenhower's security order, for the first time in the last 20 years, we are resolving doubt in the favor of the Government.

In addition to the problem of the security risk as a result of association with subversive organizations, I have attempted very frankly and honestly to face the issue of sexual perversion—the practice of sodomy—in the State Department.

This is an unpleasant subject, and my main purpose in mentioning it is to check exaggerations and false rumors, and to help to restore to the Department the good name and national respect to which it is entitled. We know that homosexuals are security risks. We realize that it is a condition which calls for psychiatric treatment. Since January 1, 1947, when statistics were first kept, there have been over 500 cases reported among State Department employees. In every instance to date where the allegation has been substantiated, these individuals have been removed from the Government service.

I wish to be completely honest in my discussion with you today. I cannot tell you there are no Communist agents employed in the State Department. I cannot assure you that there are no fellow-travelers still at work in the State Department. Neither can I say to you there are no homosexuals still on the payroll.

I can give you my assurance, however, that acting under the orders of the Secretary of State and the other top officials of the Department, we have investigated, or are in the process of investigating, every allegation that bears on any of these conditions. I can report to you without fear of contradiction that I have no knowledge of any single case in the above three categories where the person is still employed. If tomorrow information is developed, as the result of an investigation, which leads to a reasonable doubt, you have my word for it that that doubt will be resolved in the favor of the Government and of the people of the United States.

On a similar subject—on June 8, 1953, Mr. Norman Thomas, the nominal head of the American Socialist Party, wrote me in my capacity as personnel man to inquire: "What is your policy and the policy of the administration on the employment of Socialists in civil-service positions?" He made an astounding statement which corroborated the view held by many of us over the years, namely: "* * * there have been Socialists who have worked honorably and successfully in the State Department and in various lines of State Department activity abroad."

I did not beat around the bush with Mr. Thomas. On July 14, 1953, I wrote him in some detail, stating that "I would never knowingly employ a Socialist to fill * * * a policymaking position within the Department"; that "I simply feel it would be impossible for a Socialist to make or influence policy in a manner which would carry out the intentions of President Eisenhower and the Republican administration"; and that furthermore, "* * * I am equally opposed to retaining any Socialist who may presently hold such a job." I said to Mr. Thomas: "I must tell you that whenever I become aware that any person who occupies such a position is a Socialist, I shall use my best efforts to see that he is removed from that position."

This is my intention, and this is what I have done to date. My position has been backed up 100 percent by my superiors. I trust the views I express reflect the opinion of your organization.

In order to see that the security office of the State Department meets the standards to which the American people are entitled, I have succeeded in employing on a contract basis the services of Mr. James Egan. Mr. Egan is one of those little known but vitally important individuals whose contribution to the security of our Nation may never be fully appreciated. He was a principal inspector for Mr. J. Edgar Hoover in the FBI for over 30 years. When I challenged him with the proposal that he assist me to reorganize the security office in the Department of State, he responded like the splendid patriot he is, and readily agreed to undertake this tremendous task. It will be several months before he has completed his assignment, and when his job is done I shall put into effect those recommendations which he submits which seem most likely to strengthen the Security Office.

In the personnel field, which is under my jurisdiction, I found a situation which in some ways defies description. Some years ago the Hoover Commission on reorganization in the executive branch and the Rowe committee made specific recommendations for the correction of this administrative hodgepodge.

I have been fortunate enough to secure the services of Mr. George Wilson, formerly administrative assistant to Senator KNOWLAND, of California. He was a lieutenant colonel in charge of Major Knowland. He is young, able, and vigorous. He is tackling

the problem and, in my opinion, will lend invaluable assistance in straightening out the existing condition.

The most encouraging situation which I found in that sphere of operations for which I am responsible in the Department of State was in the consular area. Under the leadership of Mrs. Ruth Shipley, the veteran passport chief, these offices have been doing an excellent job. Mrs. Shipley is a remarkable woman whose career parallels in many respects that of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, as one of America's devoted public servants. It is certainly reassuring to know that there are people like her who are anxious and willing to assist the new administration in carrying out the wishes of the American people.

I am fortunate to have as my superiors in the State Department such men as Mr. Donold Lourie, General Bedell Smith, and Secretary Dulles, who have given me their complete and sympathetic support in the undertaking to which I have been assigned. I am sincerely devoted to the fundamental principles of civil liberties which have been developed in this republic for the past 160 years. I realize that it is somewhat difficult to make the American people security conscious except in time of war. Traditionally and historically we have been a people who have had very little, if anything, to fear. In our daily lives most of us do not even lock our doors at night. A great many people unwisely leave the keys in their automobiles when they park their cars. These are trivial but significant indications of a fundamental lack of security consciousness of a people who have lived in the middle of a vast continent.

We are not by nature conspiratorial, and it is difficult to convince the public that espionage and intrigue are nothing but the plots of motion picture, radio, and TV plays.

It is fortunate that the American Legion for decades has recognized the menace of communism as a conspiratorial force dedicated to the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. There are many evidences that the fundamental truth of this conclusion is slowly being recognized by our people. The tremendous step which has been taken by the new administration toward solving the problem of infiltration of Communists in Government can be briefly stated.

Under the old Truman program, the issue was "loyalty." Before a person could be discharged from Government employment, it was necessary to prove before special hearing boards that the individual was "disloyal." Obviously, to prove that the person has been disloyal one must be able to prove that he has committed some overt act against the Government of the United States. In a word, "treason." If such was the case, we have statutes to take care of that. Government employment was treated as a right instead of a privilege, and the issue was beclouded by raising the phony cry of civil liberties.

With crystal clarity, the new security regulations promulgated on April 27 by President Eisenhower pointed out (1) that Government employment was a privilege and not a right, and (2) that loyalty was not the keystone upon which decisions were to be made. The program was put on a much sounder basis. It takes into account the various behavior patterns which may render an individual a "security risk." It matters little whether an American is a fool, a loose-mouthed drunkard, a good subject for blackmail, or outright disloyal, insofar as obtaining the secrets of our Government are concerned. Suitability for Government employment is now based on the sound concept that if an individual is to be trusted with secrets which vitally affect your welfare—right here in Kansas—he must measure up to standards which will justify placing faith in him.

The new security order, therefore, in my opinion, realistically protects the interests of the Government and, at the same time, provides against arbitrary or discriminatory action in connection with an individual. I believe that the new system will work. I believe it will provide the protection to which the American people are entitled. I believe it is very important that we cease to attach the stigma of disloyalty to any person who is discharged from the Government service under the new security order. It is perfectly possible that many of the people who will be adjudged "security risks" under this procedure will be loyal and devoted Americans who simply are not suitable for Federal employment in a sensitive position.

To the best of my ability, and with the backing of my superiors and the devoted assistance of my staff, I shall attempt to administer this new security program in the State Department in such a way as to advance the interests of all of the American people.

I know the task is not an easy one. I expect in the future as in the past there will be people who will be critical of the decisions which I feel, in good conscience, I must make. It will be much easier for me to do my job if I feel that I have the confidence, the support, and the advice of the many millions of our people who belong to this great organization, the American Legion.

The philosophers of all the ages have attempted without success to define the difference between right and wrong. I do not presume to answer this question, but I do know that each of us, inherently, can distinguish in the light of our own experience, our own training and background, the important difference between what is right and what is wrong. So in closing I give you a quotation from Mark Twain which seems a reasonable standard to live by, particularly for those of us who work in Washington: "Do always what is right. It will please many people. It will astonish the rest."

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to add a comment in favor of Scottie McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland. In many trips to various parts of the world, it has been my experience that men such as Scottie McLeod more truly represent the average American, and are better ambassadors of good will, than many career men such as "Chip" Bohlen, whose nomination the Senate confirmed earlier today. To me, he is entirely the wrong type of ambassador to any country in the world. He is a surly, cocky, unfriendly individual. To me he represents a very small minority in this country. It is that type of person who can get us into much more trouble than any other ambassador. I should like to add, however, that we have many career men who are doing fine work as ambassadors.

It is the Scottie McLeod type who will do this country a great deal of good. Unless I miss my guess, the Irish will be very fond of him once they get to know him.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I am glad his opinion relative to Mr. McLeod is the same as mine.

I hope, Mr. President, we can reach a vote in the early future, first on the motion made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to recommit the nomination. When that motion fails to carry, following the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who expressed his pessimism about the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania earlier, then we shall vote on the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to recommit the nomination to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REOPENED TRANSPACIFIC CERTIFICATE RENEWAL CASE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is another matter, on an extraneous subject, which has come up, to which I must address myself for a few minutes, because I always like to clarify the record, when the record is incorrect, at the first opportunity.

This is the first opportunity I have had, in fairness to protestors, to put another point of view in the RECORD in regard to a matter I have previously discussed on the floor of the Senate.

On April 16 of this year, at pages 5758 and 5759 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I inserted in the RECORD certain information and figures and arguments with regard to the position taken by Pan American Airways, set forth in their brief to the Civil Aeronautics Board in docket 5031, reopened Trans-Pacific Certificate Renewal Case, pages 47–49.

Some of the friends of Northwest Airlines feel that the material which I inserted in the RECORD—and I made perfectly clear that I was presenting it at that time on behalf of those who held a specific point of view—did an injustice to Northwest Airlines, so in fairness I now wish to make the following statement, which I have obtained from friends of Northwest Airlines.

It is alleged that the figures which were inserted on April 18 were not developed during the hearings of the case before the Civil Aeronautics Board, but were presented by Pan American for the first time in its brief to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It is alleged that the figures are substantially in error. Northwest Airlines filed a detailed motion with the Board on February 12, 1957, petitioning that these figures and the arguments related thereto be physically stricken from Pan American's brief in the official record. The Board has not yet ruled on this motion.

I am advised that these Pan American prepared figures were not subject to evaluation during the hearing before the CAB trial examiner. The figures are a self-serving Pan American estimate prepared by their lawyers. The figures are in conflict with the official Government records on file with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Pan American estimated that Northwest's current international "earnings" amount to $3,577,000 annually. Actually, official CAB figures for 1956 show that Northwest's net profit after taxes was $1,342,472. Therefore, it is alleged that Pan American's self-serving arithmetic inflates Northwest's profit by more than 50 percent. Northwest's profits are indeed small when compared with

Pan America's operating profit from its Pacific division which totaled $7,955,000 in 1956, if I am correctly informed.

It is further alleged that Pan American's self-serving figures make further adjustments which that company asserts will increase Northwest's operating income to $5,600,000 annually. These include the assumption that the conversion of one weekly DC-4 flight to a DC-7C, and the assertion that the use of DC-7C's in the Trans-Pacific service will greatly reduce operating costs, and therefore will raise Northwest's actual operating profit by two and a half times over 1956. It is claimed that neither assertion is true nor justified on the basis of any facts which Pan American could produce during the official hearing before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It is claimed that Pan American's only purpose in presenting its exaggerated and inaccurate estimate of Northwest's international earnings is to meet the direct and explicit finding of the CAB examiner that duplication of Northwest's route by Pan American would be "disastrous" and would return Northwest to subsidy.

This conclusion was based upon examiner's finding, and that of bureau counsel, that Pan American would divert revenues from Northwest ranging from $2,292,000 to $2,859,000 per year. It is clear that even on the lower figure, Northwest's entire international operating income would be wiped out.

Further, it is represented to me that Pan American also seeks to divert attention that the fact that it already is certificated on 3 Trans-Pacific routes—1 via Tokyo to Hong Kong, another via Manila to Hong Kong, and a third, which it chooses not to operate, via Midway. These routes produce for Pan American 70 percent of the United States-flag carrier revenue in the Pacific, a total of $78,539,000 in 1956, and enable Pan American to operate 13 Trans-Pacific frequencies each week, compared with 7 for Northwest. In 1956, they produced an operating income of $7,955,000—an increase of 63.8 percent over the previous year.

Northwest Airlines, meanwhile, is certificated to operate across the Pacific by a single route—the relatively thin North Pacific route—and has access to only two of the west coast terminals available to Pan American—the two which generate the least Trans-Pacific traffic. As a result, Northwest in 1956 had about 30 percent of Pacific revenue—$25,764,000.

It is further claimed that Pan American's increase in net income in 1956, over 1955, from its Pacific operations alone, actually exceeded Northwest's total net income from all of its international operations.

Yet it is said to me that Pan American still insists that it must retain its 70 percent of the Pacific revenue, and share Northwest's 30 percent, in order to compete effectively.

Actually, if any course of action with respect to Pan American is indicated, it should be a course which would tend to reduce, rather than increase, its overwhelming dominance of United States flag international air transportation. So say those who would seek to deny to Pan-American its request in this case.

It is further alleged that Pan American's very bigness, and its awesome exercise of political influence in Washington, constitute a threat to the proper development of international aviation. Moreover, opponents of Pan American position claim the evidence offered in a recent order of the CAB, indicating that Pan American has actually falsified records and improperly padded its operating expenses in order to claim subsidy to which it was not properly entitled should forfeit any claim Pan American might otherwise have had for additional route consideration.

PUBLIC INTEREST MUST BE PARAMOUNT

I am glad to have placed in the RECORD these conflicting claims of the proponents of both Pan American and Northwest Airlines. Let me say, in concluding this statement, that it seems to me sight is being lost of the real problem before us, and that is the problem of what is in the best interest of the traveling public. I wish to repeat what I said in effect on April 16, that my interest as a Senator from the State of Oregon in this question is to see to it, to the extent that I can, that the CAB gives full consideration to the interests of the traveling public of the Pacific Northwest. I do not want any favoritism for Northwest Airlines, or any favoritism for Pan-American, but I do want favoritism for the traveling public.

I wish to stress the fact that we have this conflict in our section of the country in regard to the claims of these two powerful airlines for the route in question. Whenever I find myself in that kind of contest, I seek to present to the appropriate Government agency the positions of the conflicting groups. I have sought to do so in connection with this matter.

I dismiss any further consideration of the subject, so far as my insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is concerned, by saying that it is now up to the CAB to weigh the respective claims and proceed to a decision at an early date which will give the greatest possible protection to the best interests of the traveling public in the Pacific Northwest.

DEATH OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on the passing of our late colleague, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

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

The flag above the United States Capitol is flying at half staff today.

This is not an altogether infrequent sight in Washington, but it is always a sobering one.

A Senator is dead.

It has been appropriately observed that, for every man, there is "a time to live and a time to die."

Some men, perhaps, are not really right for the age of their existence. Some, perhaps, are simply born too late or too soon, and even in death their presence is untimely.

All death, of course, even that which is rather expected for understandable causes, seems to the living to be a tragedy.

Our religious faith teaches us otherwise: that in death we pass beyond the mortal toil of this veil of tears and enter into eternal life. Some religions even accept the dogma that life is merely a preparation for death.

Certainly, to dispel the anguish of a moment of loss, this is a comforting reflection.

Joe McCarthy had his "time to live" and he lived well. Now, has come his "time to die."

The question raised by his unusual personality in life will be argued long beyond his death. Some may even not agree that he was a man well suited to meet the challenges of his day.

Yet, the fact remains that, by the very uniqueness of his career, he carved a niche in history that would never have been put there save for the courage, determination, and stamina of Joe McCarthy.

It is of no consequence whether we agree with what a man seeks to do, or how he does it. The true criterion is why a man does what he does—the convictions which motivate and inspire his efforts.

Senator McCarthy was a fervently loyal and faithful American. In that respect, he was far more to be commended than those he attacked, or even than some of his severest critics.

The foreign press calls him "vicious," "evil," and suggests that America will be a "cleaner" land now that he is gone.

It is difficult to know what such words mean. He was, first of all, a human being. Then, he was an American. Do they abuse him for that?

The foreign press also calls him an obstructionist to foreign aid. How twisted can reason and values become?

Senator McCarthy was an American. He loathed the enemies of America. He fought jealously to achieve a primary recognition for the rights of America.

In the sight of God, he will occupy a place no better—but, surely, no worse—than that which is accorded to all good men who fight for the rights they adore.

He was neither saint nor sinner, genius nor fool, martyr nor tyrant. He was an American, and a United States Senator who represented his State and the Nation as well as he knew how. If that was not good enough for some, there are certainly others to whom his service was far more desirable than that which would have been dispatched by the subversive elements whom he ferreted out of our Government.

Do not mourn Joe McCarthy. Be thankful that he lived, at the right time, and according to the talents vested in him by his Maker.

Be grateful, too, that when it came his time to die, he passed on with the full assurance that, because he lived, America is a brighter, safer, more vigilant land today.

MODERN REPUBLICANISM IS LIKE THE COWBIRD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because earlier today I sent a release to the press gallery, I wish to take a moment to make a statement on another matter.

Mr. President, I do not want to appear before the Senate in the role of a prophet of gloom and doom, but there are some signs on the economic horizon which bear watching. In my own State, so dependent upon lumber for our economic well-being, we have been having a real depression. The slump in housing, brought on by the tight-money program, is one of the major contributing factors.

In March, the President, with great fanfare, announced a change in payment requirements for housing. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a report from the Wall Street Journal for April 1, which says that the administration's action will not do much good.

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

MOST BUILDERS AND BANKERS SAY CUT IN FHA DOWNPAYMENT REQUIREMENTS WON'T SPUR BUILDING MUCH—PRESIDENT'S MOVES CALLED A STEP IN RIGHT DIRECTION—SAVINGS-LOAN RULES EASED

The Government reduced downpayment requirements on home mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration, but builders saw little effect from the move as long as credit stays scarce.

They noted many lending institutions currently make people put down much more cash than the minimum amount specified by the Government and lenders generally are steering away from federally insured mortgages because the allowable interest rates are below those on so-called conventional loans.

Slated for House Banking Committee action this week is a subcommittee-approved bill to lower FHA downpayment requirements still further and channel more money into the mortgage market.

President Eisenhower announced over the weekend the 2-percentage-point cut in required downpayments under the FHA program. It puts the minimums at 5 percent of the first $9,000 of appraised value and 25 percent of the amount over that figure.

In addition, the FHA announced it will redeem $22,790,850 of debentures July 1, thus providing private lenders with more funds to purchase new mortgages. The debentures were issued to lending institutions in exchange for properties or assigned mortgages when FHA mortgages were defaulted.

RELAXATION ELSEWHERE, TOO

The President also said regulations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will be modified immediately to let Government-insured savings and loan associations purchase a participating interest in any mortgage originated by another insured association. At least a 50 percent interest, however, must be retained by the originating institution.

The White House explained this new rule relaxes a restriction on most savings and loan associations that they invest in mortgages on homes within 50 miles of their principal offices. Mr. Eisenhower's office explained the change "should be particularly helpful in increasing the availability of home mortgage funds in rapidly growing areas where financing needs exceed local savings resources.

The President took the steps "to make credit more readily available to prospective home purchasers and to assist home building," the White House said.

The new participation program for savings and loan associations drew hearty support from Charles Wellman, executive vice president of Glendale Federal Savings & Loan Association, Glendale, Calif. "This will tend to eliminate regional differences; associations which have money but not so much demand, will have a new source of demand, namely from associations in areas like Los Angeles, where demand is high and money is tight. It's a good new source of money for us and we'll certainly make use of it," he said.

WHAT BUILDERS AND BANKERS SAY

A check of builders and bankers around the country, however, turned up the view that beyond a possible "psychological" effect—perhaps a little spur to home buyer interest through the publicity generated by the announcement—the reduction in required downpayments on FHA-insured mortgages would have little impact on their operations.

A similar view, and sharp criticism of the FHA cut, was expressed in Washington by key lawmakers who said the downpayment move would help little, if at all.

Senator SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, who heads a Senate housing subcommittee, charged the actions might do more harm than good by stimulating demand without increasing funds available for mortgages.

Senator CAPEHART of Indiana, ranking Republican member of the committee, took the same tack. Another committee member, Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, termed the actions "too little and too late."

Representative RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of a House Banking subcommittee on Housing, termed the President's action "A very minor matter that couldn't begin to solve the problem."

Bankers and builders also noted the actual reduction in a theoretical downpayment would be relatively small—for example, $240 on a $12,000 house.

"It's a step in the right direction, but it's such a mild one, it will be of no help economically," said Raymond Lapin, president of Bankers Mortgage Co., of California, in San Francisco.

"We're concerned with the lack of credit and not downpayments," sighed Morris G. Hance, first vice president of Commonwealth Investment, Inc., in Portland, Oreg.

"REALISTIC" RATES ASKED

The President's announcement "is nothing to dance in the streets about," said Walter Cowart, president of Cowart Bros., Jacksonville, Fla., builders. "It won't cause me to reshuffle my building plans," he added.

Fred Glassman, a Philadelphia builder, remarked that on GI loans there's only a 2 percent downpayment required under Veterans' Administration rules and you still can't get the (mortgage) money.

Some people, particularly in Chicago and San Francisco, however, saw the cut in downpayment requirements as a big help for builders of lower-priced homes.

Joseph R. Downs, executive vice president of the Chicago Metropolitan Home Builders Association, called the change "at least a half step in the right direction." He added: "Any program to reduce downpayments will expand the market."

A number of builders and bankers called for what they termed "realistic" interest rates on Government-backed mortgages.

"Banks generally don't want FHA loans, anyway, because their fees are frozen," said Ernest Siegler, Cleveland home builder. Interest on FHA-insured mortgages is currently limited to 5 percent, and the maximum rate on home loans made or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration is held by law to 4½ percent. Congress has been cool to an administration request for boosting the interest ceiling on VA-backed mortgages to 5 percent.

"The mortgage money market has eased a little, but it is still tight and that is the important thing," reported an official of the Boston Federal Savings & Loan Association.

"The only change that would really stimulate home building would be an increase in the GI interest rate."

"It will definitely contribute to more business for us," remarks Wilson Brown, president of the Brown Organization, of Dallas, whose houses now under construction include 20 FHA-financed ones. "Our big market is the home from $10,000 to $15,000. Knocking $280 off the amount down for a $14,000 house will make a lot more people interested."

MONEY MARKET BETTER

Lower downpayment requirements would be just one reason, he said. The chief one, he added, is "the money market is looking better than it has been in quite a while," with lenders showing new interest.

A San Francisco builder commented: "Anything along that line would have a favorable effect. It's a step in the right direction."

The White House noted downpayment requirements were raised to 7 percent of the first $9,000 of appraised value on FHA-backed loans in July 1955, to help prevent excessive use of credit. "In view of the reduction since that time in the rate of home building and in the use of mortgage credit, the requirement is no longer needed," the announcement said.

HOUSING STARTS

Housing starts in February fell below a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1 million units for the first time in more than 5 years.

"This action will make it easier for veterans to buy homes under the FHA program if the supply of funds for Veterans Administration-guaranteed loans should, because of the limitation on the interest rate for such loans in existing legislation, continue to decline," the White House said.

The White House statement said the latest actions "supplement" other recent measures taken by the administration to increase credit availability for home buying. It said that last December it raised to 5 percent from 4½ percent the top permissible interest rate on FHA-insured home loans. This was designed to make the loans more competitive with comparable investments, the White House said.

The statement also noted the Federal National Mortgage Association has stepped up its purchases of insured and guaranteed loans.

In addition, the White House said, it has asked Congress for several changes in housing laws designed to make more credit available for home buyers and builders.

"These administrative actions and legislative proposals," the White House statement declared, "are designed to maintain activity in the home construction field by making home mortgage credit more readily available and by broadening the market for homes."

This week, the House Banking Committee is expected to stamp speedy approval on an omnibus housing bill designed to provide substantial assistance to home builders and buyers.

As formally approved Friday by a subcommittee, the measure goes further than the Administration's housing schemes and contains several provisions vigorously opposed by Federal housing officials.

WHAT BILL WOULD DO

The bill would set up a veterans' preference program within the FHA, expand housing credit available for the Federal National Mortgage Association by $1 billion, lower minimum FHA downpayment requirements still further and channel $1 billion of the National Service Life Insurance reserve fund into purchasing GI mortgages. This last provision has brought Administration threats of a Presidential veto.

In addition, the measure provides more money for slum clearance and military housing and authorized $500,000 for a special farm housing research program.

Representative RAINS predicted Congress would pass the measure within 2 or 3 weeks.

The bill sets minimum downpayment terms for home mortgages insured by the FHA at 5 percent on the first $9,000 of appraised value and 20 percent on the value above that to $20,000, compared with the just announced rates of 5 percent on the first $9,000 and 25 percent above that.

VETERANS' MINIMUM LOWERED

However, the minimum for veterans would be only 2½ percent down on the first $9,000 of appraised value and 5 percent on the remainder. In addition, they would be exempt

from the 0.5 percent insurance premium required by the FHA.

The bill specifies that whatever downpayment terms the FHA sets for its overall program, the veteran's requirements be exactly half.

The Administration has asked Congress for standby authority to lower FHA terms to 4 percent on the first $10,000 of appraised value, 15 percent on the value between $10,000 and $16,000, and 30 percent on the value above that figure.

Subcommittee members said a less liberal downpayment schedule was approved because of the veterans' preference program. They predicted the full committee would back a move to have the new terms put into effect immediately, rather than approve standby authority.

Main reason for the veterans' preference proposal, subcommittee members said, is that Congress apparently will not approve an increase in the interest rate ceiling to 5 percent on home loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee is expected to take another look at this proposal tomorrow. The House in effect rejected the boost last week, but this was partly because of a technicality in that the proposal was offered as an amendment to another bill.

TERMINATION PROVIDED

The bill provides for an orderly termination of the veterans' preference program after July 1958, when the VA program for World War II veterans is scheduled to expire. After that date veterans would be eligible for the special FHA provisions for a period roughly equivalent to the years they spent in service.

FHA officials opposed the veterans' preference, contending it would be hard to operate and should be the province of the Veterans' Administration.

The bill would also require the FHA and VA to set reasonable ceilings on discounts, taking into account various regional factors.

The FNMA would get a hefty boost—to $2,600,000,000 from $1,600,000,000—in authority to conduct its regular buying and selling of Government-backed mortgages in the secondary or resale market.

The bill provides that Fannie Mae purchase at par mortgages it buys under its special assistance program for military housing and slum clearance and other programs. The agency now purchases these mortgages at 99 percent, or 1 percent below the full amount of the mortgage.

The Administration's request for $250 million additional authority for the special assistance program was adopted.

Mr. MORSE. As further proof, in the period since a golf game was interrupted for this great pronouncement there has been no real rise in the rate of home construction.

What we need—and this is the position I have maintained from the outset—is a change in the tight-money policy. High interest rates force the cost of housing up, and the benefits flow to the moneylenders. Perhaps the strong supporters of Modern Republicanism will begin to see the light as time goes on.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD another report from the Wall Street Journal of April 1.

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

BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Home building is expected to remain slow despite restoratives applied by the administration. Bankers and construction industry executives predicted the cut in downpayments on federally insured mortgages decreed by President Eisenhower over the weekend would provide little stimulus as long as credit stays scarce. Many lending institutions, they noted, make home buyers put down much more cash than the minimum specified by the Government, and lenders generally are steering away from Government-backed mortgages because allowable interest rates are below those on conventional loans.

Key Congressmen voiced similar views. The House Banking Committee is expected to give speedy approval to legislation designed to extend substantial assistance to home builders and buyers. It would lower FHA downpayment requirements still further and channel more money into the mortgage market.

Trans World Airlines disclosed it is laying off nearly 2,000 of its 19,945 employees. Carter L. Burgess, TWA's new president, recently stated a cutback in employment was necessary in the company's effort to get out of the red. Douglas Aircraft Co. announced it will drop 1,350 of its 13,000 workers at Tulsa within a month. It blamed the Air Force's cancellation of the C-132, the big turboprop transport Douglas has been working on here.

These employment cutbacks came as fresh outbreaks of layoffs hit Maytag Co., Newton, Iowa, manufacturer of washing machines, and the home appliance divisions of General Electric at Louisville and of Westinghouse Electric at Mansfield, Ohio.

Steel producers foresee a gradual decline in operations, carrying into the third quarter. But a comeback in the final 3 months of the year is counted on to keep 1957 output around the high levels of the past 2 years.

Despite the fifth consecutive weekly decline in operations last week and dimming prospects for spring improvement in automotive steel buying, steel producers generally are sticking pretty close to their turn-of-the-year optimism.

Auto makers eye current sales trends anxiously, seeking a clue to whether the traditional spring improvement will develop. General Motors' Chevrolet division is optimistic in this regard. Its dealers sold some 44,000 cars in March's second 10-day period, compared with 34,000 in the first 10 days. On a daily average basis, this was a 15 percent pickup in the sales rate.

For the industry as a whole, an indicated gain of 7 percent took place. But total sales for the first 30 days of March trailed the year-earlier pace by 9 percent, and the daily rate was even below February's. In a drive to spur demand, every auto producer except GM's Cadillac division has a sales promotion contest in the works or already operating.

Cotton fabric prices slumped to an 8-year low. The pace-setting 80-square print cloth declined to 17¾ cents a yard last week—down 1½ cents from the high reached during last autumn's buying flurry. Since then, prices have worked slowly downward. But textile merchants report signs are beginning to appear that cotton cloth inventories may be fairly well cleaned out.

Mr. MORSE. Not only is home construction down, but we are getting the collateral impact of the tight-money policy. Auto sales for March are 9 percent below last year's rate and below February's. Only Cadillac is in good shape. Steel production is off. TWA has laid off 2,000 people. Maytag, General Electric, and Westinghouse have laid people off. These things have a cumulative effect and, in my judgment, this administration is making a serious mistake in sticking to a tight-money policy.

I predict that when enough segments of big business feel the results, the Republican Party will start to hear from its major supporters. In the meantime, the Democratic Party will continue to work for the people of America. I predict that the majority leader will be able to count on more Republican votes for programs that benefit the people when the big boys find that the problems of the workers and farmers have trickled up to them and are painfully pinching profits.

One of the odd things about the trickle-down theory practiced by the tight-money boys is that when the trickle gets small enough, they thirst too. They look for ways to quench their thirst. Lo and behold, what do we find every time—the Democratic Party has a program and a policy to benefit all Americans. Then we find the Republicans working for that program and policy but with a new label.

This is Modern Republicanism in action—and it acts like a cowbird. It lays its eggs in another bird's nest, and when the cowbird chicks hatch, they try to push the other chicks out. I think the American people are coming to understand Modern Republicanism, just as they understood the old-fashioned variety.

NOMINATION OF SCOTT McLEOD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn now to the subject matter before the Senate. I shall be very brief in my discussion of the McLeod case. I believe that each one of us has made up his mind as to how he will vote. We have studied the record, and we have had a great deal of information presented to us over the months in regard to the nomination.

However, I wish to restate the position I took as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was not so long ago that the Committee on Foreign Relations sent to the Secretary of State a letter expressing strongly our dissatisfaction with some of the appointments to diplomatic posts which we had been asked to approve. In that letter, which reflected the nonpartisan views of the entire committee, we voiced our conviction that, in the difficult international conditions which the United States faces in the world today, it is imperative for our Nation to have the very best representation abroad that it can get.

What was the reaction of the Department of State? The reply we received was a stereotyped reminder that more posts abroad are being occupied by career Foreign Service officers than ever before. The reply was anything but responsive to the issue which has disturbed this committee.

I think the appointment of Mr. McLeod is a challenge to this body. It is a typical example of what I thought we were trying to control. I think it is up to us, here and now, to show the Department of State that we were in dead earnest in what we wrote to them, or else let us stop pretending we are anxious to have qualified career men appointed to diplomatic posts. Let us simply go on confirming men for important diplomatic posts, who obviously have no qualifications for the job.

Much has been said about a presumption being in favor of a Presidential appointment to an ambassadorship. I agree with that position. However, it is

not a conclusive presumption but a rebuttable one. After having weighed Mr. McLeod's qualifications, or more accurately the stated lack of qualifications, I am satisfied that the presumption has been rebutted by Mr. McLeod himself.

Throughout my 13 years in the Senate, I have always resolved doubts in favor of a Presidential appointment unless I became satisfied that the nominee failed to measure up to at least one of the historic criteria that have been followed throughout the Senate's history in giving advice and consent to a President under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution. One of those criteria pertains to the competency and qualifications of the nominee to perform the duties of the office to which he has been appointed. It is my conclusion that Mr. McLeod does not meet this criterion and, therefore, I shall vote against him.

The record is perfectly clear that in the past I have voted to support Eisenhower nominations when I felt the four historic criteria were met, and I have done the same under Democratic administrations; likewise, I have opposed nominations of both Democratic and Republican administrations when I was satisfied that one or more of those criteria had not been fulfilled by the nominee.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon if it is not a fact that the McLeod appointment is not what normally would be considered a political ambassadorial appointment.

As I read the testimony given at the hearings, it seems to me that confirming the nomination would not mean that Mr. McLeod would serve for a period of 4 years, perhaps, in his ambassadorial position, or until a new administration took over; but that this is a move—and it is very clearly spelled out in the hearings—to place him in the ambassadorial career service.

Mr. MORSE. He made it perfectly clear in the testimony that he is seeking this place in order to move into the career diplomatic service if two things happen in the future.

One is that he decides, after this experience, that this is what he wants to do, and what he wants his career to be. He certainly did not say that he had made up his mind irrevocably.

Second, he made it clear that there was another condition, namely, whether the Foreign Service would accept him. He want on to state—and it was a point which I had missed, and I am sure other Senators were not aware of it either—that we do have at least some sort of custom or tradition, which has developed, that places the people who seek to devote their lives to the career service in the position where they must in turn be admitted to the Service on a permanent basis.

Mr. MONRONEY. As the junior Senator from Oklahoma will recall, because of the disaster that had affected the morale of the Foreign Service, when people were not entering it, the Wriston report was made, and that report provided for the lateral transfer of career civil-service people across the line into the Foreign Service.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. It was as a result of the disaster that had struck the State Department, with good men leaving because of dissatisfaction, or persecution—which some people felt they had been subjected to—or failure to close cases, or failure to give them a proper chance to defend themselves, that Congress had before it—and I personally held up the bill for several weeks on the call of the calendar—the plan for the lateral transfer of civil-service employees across the line to the Foreign Service. I held it up because I felt the procedure would be abused, and would mean that politics would enter the Foreign Service; also, that it would open the gates to men who, having been appointed for purely political reasons, and then acquiring civil-service status, could apply, after 3 years of probation; whereas a career Foreign Service man would have to wait 30 years or so.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Therefore is this not going to be something far less than a blessing, and perhaps serve as a body blow to the career service? I have in mind a man who starts as a vice consul in Belem, or in some other South American city, in a hardship position, perhaps, and in a minor capacity, and struggles up through many years, step by step, on the ladder heading toward an ambassadorial post. Such a man could be forced out at the very end. The Wriston report was sold to Congress as an important way of rewarding genuine career people who possess the basic experience and the background for the Foreign Service.

Therefore, if we open the gates with the McLeod appointment, will we not strike a body blow to the whole system around the world so far as men who struggle to keep the American position foremost in diplomatic circles are concerned?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is completely right, and what he said bears upon the objection I am raising with regard to the qualification and competency of the nominee. It buttresses my main objection to the appointment. I have said that in my 13 years in the Senate I have supported any nomination made by a President, whether Republican or Democrat, when I felt the nominee met the four criteria I have set up. Those four criteria concern themselves with character, conflict of interest, faith in our constitutional form of government, and unquestioned patriotism to that form of government.

Lastly, the nominee must have reasonable competency to perform the duties of the position involved, and that means qualifications and experience and background which would justify our believing that the nominee had the competency to perform the duties of his position.

It is on that latter criterion that I find myself unable to vote for the McLeod nomination.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I am very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Oregon and in the colloquy between him and the Senator from Oklahoma. I had not really understood the full significance of this effort until I heard the exchange. For example, I did not fully comprehend the colloquy on page 5 of the hearings until I heard the matter discussed on the floor. In the hearing, the Senator from Arkansas questioned Mr. McLeod, as follows:

> Senator FULBRIGHT. What do you hope to contribute as Ambassador to Ireland, if there are no problems? Is this just a nice, easy place to retire to?
>
> Mr. MCLEOD. No, sir. I don't expect to retire. I am relatively young. It just seems to me to be a good place to get your feet wet in the matter of diplomacy.
>
> Senator FULBRIGHT. Do you expect to make the diplomatic service a career?
>
> Mr. MCLEOD. There is still a matter of whether the career service will accept me or not.
>
> Senator FULBRIGHT. What do you mean by that?
>
> Mr. MCLEOD. Under our program you have to apply for lateral entry and be accepted under the forms and procedures.

I therefore put this question, if I may, to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Oklahoma: Does that mean, if Mr. McLeod's appointment shall be confirmed by the Senate and he receives ambassadorial status, that later, if he should be accepted in the career diplomatic service, he will move over to the class of the Foreign Service with persons who have dedicated their lives to that service?

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion, it will put him in a position of great favoritism.

Mr. CARROLL. I think I can understand, as has been so clearly stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], that there have been political appointments made by Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents, but those appointments obviously were of persons who did not seek entry into the career Foreign Service. Perhaps they were wealthy men, or perhaps there was political motivation. But in the experience of the Senator from Oregon, can he recall a case of this nature, in which a person sought to elevate himself into the diplomatic career service in this fashion?

Mr. MORSE. I think the McLeod case is a singular case, without precedent.

Mr. CARROLL. Then, considering the question raised by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], there is all the more reason why the nomination of Mr. McLeod merits reconsideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations, so that the matter can be studied further, because to confirm the nomination of Mr. McLeod could have a serious effect upon the morale of those in the Foreign Service. If that Service is to be an establishment of the President, where the door can be opened to this sort of political maneuvering, I think it should be brought more forcefully to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Colorado.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I think the colloquy has left the impression that if Scott

McLeod were considered for lateral entry into the Foreign Service, if he sought it, and were approved by the Board of Foreign Service, which passes on such applications, he would therefore come in as a career ambassador. That is not true at all. He may come in as a Foreign Service officer of the second class or of other classes.

The Foreign Service is nothing new. Entry into it has happened before the time of the Wriston recommendation; it has happened since.

Mr. MORSE. At this point, would the Senator from Kentucky give us an explanation? Let us assume this hypothetical: When a person seeks to enter the career Foreign Service from an ambassadorship, who determines what the classification will be when he is admitted laterally into the Foreign Service?

Mr. MORTON. A board of review, an examining board, set up in the Foreign Service, composed of high-ranking members of the Foreign Service, first passes on the qualifications. They then recommend to the Under Secretary for Administration yea or nay, and what class it shall be.

To my knowledge—and I have not been in the Department for the last year—since Congress enacted the recommendations which were contained in the Wriston report, the recommendations of that board have been carried out.

There are many career Foreign Service officers of the first class, and even of the second class, who have served in positions as ambassadors, and they have had lateral entry. That was true in the case of a very capable Ambassador who met a most unfortunate death in Thailand, whom many Members of the Senate knew and, I think, whom they respected and admired .

Mr. MORSE. Ambassador Peurifoy.

Mr. MORTON. Jack Peurifoy. Also, my predecessor as Assistant Secretary of State, Jack McFall, has served ably as Ambassador to Finland.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I read further from page 5 of the hearings on the nomination of Mr. McLeod:

Mr. McLEOD. Under our program you have to apply for lateral entry and be accepted under the forms and procedures. The rules as they are laid down require a 3-year prior employment in the Department, and I believe on that basis I am eligible to apply, but I would rather have more experience in this particular line before making application.

That is, he wants to gain experience by being Ambassador to Ireland. The next question was asked by the Senator from Arkansas:

Senator FULBRIGHT. If you are confirmed for this position, do you not become automatically a foreign career officer?

Mr. McLEOD. No, sir; I do not.

Senator FULBRIGHT. What further procedure must be followed, assuming you are Ambassador to Ireland?

Mr. McLEOD. Then I would have to make an application to become a member of the career service through the lateral entry program.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Who approves that?

Mr. McLEOD. Ultimately the Secretary on recommendation of the Board of Foreign Service.

If I correctly interpret the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, there seems to be some doubt in his mind as to what category of the Foreign Service it would be, whether it would be the first class, the second class, or whatever classification it might be.

The question now is, If Mr. McLeod had ambassadorial status and sought to be admitted to the Foreign Service, who would determine the classification he would receive?

Mr. MORTON. As a matter of practice, since the legislation was enacted and until my resignation from the Department—I cannot speak since then—it was based on the recommendations of the Board. The Foreign Service officers who passed on one's eligibility as a Foreign Service officer made the recommendation as to his class, and that recommendation was followed.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator from Oregon will yield further, it seems inconceivable to me that once a person had served as an ambassador, and had later submitted his application for entry into the Foreign Service through the lateral entry procedure, the Board of Foreign Service could say to the Secretary, who had recommended ambassadorial status in the first place, that the person should be placed in the lowest category of the Foreign Service. That is beyond the realm of commonsense. Therefore, if this precedent is now to be established, we ought to examine the matter very, very carefully.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Kentucky. I think we are all desirous of one thing, namely, to get the facts into the record.

I said earlier, based upon my understanding of the procedure as it was explained to us in the Committee on Foreign Relations, that this appointment would place Mr. McLeod in a position of favoritism in relation to other persons in the Foreign Service who were in the lower brackets, where they might be occupying relatively minor Foreign Service posts in relationship to ambassadorships, at least.

It is my understanding—and I wish to be corrected if I am in error—that although one may go through the procedure prescribed for lateral admission by having the so-called Advisory Board pass judgment upon the applicant, the Secretary of State has the authority to approve or reverse the action of the Advisory Board, whether it is an affirmative recommendation or a negative recommendation. I simply want to know whether I am factually correct about that, or if my interpretation of the testimony is erroneous.

Mr. MORTON. The Secretary of State has that authority, as he has had it for years, even prior to the enactment of the so-called Wriston legislation.

It is my understanding that the Secretary of State has that authority, as he has had for years, even prior to the so-called Wriston legislation. The Secretary of State has that authority to bring people laterally into the Foreign Service, in which case the nominations must be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. It seemed to me, as I listened to the discussion in the committee, that the Senator from Arkansas was quite correct in the opinion he expressed. It is rather difficult to believe that if the Senate confirms this nomination to be United States Ambassador to Ireland, it is not to be expected that this particular Secretary of State would turn down an application for an ambassadorship as a career position in the Foreign Service, some 2 or 3 years later.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield further, let me say that I agree; I believe the Secretary of State would not turn him down as a lateral entrant into the Foreign Service. The implication I was trying to correct was that from the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, I gathered that he assumed that such a person would be in the Foreign Service as a career ambassador. I think there are only five, and certain criteria have been established; and that is also true in the case of career ministers. They are very limited.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to have the Senator's contribution.

Mr. President, I return to my point which I believe bears on the question I have had to ask myself, namely, whether I believe the nominee has the qualifications and the competency to perform this Ambassador's job, keeping in mind—as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out—that the Senate also is to a certain extent helping lay the foundation, at least, for possible future promotions in the career service itself. I happen to believe that Mr. McLeod answered the question for himself, in the course of his own testimony. I believe that the record before the committee is perfectly clear in showing that I sought only to present to Mr. McLeod an opportunity to make a statement, following all the charges and criticisms which had been made against him. At the beginning of my statement I made it clear that that was what I sought to do, and I think I did so. I did not seek to adopt the role of prosecutor. I sought only to raise each point on which I thought Mr. McLeod should have an opportunity to comment. Thereafter, I wished to consider all four corners of the record made in the committee, and to judge for myself whether I believed Mr. McLeod met the criteria for appointment. After I did that, I came, regrettably, to the conclusion I am now expressing, namely, that it seems to me that, by the testimony out of his own mouth, Mr. McLeod demonstrated that he is poorly equipped for this particular appointment.

M'LEOD WANTS POST IN IRELAND AS EASY FOOTHOLD

His principal justification for seeking to be United States Ambassador to Ireland seems to be that "one must start somewhere in the Foreign Service work, and the Ambassadorship to Ireland is an easy place to begin with, because it has no problems."

Of course, Mr. President, I happen to believe that Ireland is a very important

post for an ambassador. I think we should have there one of our top men, not a neophyte. Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that, on the record, the nominee has not shown that he has either the background or the qualifications for this very important position.

I desire to point out two other things which bother me about the action of the Foreign Relations Committee in regard to this case: In recent years, the committee has withheld approval from nominees whom it felt were not worthy, from the standpoint of qualifications. The point I am raising is nothing new in the case of the actions of the Foreign Relations Committee, for in recent years a considerable number of nominees have not been approved, when it became evident that there was strong opposition in the Foreign Relations Committee.

For instance, in 1954, confirmation was withheld in the case of the nomination of Henry Byroade, to be United States Ambassador to Egypt; also in the case of the nomination of George Allen, to be Assistant Secretary of State; also in the case of the nomination of Wright F. Murrow, to be the United States representative at the United Nations General Assembly.

Furthermore, it will be recalled that at the end of 1951, confirmation was similarly withheld in the case of the nomination of a very great American, Gen. Mark Clark, to be United States Ambassador to the Vatican.

In 1951, confirmation was withheld in the case of the nomination of Philip Jessup, to be a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly.

In 1950, confirmation was withheld in the case of the nomination of Irving Florman, to be United States Ambassador to Bolivia.

In 1953, confirmation was withheld in the case of the nomination of Willard Beaulac to be United States Ambassador to Chile; and also in the case of the nomination of Arthur Gardiner, to be United States representative at the United Nations.

I point out that the cases I have just mentioned involve nominations during the Truman administration. We also have the case of the nomination of Seymour Rubin, to be Assistant Director of the Mutual Security Administration. The nomination was made by President Truman, but was withdrawn by President Eisenhower. So this is a procedure which has been followed in various administrations.

Likewise, Mr. President, in 1948, confirmation was withheld in the case of the nomination of John J. McDonald to be United States representative on the Palestine Truce Commission.

In 1949, confirmation was withheld in the case of the nomination of Francis Biddle, to be United States representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

I point out that the Senate has refused to act as a rubber stamp for the diplomatic selection of any administration. The committee did not vote in favor of the confirmation of either the nomination of Mr. Jessup or the nomination of Mr. Holmes, to name only two.

The question I raised in the committee, and the question which I raise here on the floor of the Senate, is this: Is Mr. McLeod better qualified to be ambassador than Prof. Philip Jessup, of the Columbia Law School, one of the outstanding international lawyers of this generation? Two years ago, the administration was compelled to withdraw the nomination of an able career officer, Brig. Gen. Julius C. Holmes, largely, I believe, because a single member of the committee disapproved of a certain business activity of Mr. Holmes at a time when he was not even in the Department of State. I question whether Mr. McLeod is better qualified than General Holmes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe it is up to the Senate at this time either to reassert the traditional control of the Senate in these matters, or else to recognize that the Senate has abdicated its constitutional responsibility.

NOMINEE GIVEN EVERY CHANCE TO PROVE QUALIFICATIONS

Much has been said to the effect that Mr. McLeod's testimony cleared up the charges which had been made against him. However, Mr. President, I do not think Mr. McLeod has cleared up the major charges. I desire to point out that in the committee I did not cross-examine Mr. McLeod as a prosecutor. To the contrary, in fairness to Mr. McLeod, I attempted in my questions to lay before him every criticism I had heard about him. In fairness to him, I wish to state that I believe he made a good case for himself in respect to handling the refugee problem under the restrictions which were placed upon him by the Congress itself when it passed the unfortunate Refugee Act.

However, I desire to make perfectly clear that I do not believe Mr. McLeod has in any way justified the course of conduct he followed in connection with the famous Corsi case.

In regard to other charges, Mr. President, I wish to state frankly that Mr. McLeod left me with the impression that he was an artist in the use of semantics. I found his answers evasive and anything but satisfactory clarifications of the record.

Consider, for example, his conduct in the case of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be United States Ambassador to Russia. From Mr. MceLod's own testimony I am satisfied that he did circumvent the Secretary of State by making representations to the White House without the knowledge of the Secretary of State. Mr. McLeod testified that a telephone call from the White House from the President's adviser, General Persons ,reached him—Mr. McLeod—while he was sitting in the Office of the Secretary of State, talking to the Secretary of State. Therefore, Mr. McLeod contended, the Secretary of State was aware of the fact that he was in communication with the White House about the Bohlen matter. Nevertheless, Mr. President, that did not justify Mr. McLeod's being in communication with the White House in regard to the Bohlen matter, when Mr. McLeod was a subordinate officer of the Secretary of State.

Further examination showed that prior to Mr. McLeod's visit to the office of the Secretary of State on that day, Mr. McLeod had had previous communications with General Persons, at the White House, regarding the Bohlen matter. In my opinion, Mr. President, the testimony shows clearly that in the Bohlen case Mr. McLeod went over the head of the Secretary of State.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I thought it was a little amusing to hear Mr. McLeod's discussion of his participation in the Bohlen case. In that connection, let me quote from the committee hearings beginning on page 40, at the bottom of the page:

Senator MORSE. That is, the comments that you raised at the White House level in regard to Ambassador Bohlen were limited to your belief that there was sufficient opposition to Bohlen on the Hill for various reasons that you thought it would be a mistake for a new administration to nominate for this post a man that would lead it into a congressional contest in the Senate over the appointment?

Mr. MCLEOD. I do not believe that is quite the context. I simply wanted to alert them to the fact that they might expect to have some opposition where there had been none previously.

My whole activity in connection with this matter, which I think has been completely distorted in newspaper discussion of it—for that reason I welcome this opportunity to set the record straight——

Senator MORSE. That is why I am giving it to you.

Mr. MCLEOD. Was because I felt I had somewhat of a unique position, having just come from the Senate, in knowing something of the sentiment up here, and I was only trying to ascertain whether or not the administration knew that there might be some difficulty in this appointment.

If they did and if they were willing to encounter the difficulty, then of course I had no objection.

Senator MORSE. But you raised no question yourself as to Ambassador Bohlen's qualifications for the post or any question as to his being or not being a security risk?

Mr. MCLEOD. Not in my own behalf.

Mr. President, note Mr. McLeod's use of the words "not in my own behalf."

I read further from the hearing:

I certainly had no basis for doing so. I did not know him. As a matter of fact, I did not even have the benefit of the information that this committee had at that time, because in reviewing the matter recently, I find that his hearing here was on March 2 and I was sworn in on March 3, so I did not even have the advantage of that much background.

Senator MORSE. In your conversations with General Persons, did you advise him that if they got into a controversy with the Hill over Ambassador Bohlen, questions as to whether or not he was a security risk would be raised by some Senators?

Mr. MCLEOD. There again I cannot be sure because, although I have tried to reconstruct this recently, I cannot tell you whether I talked to General Persons before or after the FBI report became available to the Department.

Now you may recall that the original question on this security situation arose from the fact that there never had been a full field investigation of Ambassador Bohlen even in spite of his long service. I believe the question was raised first in this committee, and the investigation had been requestd, but the results did not become available until after the hearing, the original hearing on the part of this committee, so in trying to reconstruct the before and after phase of those days, I am simply unable to tell you whether or not

I had the security material at the time I talked to General Persons.

Senator MORSE. Was the security check on Ambassador Bohlen subsequently made?

Mr. MCLEOD. This committee was informed I think, at the time the Secretary testified, that the investigation had been requested and, as I recall, it was as a result of that that this committee resolved that they would not receive any nominations thereafter unless there had been a clearance based on a full field investigation.

Then the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] helpfully made this statement for the RECORD:

Senator KNOWLAND. Senator MORSE, might I interrupt at this time to, I think, correct it. My recollection is that the committee having requested, as they have done I think in other cases as well, a full field investigation, then appointed a subcommittee which, to the best of my recollection, consisted of Senator SPARKMAN and Senator Taft to go over the complete file.

Well, there is more to read that bears out the conclusion I want to state as to my opinion about McLeod and the Bohlen case, and that is that at no time, either in the hearings or anywhere else, has McLeod given Bohlen a clean bill of health. Read the language he uses. It is a master exhibit in semantics.

I wish to say further I am satisfied, on the basis of the whole record, that McLeod was responsible for a very embarrassing situation at a time when a great public servant was before the Senate for confirmation of his nomination, and that as a result of his course of action a great injustice was done to Mr. Bohlen. I was very much disappointed that Mr. McLeod did not face this matter frankly before our committee and point out what I think is an indisputable fact—that there is no question as to the great patriotism of this great Ambassador, who has just been transferred from the Moscow, Russia, post to a position of much less importance on the world scene, but nevertheless still a very important one, to the Philippines. It is just an example of one of the reasons why Mr. McLeod did not instill in me the confidence that he had the qualifications and competency that I think we ought to have in an ambassador.

I believe if a mistake has been made, a man ought to say so unequivocally, rather than use the evasive approach to this matter that I thought he used in his answers to my question.

Then, too—and I am almost through—I found his explanation of the so-called numbers game in connection with the security investigations of alleged subversives in the State Department to be completely unsatisfactory. He was unable to point out to the Committee a single Communist that he had uncovered; but there again he said we are dealing only with security risks. He talked in terms of whether someone was weak on Communists.

It is my opinion that the procedures and tactics that he used as chief security officer were not in conformity with fair processes under acceptable standards of American democratic processes. I do not think his record as security officer qualifies him in any way for the nomination of Ambassador to Ireland.

There are many more things I could say in evaluating the record, but I think each one of us has come to his own conclusions and I am ready to vote on the nomination. I shall vote against it because after weighing the entire record of Mr. McLeod as it is known to me, I do not think he possesses that competency and those qualifications that, in my judgment, justify the Senate's approving this nomination to be Ambassador to Ireland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks certain newspaper clippings, reports, and exhibits which, in my judgment, sustain my judgment.

There being no objection, the newspaper articles, reports, and exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERCER ISLAND, WASH., *April 25, 1957.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Certainly I do not feel that McLeod could ever represent me ever, anywhere.

Please make every effort for peace and understanding among all peoples and nations.

EUGENIE F. JENNER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *April 15, 1957.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are sure that you have seen the editorial entitled "The McLeod Appointment," in the New York Times of Thursday, April 11.

Its arguments against approval by the Senate of this appointment seem to us conclusive. In fact we would put the case more strongly. It seems to us that the appointment of Mr. McLeod as Ambassador would injure the essential interests of both the country he represented and the country to which he was accredited. A man whose name is a symbol of the ugliest sort of illiberalism in both the domestic and foreign policy ought not to represent the United States, anywhere.

We most earnestly hope that you agree and that you will vote against approving this nomination.

Sincerely yours,
L. H. BUTTERFIELD.
ELIZABETH E. BUTTERFIELD.

COHOES, N. Y., *April 14, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope that you will pardon me writing to you on the matter of Scott McLeod as Envoy to Eire. While it is true that I am not one of your constituents, nevertheless I am accustomed to look to you for leadership in the Senate.

The fact is I am exceedingly wroth at this latest example of the famed Eisenhower ignorance. I regard this nomination as an insult to the Irish people and to Americans, like myself, who have Irish blood in their veins.

I have written to the two Senators from my State but being of the Democratic persuasion, I am dubious whether or not my complaint will be heard or heeded.

Sincerely,
STANTON ABLETT.

PROVIDENCE FORGE, VA., *April 17, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope sincerely you will vote against confirmation Scott McLeod, Minister to Ireland. Have been there. They do not need or want his kind. Expect write you when data is all in hand of an Indian Korean veteran named Oregon Wyndell Wynn. Take care yourself, the country needs you.

IDA HIMES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 16, 1957.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I urge you to oppose the confirmation of Scott McLeod as Ambassador.

In my opinion McLeod is not suited by temperament to hold this position. He is not experienced in this field. He made a mess of the refugee program until a national furor and Eisenhower forced him to admit the refugees which the Congress had authorized. His handling of the refugee program evinced a predilection for McCarthyism which all sensitive Americans abhor.

I urge you to oppose this outrageous appointment.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN C. SASSER, Jr.

WOODSTOCK COUNTY SCHOOL,
South Woodstock, Vt., April 15, 1957.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you to express my opinion regarding the appointment of Mr. McLeod to be the United States Ambassador to Ireland.

In my opinion this appointment is very bad. It will do much to lower the dignity of the United States diplomatic corps. Mr. McLeod is a man who has acted with pettiness, and possible deceit, in his office while striving to carry out his own conception of our security and diplomatic problems. Our diplomatic corps needs men who can and will take unpopular stands on issues—this is strength of character—but these men must also be of generous impulses and have wide objective views of the problems of history.

I think only harm will come to the United States by maintaining this small man in high and honored office. I urge you to use all of your influence in the Senate to prevent Mr. McLeod from becoming Ambassador to Ireland.

Respectfully,
CHARLES B. SILLIMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 23, 1957.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been shocked by the suggestion that Mr. Scott McLeod is to be sent by my country as our (yours and mine) ambassador to Ireland. In Europe his name is so interwoven, rightly or wrongly with Mr. Cohen and Mr. Schine on their destruction of the United States Foreign Services that his confirmation by the Senate is inconceivable unless they, as a body, wish to credit that disgraceful period of our life.

While I feel sure Ireland would be unhappy about the appointment, they may not be strong enough to register a direct refusal. However, some of their newspapers are rather blunt about it. They seem to want no part of him. This also was the position taken by the New York Times—when Mr. McLeod's name first came up.

Other countries of the world, who will not have to suffer Mr. McLeod's presence will no doubt register in their minds, if he is confirmed by you, who in fact is running the United States State Department.

May I please, as a citizen of this country, ask you to consider carefully the type of person it is that represents us in foreign lands—as Mr. United States.

I cannot believe that the dignity of the United States Senate would be so lowered as to allow the possible discussion in the

same breath, let alone room, of Mr. Bohlen and Mr. McLeod, that fact alone reduces our great Foreign Service to a dreadful state. It has taken years to overcome Mr. Cohn and Mr. Schine. I do hope you are not going back to what they stood for.

Respectfully yours,

PETER CUSICK.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *April 11, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Humbly ask your support blocking McLeod ambassador Ireland. I am World War II Pacific vet.

JOSEPH DRANGA.

[From the Washington Post of April 17, 1957]

SCOTT MCLEOD TARGET OF NEW IRISH BLAST

DUBLIN, April 16.—The Irish Times today called United States Ambassador-designate Scott McLeod "The Hangman" and urged Premier Eamon de Valera to reject him.

The conservative newspaper, one of Ireland's leading publications repeatedly has criticized McLeod's appointment. The newspaper said the suicide April 4 of Canadian Ambassador E. Herbert Norman in Cairo is a "valid reason" for the government to refuse to accept McLeod's appointment.

"There is now very little cause to disbelieve that it was his unwholesome department * * * that led the American Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee to republish the disproved charges which impelled Norman to jump to his death," the newspaper said.

"We do not welcome the hangman in our midst and it is not customary to reward his services with an ambassadorship. Mr. McLeod's appointment would be indiscreet in any circumstances. In the light of Mr. Norman's suicide, it becomes intolerable."

The newspaper asserted McLeod "has gained notoriety as a systematic inquisitor of diplomatic qualifications, after a formula more reminiscent of Russia than of a western democracy."

[In Edinburgh, the independent Scotsman, Reuters reported, said in an editorial in Wednesday morning's paper, that Prime Minister De Valera's Government "cannot be happy" about McLeod's appointment.

["The egregious demagog, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, is now in eclipse, but the harm that he did when his inquisition was in full swing has not been forgotten. And Mr. Scott McLeod as security officer in the State Department was regarded as one of McCarthy's henchmen.]

[From the Washington Post of April 11, 1957]

FIGHTING IRISH

What has Ireland done to the United States to deserve Scott McLeod? President Eisenhower was scarcely his most persuasive yesterday in explaining his nomination of Mr. McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland and of Henry J. Taylor as Ambassador to Switzerland. Neither Dublin nor Berne comes in the category of a post to which a career appointment is ruled out by expense. It is hard to see what special qualifications either a glorified gumshoe or a somewhat credulous radio broadcaster possesses to merit this sort of reward.

The President justified Mr. Taylor's appointment on grounds of personal admiration and friendship. This is at least understandable if not commendable—although Mr. Eisenhower's assertion that Mr. Taylor's views in the foreign field coincide with his own raises the question whether he has listened to Mr. Taylor's broadcasts recently. At any rate, perhaps Mr. Taylor can entertain the Swiss with tales of flying saucers, in which he advertised himself as an expert and ardent believer a few years ago.

In the case of Mr. McLeod, who has headed the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, the President offered no such personal justification. He acted, he said, on the recommendation of Secretary Dulles. Yet, if we are to believe John Beal's biography of Mr. Dulles, the Secretary attempted to fire Mr. McLeod for insubordination 4 years ago. Mr. Dulles' interest in promoting Mr. McLeod out of his way is obvious, but the Irish may reasonably inquire (and the Irish press has inquired): "Why at our expense?"

This is the man who acted as a stooge for Senators McCarthy and BRIDGES; who leaked "information" to the McCarthy inquisition; who attempted to frustrate confirmation of Charles E. Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia; who conducted a reign of terror among State Department employees on security charges; whose office suspected the Department Policy Planning Staff because members were assigned as a part of their jobs to read the Daily Worker and (in a totally different category) even The Reporter; who presided over the Refugee Relief Act with such severity that it became a mockery. The fact that Mr. McLeod recently has seemed to mend his ways and to keep out of the bad news by no means makes a rose of his past malodorous record.

To appoint such a man to a diplomatic post is an insult to the recipient nation and a degradation of diplomacy. How can the Senate, which is at frequent pains to demonstrate its friendship for Ireland, view this as a friendly act?

[From the New York Times]

THE MCLEOD APPOINTMENT

Scott McLeod is the symbol in the State Department of all that has happened in the last 4 years to lower morale so drastically and to drive from the diplomatic career some of the best officers we had. He entered the State Department in the security section in 1953 as the representative of Senators BRIDGES, McCarthy, and the late Senator McCarran. No one man has represented in the public mind more than Scott McLeod all the evils of McCarthyism as applied to diplomacy. On Tuesday he was nominated as Ambassador to Ireland.

Is it any wonder that a storm of criticism has arisen throughout the country over diplomatic appointments when such things can happen? It would be unjust to make a blanket condemnation, for some fine appointments were made, but there have been bad appointments, and this one comes as a climax. It would be hard to imagine a worse blow to the diplomatic corps or a worse example of playing politics with the foreign affairs of the United States. Secretary Dulles must take the blame for Mr. McLeod's unfortunate work in the field of so-called security and the refugee problems, for he, after all, is the head of the Department, and he must take the blame for this appointment.

Ireland deserved a better fate. She has been most fortunate since 1953 in having a first-rate envoy—Ambassador William Howard Taft 3d. Dublin is a post where the work is not arduous and life is wonderfully pleasant. The man who is named to Ireland is a fortunate man. If he is a career diplomat like Mr. Taft he is a lucky man. For the noncareer man it is a reward.

And now it is Scott McLeod who is going to get this reward if his nomination is ratified. Whether he gets it or doesn't is not a personal matter. He is a well-intentioned if woefully misguided young man and no one begrudges him any happiness he can get. But the damage to the State Department and the United States diplomatic corps that will result from this appointment is public business. The Senate should block it.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 21, 1957]

IRISH ATTACK ON MCLEOD STEPPED UP—NOW HE'S LINKED TO NORMAN CASE

(By Don Cook)

LONDON, April 20.—If the nomination of Scott McLeod as American Ambassador to Ireland is approved by the Senate, he will arrive to take up his mission in Dublin against a background of some of the harshest public criticism heard in a foreign capital against an American appointee in a long time.

Led by the Irish Times, there has been a steady and often bitter attack on the McLeod nomination since it was first hinted at last month. The suicide in Cairo of Herber Norman, Canadian Ambassador to Egypt, following the fresh airing of "Communist" charges against him by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee, brought a new wave of criticism of the McLeod appointment.

NO ACTION BY DE VALERA

So far, however, Prime Minister Eamon de Valera's government shows no signs of withdrawing its acceptance of the appointment of Mr. McLeod, who is still the State Department's security chief pending his confirmation as envoy.

The Irish Times charged it was Mr. McLeod's "unwholesome department, whether or not Mr. McLeod was the direct party responsible" which led to the fresh publication of charges against Mr. Norman and "impelled him to jump to his death." The paper continued:

"This surely is a valid reason why Mr. de Valera should revoke his agreement (to the appointment), or, if that is impossible, why the American authorities should change their minds. Mr. McLeod's appointment would be indiscreet in any circumstances. In the light of Mr. Norman's suicide it becomes intolerable."

IT IS HUMILIATING

Earlier, the Irish Times had said that "it is humiliating to find the United States Embassy in Dublin regarded as a dumping ground for a man whose political party desires either to reward for dubious services or, more conceivably, to put out of the way of doing further mischief."

It added, "We should be sorry to believe that America thinks so little of a nation which has contributed greatly to her blood and advancement as to send it an ambassador of whom such meager good has been heard and so much ill."

Not all Irish newspapers have taken so stiff a line. The Irish Press blamed the controversy on domestic political issues in the United States and remarked that "it would be premature to judge the merits of the appointment on such grounds."

The Irish Independent has carried a favorable profile article on Mr. McLeod, describing him as a sensible young fellow who is a good storyteller and gets along with all sorts of men.

In London, the Daily Telegraph has been leading the attack on the appointment here, calling it "flat-footed diplomacy" and asking, "Just because most American policemen are Irish, is this a good enough reason for appointing an American policeman as United States Ambassador in Dublin?"

[From the Washington Star of April 10, 1957]

MCLEOD'S APPOINTMENT TO IRELAND — NEW AMBASSADOR SEEN AS BRINGING DISCORD IN FOREIGN SERVICE MORALE

(By Doris Fleeson)

The nomination of Scott McLeod to be Ambassador to Ireland is a little candle throwing its beam on the extraordinary supineness of present-day Washington. That indifference to duty and to the welfare and the needs of others afflicts the Republican

administrators and Democratic Congress alike.

There is nothing secret, rare, or difficult about the McLeod matter that a little stamina would not solve. The chances are the stamina won't be forthcoming.

McLeod is the former FBI agent, assistant to Senator BRIDGES and warm ally to Senator McCarthy, whom Secretary Dulles put in charge of security in the State Department. This was in the early Eisenhower days when McCarthy was riding high and the President's orders were to get along with him.

The effect on Foreign Service morale was immediate, unfortunate and lasting. But McLeod stayed even after he publicly tried to help McCarthy stymie the President's appointment of Charles Bohlen to be Ambassador to Russia. Dulles has explained to his latest admiring Boswell that he wanted to fire McLeod then but was restrained by his then undersecretary, Bedell Smith.

With the President in his second and final term, Dulles decided to get McLeod out of the security and immigration field where he has been a constant source of friction. But Senator BRIDGES is still the senior Republican, ranking on Appropriations and Armed Services.

Dulles offered McLeod the embassies of Honduras and New Zealand. They weren't good enough. McLeod has been paid his price to go quietly—the attractive assignment to Ireland.

In itself, the matter is relatively minor. Friends of Ireland will wish that amid its many difficulties it would have a more distinguished and effective envoy. But it is not a trouble spot for this country.

Ireland has not protested the appointment formally despite a press and parliamentary attack on the selection in Ireland by liberal forces which pointed out that McLeod's friend, McCarthy, was in eclipse here.

But the Foreign Service is bitter that he should be rewarded for what they regard as his hatchet work. He is the last straw on their heavier-than-usual cross of campaign contributors who skim the cream of overseas assignments in all administrations.

With the McLeod appointment, career men are left only in the hard spots: The Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, behind the Iron Curtain, and near the Arctic Circle. Possibly the country should be grateful for small favors.

This is the readymade case for the Democratic majority which professes to believe that foreign policy is badly executed. But controversy is discouraged by the LYNDON JOHNSON leadership; the Democratic Senator who starts one is apt to find himself charging up San Juan Hill alone.

It is beginning to appear in fact that the Democrats lost the art of controversy in their 20 years amid the political fleshpots. How they could lose on this one it is hard to see. The McLeod appointment does not divide the Democrats, they are all against him.

It does divide the Republicans and would bring the anti-Eisenhower right wing rushing from its corner—if it were made an issue.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1957]

PAPERS ABROAD ASSAIL MCLEOD

LONDON, April 11.—The Conservative Daily Telegram today denounced appointment of Scott McLeod as United States Ambassador to Ireland, calling it "flat-footed diplomacy." "Just because American policemen are Irish, is this good enough reason for appointing an American policeman as United States Ambassador to Dublin?" it asked in an editorial.

"Presumably President Eisenhower thinks it is.

"For otherwise he would surely not have named Mr. Scott McLeod, former FBI agent and State Department security officer for the post.

"Mr. McLeod came to the State Department in the early days of the administration as an acknowledged partisan of the McCarthy wing of the Republican Party.

"In the words of Mr. Dulles' latest hagiographer, his appointment as security officer 'seemed to keep (Senator Joseph) McCarthy and his allies off the Department's neck.'

(A hagiographer is a writer of lives of the saints. A new biography of Dulles by John R. Beal was published last week.)

"It does seem flat-footed diplomacy in the most literal sense to elevate to ambassadorial rank a man who failed so disastrously as State Department policeman."

The Telegraph editorial then referred to the suicide in Cairo of Canadian Ambassador Herbert Norman "after repeated but wholly unfounded accusations of Communist sympathies by a Congressional committee."

"That this latest and most tragic example of damage still being done by McCarthyism should coincide with such gratuitous honor for one of McCarthy's most energic agents will disturb most Americans quite as much as it shocks friends of the United States abroad," it said.

In Dublin, the Irish Times expressed hope that the United States Senate will block the appointment of McLeod as Ambassador to Ireland.

The independent Times, which is friendly to Prime Minister Eamon De Valera's Government, said editorially:

"If we cannot fairly blame Mr. De Valera for giving his agreement to the nomination, we can only at this stage express the hope that the American Senate will refuse its consent to the appointment.

"The Department of External Affairs could hardly have been expected to foresee the wave of disapproval which has followed his (McLeod's) nomination," said the paper. "But it must have had some inkling of his reputation—enough, anyhow, to inform the Prime Minister that his appointment was unlikely to improve Irish-American relations.

"It is humiliating to find that the United States Embassy in Dublin regarded as a dumping ground for a man whom his political party desires either to reward for dubious services rendered or, conceivably, to get out of the way of doing further mischief.

"We should be sorry she (the United States) thinks so little of a nation which has contributed greatly to her blood and advancement as to send it an ambassador of whom such meager good has been heard and so much ill."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 12, 1957]

ENVOY CHOICES STIR CRITICISM

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The question is being raised again here whether there isn't some better way of picking America's foreign envoys.

What was good enough for the sleepy 1890's isn't good enough for the H-bomb era, it is argued.

Mr. Eisenhower promised the best brains in his appointees but the current major shift in diplomatic posts is causing journalistic questioning.

The New York Times and the Washington Post editorially assailed the appointment of Scott McLeod, State Department security official, and protege of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, to the Republic of Ireland. "The Senate should block it," the New York Times declares.

Swiss newspapers express concern over the appointment of Henry J. Taylor, businessman and radio commentator, named to Bern. In a 1950 broadcast Mr. Taylor announced "flying saucers do exist." He said that when the Air Force tells the story "the information will be good news—wonderful news—for Americans."

Mr. Taylor in broadcasts also took a stand against the British Labor Party as socialistic and related to communism.

PARSIMONY DEPLORED

The State Department picked Amory Houghton, on leave as board chairman of the Corning Glass Works, Ambassador to Paris. He does not speak French. It named David K. E. Bruce, Ambassador to Bonn. He does not speak German. It named William S. B. Lacy, Minister to the Philippines, without previous experience in Eastern Europe, to Warsaw. In turn, Charles E. Bohlen, Ambassador to Moscow and outstanding expert on communism, is being sent to the Philippines.

Asked about diplomatic appointments at his press conference this week, Mr. Eisenhower echoed unhappiness of most observers about the Congressional parsimony in diplomatic entertainment allowances which makes it impossible for any but rich Americans to take top European posts—London, Paris, Rome, and the like.

The President observed that times have changed, government must change, too: "I happen to believe," he said, "that in this day we cannot * * * limit ourselves to the governmental processes that were applicable in 1890."

Mr. Eisenhower follows the policy of leaving selection of envoys to others though, of course, he bears ultimate responsibility.

The caliber of present American noncareer appointees to top European posts is believed to be at least as high as it was in Truman and Roosevelt administrations, and perhaps higher. Rewarding rich political supporters with these posts is an old American tradition. But is the tradition safe, it is asked, in the H-bomb era?

OPPOSITION GATHERS

Principal immediate criticism does not center on these top jobs, however, but on appointment of Mr. McLeod and Mr. Taylor. Senate confirmation is expected though opposition is developing.

The nominations have brought criticism abroad.

The Associated Press quotes the conservative Daily Telegraph of London as denouncing the McLeod appointment. The paper says Mr. McLeod, former FBI man, brought police methods to the security office of the State Department and asks whether a "policeman" should be named United States Ambassador to Dublin.

In Dublin, the Irish Times, independent, expressed hope the Senate would reject Mr. McLeod. It quotes a "wave of disapproval which has followed his [McLeod's] appointment." It calls the appointment "humiliating" to the Republic of Ireland.

Questions have been raised in Switzerland over the appointment of Mr. Taylor.

It appears that foreign critics of the United States are attempting to use the appointment as a basis for attack.

A current sympathetic biographer of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Jack Beal of the Luce publications, declares that Mr. McLeod made a "shambles of morale" in the State Department, where he is chief security officer. Mr. Beal praises Mr. Dulles highly. He reports that Mr. McLeod, acting independently of his chief, through conservative Senators STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, and McCarthy, leaked information attempting to block confirmation of Mr. Bohlen to Moscow. For this, Mr. Beal reports, Mr. Dulles nearly, but not quite, fired him.

TAYLOR ENDORSED

Asked about these appointees at his April 10 press conference, Mr. Eisenhower said of Mr. McLeod that he was "not so well acquainted with him (as with Mr. Taylor).

"He was taken on Secretary Dulles' recommendation, and I assure you again I have the utmost confidence in Mr. Dulles."

Mr. Taylor, chairman of the board of the Silicone Paper Co. and other business con-

nections, describes himself as "journalist, economist." He worked for the Scripps-Howard newspapers and was sponsored over radio by General Motors.

Survey of these broadcasts shows Mr. Taylor a man of apparent strong feelings who called Communist Chinese leader Chou En-lai "a barbarian bandit, as foul a man as lives."

He declared that Mr. Chou and Indian Prime Minister Jawaharial Nehru "cooked up" the Bandung conference "to take a solid sock at the United States." He described President Tito as "the red boss of Yugoslavia, whose own hands are as bloody as any man's in the Kremlin." He warned against the British Labor Party.

Mr. Taylor's flying-saucer broadcasts brought denials both from President Truman and the Air Force.

[From the Washington Post of April 15, 1957]

McLEOD TOPIC OF IRISH CONTROVERSY

DUBLIN, April 14.—The Irish Association of Civil Liberty asked the Government today to "reconsider its reported agreement" to accept the appointment of Scott McLeod as United States Ambassador to Ireland.

Author Sean O'Faolain is president of the Association's Council, which referred to the "outcry from reputable and presumably well informed newspapers" against the McLeod appointment as "unprecedented."

The Civil Liberty Association said "While this association is in no position to pass judgment at this stage we are conscious of a profound uneasiness over the appointment, especially as our preliminary inquiries have tended to confirm our fears."

President Eisenhower's appointment of McLeod to succeed Ambassador William Howard Taft III has been opposed by the Irish Times, which expressed hope the United States Senate would block the choice.

"It is humiliating to find the United States Embassy in Dublin regarded as a dumping ground for a man whom his political party desires either to reward for dubious services rendered or conceivably to get out of the way of doing further mischief," the Times said.

The Irish Independent, top circulation Irish daily newspaper, said tonight the "suggestion there has been an outcry here against it (the McLeod appointment) is, as the Irish public is well aware, quite unfounded."

The Independent said it would appear that some American and English newspapers "accept the notion that there is some feeling in this country against Mr. McLeod's nomination." The paper then added:

"It would be well that these ideas should be dispelled. In accordance with diplomatic usages and international courtesies, we expect that a person appointed as Ambassador to Ireland should be a man against whom Irishmen could make no objection on any reasonable grounds.

"If no such objection appears, the choice of Ambassador is entirely one for the United States. It would be wholly contrary to Irish courtesy to attempt to interfere in such choice or to seek to influence it.

As far as Ireland is concerned, we are aware of no grounds on which exception could be taken to Mr. McLeod's nomination and appointment. The suggestion that there has been any outcry against it is, as the Irish public is well aware, quite unfounded."

The Independent said a statement in a London paper that the Irish people are hostile to McLeod is equally baseless.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania to recommit to the Foreign Relations Committee, for the purpose of taking additional testimony, the nomination of Scott McLeod to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Ireland.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

SPEAKING AT A DISADVANTAGE

I am speaking at a disadvantage this afternoon, because it was necessary for me to leave town, immediately after the services for the late Senator McCarthy in this Chamber on last Monday, in order to attend the funeral, in Cheyenne, of an old friend of mine, the wife of one of my dearest friends for more than 40 years. Before leaving, I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and made the request to the majority leader that there be no vote upon this nomination until I had returned and had an opportunity to examine the record.

I knew I would be back this afternoon. I flew to Cheyenne, and I flew back this afternoon from Chicago to which I went by train last night from my home city. I arrived scarcely 20 minutes ago and I came directly to the Capitol.

Now I am advised by the Presiding Officer that a vote is pending. I have not had the opportunity, as I say, to examine the record, but there have been called to my attention certain matters which I feel I should bring to the attention of the Senate before the vote is taken.

TIMES CALL FOR HIGH-CALIBER DIPLOMATS

The public press has been full of information, which has come to every member of our Government, and to every Member of the Senate, with respect to the critical nature of our foreign relations. No argument is necessary to prove that the United States should take the greatest care in selecting its ambassadors at this time. The best are none too good if we hope to make the world understand us.

I do not know what the feelings of the other Members of this body may be, but my feeling is that the divergence of policy between the United States of America and Soviet Russia has not been brought to anything resembling a solution. The cold war which is being waged by Soviet Russia against our country and the attempts the Communists make to stir up misunderstanding in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world put us on notice that we have not settled the conflict between dictatorship and free government, and that we have not in any way placed ourselves in a position diplomatically to make certain that the way is clear for us to win the cold war.

There should be no doubt, therefore, in our minds, when we vote upon the nomination of anybody to go abroad as an ambassador of the United States to any country in Europe, and particularly, may I say, to the capital of Eire, the city of Dublin, that we are choosing a representative to labor in the frontlines of foreign policies.

The President asks the Members of the Senate to advise and consent to the confirmation of this nomination. I cannot give my advice that this nomination should be made, and I cannot vote to confirm this nomination.

I CANNOT ADVISE AND CONSENT TO THIS NOMINATION

The reasons for my position are threefold.

In the first place, I have heard nobody as yet explain why William Howard Taft III has been requested to resign or vacate this post in Dublin.

I had the great good fortune in 1955, after a long and wearing session of Congress, to go to Ireland with my wife. It was my first visit to the land in which both my parents were born. I found it of tremendous interest and great instruction.

But I wish to tell the Senate that to my great satisfaction I discovered that William Howard Taft had been accepted by the people of Ireland as the great man he is. He had won their confidence and their respect, and he was extending all the help and advice and assistance that a diplomat could properly extend to aid the people of that nation. His selection to serve as our Ambassador was received as a high compliment by the people of Ireland.

I visited the ambassador at the Embassy. That was late one Saturday, as the Embassy was about to close. I had been in Dublin for 10 days at the time, and had been remiss in failing to pay my respects to the American Ambassador.

I went there, and I was delighted at the cordial reception I received at the hands of Mr. Taft, who might easily have been annoyed at the arrival of so late a visitor. The Ambassador's hospitality and good humor were exceptionally warm. He said to me, "Senator, how long have you been in Ireland?" I said, "Ten days." And he inquired, "What has brought you here and what can I do?" I said, "Well, Mr. Ambassador, I am here not by authority of the Senate or any of its committees, but I am here on a personal visit. I am not investigating the Embassy or the Ambassador. I am here visiting old Ireland, the home of my ancestors and my mission is only to let you know the high regard you have won among the Irish people."

We were invited to his home in Phoenix Park. There we had a luncheon with him and with Mrs. Taft and with their children. I shall never forget the little play that his children put on for our entertainment. These were little youngsters who, with the Ambassador and Mrs. Taft, had visited the Irish playhouses, and there had become well acquainted with the artistic element of the Irish capital. I observed the little Taft boys speaking with a brogue, giving the little show—"The Weather Clark" as it was called—clark for clerk.

I recite that here only as an indication of the position that Mr. Taft had won in the hearts of the people of Ireland by the gracious qualities of his whole family.

THE HIGH RESPECT AND AFFECTION THE IRISH ENTERTAIN FOR AMBASSADOR TAFT

A few days afterward the Irish Government gave a reception, or tea, in St. Patrick's Hall, which is in Dublin Castle. This tea was given for the visiting astronomers. All the astronomers of the world had been gathered there. It was their triennial session. We were invited. I could tell by the warmth of the attitude toward Ambassador Taft what a deep impression he had made upon the leaders of Government.

All of this information caused me to make inquiries wherever I went about the standing of the United States Ambassador. I found that there were sound reasons for the high respect and sincere affection the Irish people entertain for Mr. and Mrs. Taft. Of course, he is a Gaelic scholar. He taught Gaelic in Yale. But he is more than that. He is a statesman. He has inherited the great talents of the Taft family.

I speak as one who has served with his father, the late Senator Taft. I was the first chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Senator Taft was the second chairman, when the control of this body changed. Then, when the control changed again, I resumed the chairmanship. I take pride in telling the Senate that there never was the slightest dispute between the late Senator Taft and me about the selection of the expert staff to carry on the work of that committee, and most of the staff are still working for the Joint Committee, because, under Senator Taft, that committee was guided along the line of honest and objective research into the economic situation of our country. I did my best to follow the same course of action.

So I saw in the son the reflection of the father. I had known the grandfather, the President and Chief Justice, after whom the ambassador was named. I remember hearing him speak when he was President; and, after he was President, when he was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; and, before that, when he was on the faculty of the Yale Law School.

So I took pride in the fact that my Government was sending to little Ireland a great man who could sit in any cabinet and confer with any diplomat the world over to our honor and credit.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have not quite finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was making some comments upon the great influence of William Howard Taft III as an ambassador of this Government in the capital Eire, at Dublin, and my pride in the fact that our Government had sent a man of that caliber to represent us in the city of Dublin, to which go representatives from all the other countries in the world, particularly those of Europe. So I feel that some explanation should be given to the Senate why the President makes the change from William Howard Taft to Scott McLeod.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I happened to be a Senator from Connecticut when William Howard Taft was appointed to Ambassador to Ireland. I talked with him this year, when he was back here, about the prospective change. He is very well satisfied to be relieved of his duties as Ambassador to Ireland. I think he has spent 8 of the last 11 years there, in one capacity or another, the last 4 years as Ambassador. I do not believe I am violating any confidence when I say that he felt he was due for a change, so to speak. So I think I can assure the distinguished Senator that the Ambassador incumbent harbors no resentment, but, on the other hand, has welcomed the change, so far as his relief is concerned.

I agree with all the fine things the distinguished Senator has said about Ambassador Taft. He has made a fine record, and has, indeed, endeared himself to the Irish people in a very unusual way. But I assure the Senator that he does not feel that he has been slighted in the least. On the other hand, I believe he is in entire sympathy and accord with the change which has been made, so far as he is personally concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut, and I have every confidence in his own accuracy. But, as I explained when I arose, I have not had an opportunity to read the RECORD. I know of no other explanation which has been offered than that which has just been offered by the Senator from Connecticut for the dropping of Mr. Taft. There may be others. I do not know. I am told by my colleagues whom I have consulted since my return this afternoon that nothing has been said on the subject. Whatever may have been said, it was not very extensive in its content. I feel that that is one of the questions which the committee itself should examine, for apparently no offer of another appointment has been made to Mr. Taft.

I pay my compliment to him not at all in a political sense, but in a personal sense, as a sincere expression of the very favorable impression which his service among the Irish people has made upon me. I cite that as an illustration of how important it is, when we have good men, against whom no criticism can be offered, that we should be reluctant to change. Such men should be chosen always to carry the title of Ambassador of the United States.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I, too, am glad to have the explanation of the Senator from Connecticut. I wonder if the Senator from Connecticut, the minority leader, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], or any other Senator on the other side of the aisle could tell us whether or not Ambassador Taft requested that he be relieved.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I continue my remarks?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understood the Senator had asked a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was the Senator from Oregon who asked the question which the Senator from California now rises to answer. I prefer to proceed, and then I shall be glad to yield for any questions which may be asked.

I have set forth, I think, a sufficient portion of the story of the appointment and the activities of Ambassador Taft to explain why I feel that his record is worthy of consideration, when there is before the Senate a motion to recommit the nomination of a successor who would step into his place, and whom, I am sure, no one would praise as one having one-tenth the qualifications of Ambassador Taft for the position of Ambassador of the United States anywhere in Europe.

DIPLOMATIC POSTS ON THE AUCTION BLOCK?

I turn to the second reason why I feel that this nomination should be recommitted. From the Washington Post of March 22, 1957, I read from the column of Mr. Joseph Alsop entitled "Diplomatic Appointments Record Called Squalid":

> PARIS.—The Eisenhower administration's traffic in diplomatic appointments has now reached a stage that calls for public comment. * * *
>
> Scott McLeod is to receive the Embassy in Dublin as his just reward for having done more harm to the American Foreign Service than anyone else in recent memory. Perhaps McLeod will not do a great deal more harm in Ireland, but why on earth should he be sent there at all at the expense of the American taxpayer?
>
> But this is a relatively minor incident in a long and squalid story. This year most of the diplomatic posts in Europe have been crudely placed on the auction block and sold for cash on the barrelhead.
>
> By sheer accident, some of the very rich men who have thus been named to represent the United States abroad ought to make excellent ambassadors. John Hay Whitney in London, for instance, is the sort of man who ought to receive a political appointment to a major embassy quite without regard to his Republican contributions. Then, too, the administration must be credited with at least two really admirable nonpolitical appointments, those of David K. E. Bruce in Germany and Ellsworth Bunker in India.
>
> All the same, the overall record is really pretty unappetizing. Some recent incidents suggest, on the one hand, that the price of diplomatic appointments has now reached a level that is downright scandalous.

Joseph Alsop is a reputable columnist, who enjoys the respect of the journalistic profession and the respect of all in Government who know him. When Joe Alsop says that the traffic in ambassadorships has become scandalous, I think there is an appropriate field for inquiry by the Foreign Relations Committee in examining into the subject before any action is taken.

Let me proceed with the column:

> There is the case, for example, of the present Ambassador to Denmark, the experienced, ex-Foreign Service officer, Robert Coe.

Mr. President, Robert D. Coe chose Wyoming to be his place of residence. Wyoming is the site of his citizenship. He is the son of William Robertson Coe, a very wealthy industrialist who, after he

retired from business, moved to Wyoming and established himself there on a ranch. He made many philanthropic contributions to the welfare of the State in the way of building hospitals and gifts to the State University, and the like. Robert Coe is his son. He entered the Foreign Service in 1928. He was not appointed to the ambassadorship to Denmark until, as I recall, in 1953.

Let me return to the article, which is the meat of the charge that has been made. I am quoting again from Mr. Alsop:

> It is an open secret that Coe's original appointment was recognition not of his Foreign Service training but of his family's enormous contributions to the 1952 campaign fund. In the last campaign he was again approached by an old friend, who was one of the Republican Committee's money collectors, with the delicate intimation that it was once more time to cough up.
>
> "It's going to have to be a deep bronchial cough, too," added the friend.
>
> In total, Coe's cough reached the sum of $7,000—surely a respectable extra cough from a man who has always been a generous Republican contributor in his adopted State of Wyoming. But it was not enough, and Coe was summarily informed that his services would be dispensed with this spring. He is to be replaced by a professional diplomat, Miss Frances Willis, Minister to Switzerland, who is being moved to make room for a political appointment.

Whether that is the fact, I do not know. However, the Washington Post yesterday morning announced that Mrs. Agnes Wheaton, a new member to the publicity staff of the White House, when questioned as to who was to take the ambassadorial post in Denmark, from which Coe has resigned, said that she had not yet been advised. During my absence perhaps a nomination has been sent to the Senate. I do not know.

I pause for any Senator to rise who may know of a successor to Robert D. Coe, of Wyoming. I hear no response. Does not the silence call out for a committee investigation? Is the Senate asked to advise and consent to the nomination of Scott McLeod to be Ambassador to Ireland while these charges are published in the public press that a career man has been asked to resign because his contribution to the presidential campaign was not as ample as required?

Unless we take particular care to play our part in the advice and consent to these ambassadorial representatives of the United States, we share whatever blame may come from the inept handling of our foreign affairs that is certain to result.

Unless we throw the spotlight of clear and honest investigation upon all the facts, we cannot proudly walk around the Senate floor and say we are well represented abroad, when the charge is made that the Ambassador of the United States to Denmark was required to "cough up" $7,000 for the political campaign of 1956.

We know, and the record of the Senate committee teaches us, that the contributions in the Republican campaign of 1956 and the campaign of 1952 came from big business. I see the Senator from New Hampshire smiling at me as he comes across the aisle.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was wondering whether the Senator would tell us about some ambassadors who made large contributions to the Democratic campaigns of 1948 and 1944.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I expected that sort of argument from the Senator from New Hampshire. That is not rising above the issue at all, is it?

Mr. BRIDGES. No, but——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is merely smearing and saying, "If you do it, we can do it. If we do it, you also did it." I never participated by my vote on the floor of the Senate in the confirmation of any ambassador who was called upon to contribute to a presidential campaign as a price for his selection.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to look at the record.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will have to take my word for it, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire. He does not have to look at the record. He knows he does not have to look at any record.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wyoming says he has never voted during a Democratic administration for the confirmation of an ambassador who had made a substantial contribution to the Democratic Party. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what I said; not in a single case where a charge was made in the open press that a scandalous contribution had been made. Does the Senator believe in scandalous contributions or does he not?

Mr. BRIDGES. What is that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire believe in scandalous contributions, or does he not?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not believe in scandalous contributions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator object to an investigation?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not object, but the facts are known.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I ask the Senator to vote to recommit the nomination to the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has had his say, and he has convicted himself.

Apparently a successor has not been chosen. Why shall not the Senate find out about the choice?

We are conducting a large scale investigation into the activities of the head of the Teamsters Union. I have heard enough of the testimony in that case to say that I applaud the members of the committee who are proceeding with that investigation. If appointments to postmasterships were being sold, the Civil Service Commission would investigate. When ambassadorships are in question, we should investigate.

We cannot afford to have scandalous corruption in any of the activities of the Government at this time, particularly in the Foreign Service, because we are leading the world, or think we are, in the preservation of honest, free government.

A THIRD REASON TO RECOMMIT

Therefore, Mr. President, for those two reasons I shall vote to recommit the nomination. I shall also vote for a third reason, and that is that in all the discussion which has taken place before the nomination of Mr. McLeod was made it was stated in the public press and upon the floor of the Senate, and in private conversations, that Mr. McLeod was being promoted upstairs, so to speak, to remove him from Washington.

He was being taken out of the State Department, where at one time it was said the Secretary of State wanted to have him discharged. We are told that as a member of the staff of the State Department he made open war against another presidential nominee for an ambassadorship, Mr. Bohlen.

Shall the Senate hold back now and refuse to look into a matter of this kind? Shall any Democrat who regards himself as in any way responsible for raising the standard of ethics and ability of our ambassadorial representatives now refuse to turn this nomination back to the committee, so that we may have the facts.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment.

The issue is clear. I do not know how I will vote eventually if Scott McLeod can demonstrate that he has not fought his President, who is nominating him for this position; if he can demonstrate that he has not been a stumbling block in the path of the Secretary of State, if he can show by his record the capacity to serve as an ambassador in what we know is a world crisis.

If anybody, even the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] can demonstrate that Scott McLeod is a person qualified to hold such a diplomatic post, then I might be convinced. But certainly I am not ready to say "yea" now. I will say "yea" to the motion to recommit, but not on the question of the confirmation of the nomination.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator from Wyoming, on September 18, 1950, vote for the confirmation of the nomination of William O'Dwyer to be Ambassador to Mexico?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not believe I was present that day; I might have been.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is wrong, if the Senator from Wyoming was not present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I was recorded as present and voting, then I'm sure I voted for the confirmation of his nomination. Mr. O'Dwyer had been the mayor of the city of New York, and there was no breath of scandal at the time with respect to the action of the ambassadorships and he was not being sent to the turbulent European area where we are advised by some in authority that we stand on the brink of war.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that one? [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I will yield on that one. Was the Senator from New York in the Senate at that time?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York was definitely in the Senate that day and warned the Senate of what was coming. In the face of that warning,

Mr. O'Dwyer's nomination was confirmed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The confirmation of the nomination of O'Dwyer, I am ready to confess upon the floor, may have been a mistake, but one which should not be cited by our Republican friends as a reason for voting now, without an investigation, to confirm the nomination of Scott McLeod in the terrible crisis involving NATO, the Middle East, and Russian threats to the free world.

I have stated the reasons why I feel this nomination should go back to the committee. I feel that the great service which William Howard Taft III has rendered is an indication of what we should strive to do. If he now feels that he must conclude his service, that, of course, is a decision for him to make. But let us send to Ireland as a successor a person who can make some pretense of standing in Mr. Taft's shoes.

Secondly, there is the charge that ambassadorial posts have been scandalously put upon the auction block. Nothing has been heard about this. Let us investigate it.

Third, the charges and the criticisms which have been voiced against the nominee in this case have been such as to indicate that his nomination is not a reward, but is a nomination to get a troublesome factor out of the State Department in Washington.

Mr. President, I shall, therefore, vote to recommit the nomination.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the motion to recommit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to recommit the nomination. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would note "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If present and voting the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH and Mr. CASE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah Mr. [WATKINS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH and Mr. CASE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—22

Carroll	Hill	O'Mahoney
Church	Jackson	Pastore
Clark	Kennedy	Scott
Douglas	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ervin	McNamara	Symington
Fulbright	Monroney	Yarborough
Green	Morse	
Hennings	Neuberger	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Frear	McClellan
Allott	Goldwater	Morton
Barrett	Gore	Mundt
Beall	Hickenlooper	Potter
Bennett	Holland	Purtell
Bricker	Hruska	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson
Bush	Javits	Russell
Butler	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Knowland	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Talmadge
Dirksen	Malone	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Thye
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Williams

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson	Hayden	Neely
Bible	Humphrey	Payne
Byrd	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Case, N. J.	Langer	Watkins
Chavez	Lausche	Young
Cotton	Long	
Eastland	Murray	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to recommit was rejected be reconsidered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REVIEW BY SENATOR MUNDT OF BOOK ENTITLED "ALGER HISS—IN THE COURT OF PUBLIC OPINION"

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have been asked by a number of my colleagues to prepare and discuss an analysis of the book entitled "Alger Hiss—in the Court of Public Opinion," which was written by Alger Hiss and was published this week.

In my opinion, the book is in the nature of a deliberate attempt to misrepresent justice.

I ask unanimous consent to have my analysis printed at this point in the RECORD, because I think it will serve the purpose of those who are interested.

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

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK BY ALGER HISS ENTITLED "ALGER HISS—IN THE COURT OF PUBLIC OPINION"

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota), acting chairman of House Committee on Un-American Activities during most of the Hiss hearings in 1948)

I am glad to accept the United Press invitation to review the Hiss book. As acting chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities during most of the Hiss hearings, I have followed every facet of the Hiss case and believe there are facts in connection with it which the public should have in evaluating the contents of this Hiss apologia.

While purporting to include new evidence, the book actually contains nothing of substance which was not presented in the two Hiss trials and in the futile petition for a new trial. In the main, the book is simply the age-old complaint voicing the views of the convict after the court has issued its verdict of "Guilty." It is largely an uninteresting rehash of well-known details of committee and court hearings involving Alger Hiss.

Like many books of this type, this volume is more noteworthy for what it does not say and for what it evades and omits rather than for what it includes. For example, it evades the basic issues of fact by failing fully or accurately to report the vital part played in the Hiss conviction by four mute but mighty "witnesses." These were the expensive rug Hiss received from Chambers; the typewriter which was identified as the Hiss machine on which the documents received by Chambers were written; the Ford car which even in his book Hiss is unable to explain away in many

monotonous pages devoted to it; and, finally, the telltale State Department notes in the handwriting of Hiss which Chambers produced for the trial.

The book improperly attributes to the House Committee on Un-American Activities a predetermination to expose and convict Hiss. As acting chairman of that committee at the time, I know that exactly the reverse was true. To a man, our committee at the outset was impressed by Hiss because of his background and appearance, and we were predisposed at the beginning to believe Hiss and to be skeptical of Chambers. As the evidence accumulated, however, and the Chambers testimony checked out with verifiable facts and documents, while the Hiss testimony grew steadily more evasive and inaccurate, we came to the conclusion that Hiss was falsifying his evidence. In a final effort to enable him to reestablish his rapidly collapsing position, we offered him an opportunity (accepted by Chambers) to take the lie-detector test which he avoided. Even so, it was the Federal grand jury and the Federal court—not our committee—which indicted and convicted Hiss of perjury on 2 counts and sentenced him to 5 years in the Federal penitentiary.

Written at times in stilted, legal phrases, the book is difficult reading. It is the attempt of a clever lawyer to build a case for himself by use of carefully selected excerpts taken out of context and by skillful omissions. It implies that Wadleigh might have been the culprit for the deeds which helped make Hiss the convict—but it offers neither evidence nor proof. In its bitter and vicious attacks upon the FBI, the American jury system, the trial judge, the prosecuting attorney, and the House committee, the book speaks in harmony with criticisms from the Communist Daily Worker, but it is as unconvincing as it is offensive and out of place. One wonders, also, at the strange solicitude Hiss shows for Harry Dexter White (pp. 80–83 and 87) whom J. Edgar Hoover referred to in a letter to the White House on February 1, 1946, "as being a valuable adjunct to an underground Soviet-espionage organization operating in Washington, D. C." However, unless one has no confidence in our jury system or in our Federal courts there is nothing in the book which changes the stern, demonstrable facts upon which the Hiss conviction was based. The book addresses itself to the credulity of Americans rather than to their conscience.

Hiss devotes much space to repeating the unsupported thesis of possible "forgery by typewriter" which his defense attorneys attempted to develop in their petition for a new trial. But he fails, entirely, to print Judge Goddard's renowned rejoinder to that petition when, in denying the new trial, the judge said, "The Hisses and their witnesses identified No. 230099 as their machine at the trial. Furthermore, this motion has not answered the handwritten documents produced by Chambers which were admittedly in Hiss' handwriting. The defense reasoning that No. 230099 was manufactured after the Hiss machine is not sustained by proof. Some of their own witnesses cannot support their theory."

When it is recalled that the Hiss defense corps spent over $7,500, and consumed more than a year in trying to duplicate the typewriter and reported they "examined thousands of Woodstocks," gathered over "2,000 pieces of type," and visited dozens of typewriter shops across the Nation in their unsuccessful attempt to fabricate a machine which could duplicate the typing of the Hiss machine only to find that their own defense experts could still identify discrepancies in their effort, the statement by Judge Goddard in denying the appeal petition takes on increased significance.

Even Hiss cannot support the necessary hypothesis that Chambers could have done all this in a few short months, without adequate funds, without technicians, and without arousing the same public attention and suspicions that Hiss admits his own efforts created. What Hiss could not do with all his aids and money in a year, it is obvious Chambers could not have done, alone, in less than 3 months.

However, since this is the thesis upon which Hiss develops his book, I wrote a letter to the FBI on May 1, this year, to inquire whether it had ever examined known specimens of typing from the Hiss typewriter. After all, it is the typing rather than the typewriter that was obtained by Chambers and which helped convict Hiss, so I wanted to doublecheck that pertinent point for this review. On May 3, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, replied stating, "Yes, on two occasions, and FBI document-examiners concluded that the 'Baltimore documents' (typed documents produced by Chambers at the Baltimore pretrial hearing in the civil case of *Alger Hiss* v. *Whittaker Chambers*) were typed on this typewriter."

Mr. Hoover's reply continued, "The Hiss defense located the Hiss typewriter in the home of Mr. Ira Lockey, Sr., in May 1949. On May 20, 1949, the FBI laboratory concluded that the typewriter used to type the "Baltimore documents" was the same typewriter which typed an application for Federal employment dated July 26, 1947. The application was made out by the son-in-law of Lockey, Sr., and typed on the so-called Hiss typewriter." As to the second occasion, the FBI reply to me stated, "On October 21, 1949, the FBI obtained numerous typewritten specimens from the Hiss typewriter which the defense produced in the first trial; however, at no time did the FBI have possession of this typewriter and the specimens were secured while the typewriter was in the custody of the Court and in the presence of the clerk. The FBI concluded that the Hiss typewriter bearing serial No. 230099 was the typewriter used to type both the Baltimore documents and letters bearing the signature of both Mr. and Mrs. Alger Hiss. The FBI laboratory also concluded that these typed specimens were identical with the typing on the application for Federal employment typed by Lockey's son-in-law."

Efforts by Alger Hiss to explain away the typed documents which stubbornly arose to plague him were rejected by the jury; they were rejected by the Circuit Court of Appeals; and they were rejected by the United States Supreme Court, itself, two members of which appeared as character witnesses for Hiss at his first trial. After 8 of the 12 jurors voted for conviction in that trial, however, it is noteworthy that neither of these Justices of the Supreme Court appeared as witnesses for Hiss in the second and conclusive trial of Alger Hiss.

The Hiss book, finally, suggests his case now be reexamined in the court of public opinion. So be it. However, a quicker and clearer verdict could be obtained by a much more direct and courageous action by Alger Hiss. On January 9, 1953, the magazine U. S. News & World Report carried an article entitled, "I Was in a Communist Unit With Hiss," quoting verbatim the confessed Communist, Nathaniel Weyl. Weyl said he was a member with Hiss of the Communist "study group" in the Department of Agriculture disclosed earlier by Chambers. On page 24 of this interview in U. S. News & World Report, in a nonprivileged statement enjoying no immunity against court action, Weyl continues in language making him and the magazine clearly guilty of libel if his statements are untrue. On that page, Weyl is asked, "Do you know whether Hiss was a member of the Communist Party?" Weyl replied, "He was a member of the party." Later in the interview, Weyl was asked, "Could you say what phase of the Communist Party Hiss was interested in?" Weyl answered, "He was a devoted Communist therefore interested in all phases of the party work." Weyl added that he attended such Communist meetings with Hiss "perhaps 30 or 40 times."

The statements by Weyl are either true or they are cause for action in a libel suit. While they stand, the entire Hiss book falls as it entirely ignores this firsthand specific evidence from a source completely unrelated to the Chambers documents, the evidence before the court, and our committee's findings.

Recalling that it was his reluctant libel suit against Chambers in Baltimore that eventually unearthed the evidence contributing to his own conviction by the Federal court "The court of public opinion" will, I am sure, be interested to learn whether Alger Hiss, now that he is free to do so, will confirm the Weyl testimony—or whether he will start another libel suit?

After all, the Weyl report is really the only new evidence that has become available since the conviction of Hiss in Federal court. It is too bad that in a bulky volume of 424 pages, Hiss devoted only a brief footnote to Weyl and ignored entirely his magazine interview of some 4 years ago.

RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF SPEARFISH, S. DAK.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by previous agreement, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] desires recognition for the purpose of considering a bill which was objected to earlier in the day, but to which no objection will now be made.

If there are any Senators who care to discuss the pending nomination, it will be carried over until tomorrow. If there are none, we shall vote tonight.

First, I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota call up the bill in which he is interested, so action may be taken on it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the present consideration of Calendar No. 277, House bill 2401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2401) to provide for the reconveyance of certain land to the city of Spearfish, S. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill as in legislative session?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I may say that I have discussed with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] his objection in connection with this proposed legislation. Upon hearing the explanation, he assured me that he would withdraw his objection, and that it was perfectly satisfactory to him to have the bill passed. He is present on the floor at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my reasons for supporting the bill referred to by the Senator from South Dakota.

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

H. R. 2401 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the city of Spearfish, S. Dak., a 1-acre tract

formerly used in connection with a Federal fish hatchery. The land is no longer used nor wanted by the Government.

In 1935 this tract was owned by the city of Spearfish. The city desired to assist in the enlargement of the nearby Federal fish hatchery and passed a resolution authorizing the donation of the tract, subject to a reversion for nonuse for fish-hatchery purposes.

Due to charter limitations, the land was conveyed to a third person for $1, and by him to the United States without cost, rather than by direct conveyance from the city to the Government. However, through oversight, the reversionary clause was not included in the conveyance to the United States.

Following the donation to the Government, the United States erected a small stone building on the tract which, according to the Senate report on H. R. 2401, is valued at $1,500.

The foregoing facts presented a question of the possible application on the Morse formula, and I asked that the bill go over on the call of the calendar until I had an opportunity to determine whether these facts require the payment of consideration to the United States in return for the reconveyance to the city.

Mr. President, a study of this case satisfies me that in equity and good conscience, the reconveyance, like the original conveyance to the Government, should be gratuitous. The Morse formula is inapplicable here.

The United States, speaking through the Department of the Interior, concedes that the conveyance to the United States was without consideration. The Senate report indicates that a reversionary interest was to have been retained by the city. Congress, like the courts, should do equity under those circumstances. Equity and fairness call for a recognition of the reversionary interest which the city intended to retain from the outset. The passage of H. R. 2401 will do equity.

There remains one question: Should the city reimburse the United States for the stone building constructed by the Government on the 1-acre tract? The answer is obvious. Once we concede that a reversionary interest was in fact intended by the parties, it is clear that improvements placed on land that is subject to a reversion should go to the holder of the reversionary interest—in this case, the city of Spearfish, which dealt originally through its nominal third-party grantee.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. President, I have no objection to the passage of this bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 2401) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NOMINATION OF SCOTT McLEOD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if there are any Senators who desire to discuss the McLeod nomination further.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have been seeking to cooperate with the leadership all afternoon with regard to this nomination. I thought the Senate would vote on the recomittal motion tonight, and vote on the nomination tomorrow. The Senator from Texas never advised me to that effect directly, but I relied on the staff associates on the floor of the Senate, who led me so to believe. Therefore, I greatly shortened my discussion of the nomination in order to cooperate with the leadership and to enable the Senate to be in a position to vote on the motion to recommit. If it is desired to proceed to a vote on the nomination tonight, I shall speak at some length. I think the nomination should go over and we should proceed on tomorrow to whatever discussion there may be. I believe that will result in a vote on this question tomorrow afternoon.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon desires to discuss the nomination further, I am prepared to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make that request as in executive session?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not know how long the Senate will take on the nomination. I do not think any Member can give assurances as to when the Senate will vote on the nomination. It is the hope of the leadership the discussion will not be too prolonged and that the Senate will come to a vote sometime tomorrow. If that can be done, there will be no session on Friday. If that is not done, we shall have to be prepared for a Friday session.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 120. An act for the relief of James F. Walsh;

S. 394. An act to waive the limitation on the time within which a Medal of Honor may be awarded to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy; and

S. 998. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have found it will inconvenience some of my colleagues, because of arrangements previously made and because of a bipartisan conference tomorrow at the White House, to meet earlier than usual tomorrow. It would be better if we met at the usual time and, if necessary, sat later in the evening.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate rescind its previous order, and I now request that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment, as in executive session, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, of course, will put that question; but before doing so the Chair would like to ask the majority leader a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be delighted to hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a very important meeting in the State of Delaware tomorrow evening, which a couple of Senators would like to attend. It is almost necessary that those Senators be on the 3 o'clock train tomorrow afternoon. The Chair realizes, of course, that the majority leader cannot give definite assurance to those two Senators as to what may happen tomorrow, but can the majority leader give them any encouragement at all?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, to what State does the Senator refer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senator from Missouri, the Chair will state that the two Senators are from Massachusetts and Delaware.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the problem of my friend, and I shall cooperate to the extent of my ability in endeavoring to get him away from here before his train leaves. I do not know how many speeches there will be tomorrow, nor how long they will last. I had hoped for a vote this afternoon. Obviously, there are other Senators who prefer to vote tomorrow, and we accommodate ourselves to each other. I hope the Chair will not object to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will not object.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 9, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be solicitor for the Department of the Interior, vice J. Reuel Armstrong, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John F. Barr, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia for a term of 4 years, vice Irl E. Thomas, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Robert E. Dixon, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5136.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United State Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. James S. Russell, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. John H. Sides, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress; title 10, United States Code, section 3291, as amended by Public Law 294, 84th Congress; title 10, United States Code, section 3311; title 10, United States Code, section 3292, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

TO BE MAJORS

Bell, Franklin D., DC, O984151.
Dunning, Guy J., Jr., MC, O470196.
Griffin, David J., MC, O1918945.
McCurdy, Harry W., MC, O1725453.
Rush, Jack T., MC, O1941860.
Stacy, Harold G., MC, O418782.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Andrews, James L., DC, O4034174.
Armstrong, Carl L., MC, O4022721.
Baugh, Joseph H., MC, D4016516.
Baze, Wallace R., DC, O985332.
Best, Robert N., DC.
Bickley, Russell W., DC, O2051412.
Bundt, Lyle D., DC, O2104361.
Chamblin, Don W., MC.
Davis, Thomas H., DC, O1941685.
Ditmore, Harry B., Jr., MC, O4067761.
Fitzpatrick, Jack C., MC, O936702.
Glanz, Sidney, DC, O4022056.
Hagen, James R., DC, O4056066.
Hauschild, Thomas B., MC, O1787164.
Hess, Joachim L., MC, O2029548.
Hogan, Henry W., MC, O4022367.
Huycke, Edward J., MC, O4055729.
Jacoby, Philip R., MC.
Johnson, Cecil V., MC, O1887556.
Kimbrough, Edward E., III, MC, O4013285.
Mahin, Dorsey T., MC, O980760.
Maier, John G., MC, O1337977.
McClure, Jack B., MC, O1922446.
McKinley, Robert L., MC, O1919506.
Mendenhall, Max K., MC, O425291.
Miller, Claude R., Jr., DC, O1878155.
Murray, Thomas B., MC, O4022303.
Potter, Stanley E., MC.
Powers, Joseph F., MC, O4013697.
Rasmussen, Donald L., MC., O4050810.
Rockwell, Winthrop R., MC, O4016541.
Seibert, Jay S., DC, O4000947.
Smith, Daniel L., MC, AO751970.
Staats, Robert E., MC, O774798.
Townsend, Walter R., MC, O998966.
Ventimiglia, Joseph J., MC.
West, Stanley Q., Jr., MC, O1891651.
Westerfield, Frank M., MC, O1880743.
White, Arthur C., JAGC, O2204416.
Wilkinson, William H., MC.
Williams, James F., DC.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Abul-Haj, Suleiman K., MC.
Alderman, Kurtz E., MC.
Aldous, Richard A., MC, O2282907.
Allen, George L., MC, O1889996.
Altstatt, Leslie B., MC, O1889131.
Amos, William E., MC, O2283287.
Baker, Evaline R., ANC, N901510.
Becker, Elmore J., MC, O2282655.
Becker, Quinn H., MC, O1916454.
Benjamin, George S., MC, O2283259.
Bowers, Bruce T., MC, O2279493.
Brougher, David E., MC, O1891190.
Bryan, Paul E., MC, O1928665.
Burk, Billy D., MC, O2282913.
Burkhalter, William E., MC, O4040449.
Burkhardt, Garfield F., MC.
Collins, James R., MC.
Comer, James E., Jr., MC, O1877422.
Cooper, Everett B., MC, O4034536.
Crawford, William J., MC.
Curtis, John C., MC, O1942147.
Daine, Donn D., MC, O2277949.
Danford, Henry W., MC, O2279400.
Deffebach, Roy R., MC, O2279575.
Delano, John W., MC O1875744.
Denison, Terry R., MC, O2282911.
Driscoll, Paul J., MC, O1875721.
Edland, Robert W., MC, O2283437.
Edwards, Leon C., MC.
Ellis, Donald L., MC, O2279640.
Elton, Richard C., MC, O2282656.
Fabricant, Jerome M., MC, O2279778.
Farrelly, Robert L., MC, O2283260.
Fischer, Stanton P., MC, O2283395.
Geer, Thomas M., MC, O2283101.
Gentry, Robert P., MC, O2283401.
George Myron D., MC, O2282971.
Gillespie, James T., MC, O4013679.
Goldman, Betty R., ANC, N901964.
Goodman, Robert I., MC.
Gorczyca, Casimir A., MC.
Guevara, Santiago F., Jr., MC, O2279768.
Guiglia, Theodore N., MC, O2282892.
Harris, Thomas W., MC, O2279523.
Hopkins, Edward D., Jr., MC, O1887807.
Horan, Dennis P., MC, O2279492.
Hudson, Thomas L., MC, O4025059.
Huff, William S., JAGC.
Ikola, Roger A., MC.
Johnston, Gerald S., MC, O2279490.
Jones, Harry E., Jr., MC, O1879407.
Kendrick, Daniel L., MC, O2282851.
Ketchum, James S., MC, O2279522.
Kimmerling, Richard W., MC, O2279491.
Knochel, James P., MC, O2283399.
Kost, Harold S., MC, O2282909.
Kozak, George, MC, O2283258.
Laezman, Bernard L., MC, O2283192.
Leonard, Lawrence M., MC.
Lester, Melvin A., MC, O2282974.
Lubow, Martin, MC, O2279380.
MacMillan, Kirwan T., MC, O2283261.
MacTaggart, Lois, AMSC, M2972.
Mangus, Samuel J., MC, O2279310.
McCaleb, Morgan H., MC.
McCullough, Robert E., MC, O2279311.
McCully, John T., MC, O2282889.
McKenzie, William J., Jr., MC.
Meyer, Hobart, Jr., MC, O2279444.
Miller, Robert A., MC.
Minter, Marion L., ANC, N804243.
Mobley, Henry B., MC, O4051002.
Morton, James R., MC.
Mutz, Sterling B., MC, O2279577.
Nelson, William P., MC, O2279418.
Nussbaum, Paul S., MC.
Oakes, Francis D., MC, O2279465.
Oberlin, David W. W., MC, O2279578.
Olsson, Ray A., MC, O2279342.
Pare, Robert H., MC, O2279379.
Payne, Thomas W., MC, O2282888.
Pearce, Luther W., MC, O4069712.
Peard, William G., MC, O2279548.
Piatt, Tom H., MC, O2282660.
Plunkett, Guy D., MC, O4067953.
Powers, John Y., JAGC, O2274734.
Quigley, William F., MC, O2282847.
Ray, Harold G., MC, O1942257.
Reese, Herbert E., MC, O2283404.
Rich, Richard B., MC, O2279670.
Richards, John C., MC, O2282659.
Riedel, Albert F., Jr., MC, O2282910.
Rosteing, Horace M., MC.
Sadler, Theodore R., Jr., MC, O2103497.
Sanders, Graydon C., Jr., MC, O2275426.
Sawyer, William D., MC, O4055740.
Schlegel, Robert J., MC.
Schneider, George W., Jr., MC, O2282946.
Schulz, Donald W., MC, O2283403.
Schwartz, Peter, MC, O1875469.
Searer, Wendell P., MC, O2283435.
Simsen, Donald A., MC, O2279502.
Sisk, Walter L., Jr., MC, O2279576.
Smith, John H., Jr., MC, O2282903.
Smith, Thomas J., MC, O1876035.
Smyth, Anna M., ANC, N804182.
Sodee, Donald B., MC, O1888111.
Steele, Richard A., MC.
Stockton, William J., MC, O2279290.
Tarpley, William T., MC, O1887927.
Tidwell, Owen K., MC, O2282855.
Tur-Rodriguez, Luis A., MC, O2282739.
Vittrup, John F., MC, O2277870.
Wallace, Raymond D., Jr., MC, O1651970.
Wallrich, Richard, MC, O4056233.
Wills, Theodore E., MC, O4073415.
Wright, Harold L., MC, O2279419.
Wright, Robert M., MC, O2283097.
Zalta, Edward, MC, O2279709.
Zumbo, Orazio R., MC.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Dubatowski, Doris T., ANC, N902625.
Knapp, Stuart E., MSC, O1928156.
Lawrence, Lucille C., AMSC, R20009.
Proctor, Jo Ann, WAC, L1010884.
Scurlock, Rose Mary T., ANC, N902528.
Shelton, Ellen J., WAC, L1010891.
Sylvester, Suzanne E., WAC, L1010900.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grades specified:

TO BE CAPTAIN

Knight, Ovid L., O27601.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Beavers, Joseph E., O70266.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

TO BE CAPTAINS

Bratton, Joseph K., O2274963.
McAlbee, Filmore W., O1294507.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Howard, Samuel A., O1928126.
Pringle, Edward M., O1886148.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Griffin, Richard E., AO3046463.
McDermott, William L., O4074300.
Morrison, Kenneth L., A4063723.
Parker, Murry E., O4063729.
Selig, Leon M.
Summers, Harry G., Jr.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Adcock, Bobby R.
Albrecht, Frederick C.
Bowen, Carl L.
Brown, Donald R.
Cohen, Sanford
Conklin, Robert D.
Fisher, George A.
Hawkins, Sanders F.
Inlow, Neely S.
Krimmer, John A.
Lemm, Jerry L.
Merten, George D.
Mills, David H.
Mills, Freddie J.
Naylor, Donald L.
Oliger, Raymond S.
Phillips, Frederick H.
Reue, David N.
Santori, Luis A.
Simnacher, Bruce D.
Starr, Jon L.
Turner, James G.
Yeats, Christopher S.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Abraham, Richard G.
Adams, James R.
Adams, Rudolph, Jr.
Addicott, Charles W.
Ady, Aard B., O4077325
Agee, Robert E.

Ainsworth, Robert L.
Alexander, John J., Jr.
Alexander, Theodore C.
Algard, Norman U., Jr.
Alston, Pontha D.
Ambrosino, Richard R.
Anderson, Curtis, E., Jr.
Andrews, Richard P.
Anglin, Richard C.
Appeldorn, Francis R.
Aquadro, Kerry J.
Arington, Richard L.
Armstrong, Raymond L
Armstrong, Robert E., III
Bachmann, Robert R.
Baeb, David E.
Bagnaschi, Albert L., Jr.
Bailey, Edward T.
Baldwin, Richard B.
Banker, Eugene O.
Banyas, Walter
Barber, Orion M.
Barker, Harold S., Jr.
Barker, James H.
Barnes, James M.
Barone, Harry N.
Barry, Joseph A., III
Bartlett, Gerald T.
Barton, Robert B.
Bates, David W.
Batson, Joseph D.
Beal, Jackie L.
Beatty, Robert C.
Beaumont, Roger A.
Beckett, Peter E.
Beckwith, Robert B.
Bedard, Richard G.
Behm, Peter S.
Beitz, Charles A., Jr.
Bell, Frederick V.
Bell, William E.
Bennett, Ferrell R.
Bergson, Richard W.
Berner, John J.
Bernsen, Ralph J.
Bernstein, Donald
Berry, Thomas L.
Best, Darrell E.
Bethke, Gerald H.
Betke, Herman R.
Betters, Richard B., Jr.
Biscomb, Donald L.
Biscomb, Gordon L.
Bishop, Edward M.
Bisping, Jack F.
Black, Calvin D.
Black, Clinton H.
Blankenship, Dan
Boes, Richard W.
Bonta, Stanley G.
Boose, Howard R., III
Borgstrom, Richard O.
Bosse, Joseph N.
Bourland, James M.
Boyanowski, John G.
Boyle, Ernest W.
Brabson, Charles M.
Bragg, Russell J.
Braxton, Paul G.
Bredehoeft, Peter R.
Breeding, Gerald L.
Breer, William T.
Breitenberg, Edward P
Brewer, John H., Jr.
Brickhouse, Willie T., Jr.
Brigham, John C.
Brill, Ronald R.
Bristol, John M., Jr.
Brittain, Richard T.
Brock, Jeffrey D.
Brooks, Charles R.
Brothers, David L.
Brown, Beauregard, III
Brown, Dennis B.
Brown, Ellwood M.
Brown, Richard W.
Brudvig, Dale K.
Brugnoni, John J.
Brunett, Allan L.
Bruno, Marshall J.
Bruns, Lawrence D.
Bryant, Walter R.
Buchan, Alan B.
Buckley, George M.
Buddo, James S., Jr.
Budrich, Dudley J.
Bunting, Roger C.
Burke, James D.
Burke, Richard A., Jr.
Burkhalter, Edward L.
Burkhart, Robert H.
Burnam, Jerry D.
Burrow, Frederic H.
Bush, Bobby K.
Bushyhead, Edward R.
Butler, Robert W.
Bynam, Holland E.
Byrd, Doxey, Jr.
Cable, Thomas H., Jr.
Cadinha, Howard E.
Cain, William H., Jr.
Camp, Dave E.
Campbell, Donald M.
Campbell, John V.
Campbell, Richard E.
Cannefax, Robert W.
Cannella, Phillip F., Jr.
Carlin, John C.
Carrier, Billy C.
Cavanaugh, Stephen E.
Chandler, Richard, Jr.
Chaney, Arlen L.
Chapman, Paul P.
Clark, Joseph E.
Clay, Clifford D.
Coats, John I.
Cobb, Edward R., Jr.
Colbat, Bruce S.
Coleman, Ronald S.
Collins, David G.
Collins, Philip J.
Combs, Carlton E., Jr.
Conger, John T.
Conger, William K.
Conkel, Ronald P.
Connors, Donald L.
Cooper, Robert A.
Copeland, John W.
Cordell, Ralph D.
Corner, Charles R.
Cortelyou, William T.
Cotter, Joseph L.
Cotter, Paul L.
Coyle, Terence M.
Cozzolino, Joseph M.
Craddock, Nicholas J., Jr.
Craig, Donald G.
Crane, George R.
Creekmore, Robert S.
Crittenden, Robert N.
Crofford, Clifford D.
Crognale, Joachim A.
Cross, John S.
Culbertson, Jerome B.
Cullins, Robert B., III
Cunniff, Roy A.
Curbow, Gerald D.
Dacey, John C.
Dahl, John F.
Daily, Stanley J.
Dalzell, Gary W.
Damme, Richard J.
D'Angelo, Anthony P.
Davenport, Theodore G.
Davis, Billy G.
Dawson, Jon C.
Dearden, Sheldon W.
Deas, Carter L.
DeBerardino Anthony
DeHertogh, August A.
Denslow, Lathrop V.
Deshler, Robert C.
DeVoe, Stephen E.
DeWitt, Edward J.
Dick, William W. III
Dickerson, Jon R.
Dingler, Doyce M.
Dink, Louis L.
Dodge, Rodney E.
Dodson, Claude C., Jr.
Doneski, Bernard J., III
Dorough, Aaron G.
Dougal, Richard K.
Dougherty, James E.
Draney, Nolan G.
Dressel, David L.
Du Bois, Donald A.
Du Bois, Donald G.
Dugas, Raymond S.
Duke, Robert G.
Duncan, Donald R.
Duncan, Wayne M.
Dupies, Donald A.
Durbin, William B.
Durham, James A.
Eckert, Frankin A.
Edge, John S.
Enfield, Norman R.
Englander, Richard M.
Enos, Edmund F., Jr.
Espin, Howard E., Jr.
English, Don C.
Evangelides, Theodore
Faas, Ronald C.
Farrar, Kendall
Farrer, Gary R.
Farwell, William H., Jr.
Fenton, Donald F.
Fentress, Harry B.
Ferguson, Lloyd D.
Ferreira, Clarence E.
Fickett, Richard K.
Fiely, Linus H.
Fingles, Douglas O.
Fiorino, Charles J.
Fitzpatrick, Paul F.
Flanders, Norwood S.
Fong, Joseph Y. K.
Fontanella, David A.
Ford, Alvin J.
Foster, John F.
Foster, William R., Sr.
Fouratt, Enos J., Jr.
Frangos, Stephen J.
Frank, Laurence A., Jr.
Frantz, Robert A., Jr.
Frederickson, Eugene
Freeman, Carl F.
Frey, William R.
Fugitt, Billy W.
Gabor, Andrew E.
Gaffney, James J.
Gambrell, Samuel C., Jr.
Gammell, Richard A.
Gann, Charles E.
Garabedian, Aram G.
Gardner, Robert L.
Gaustad, Peter J.
Gaw, Stephen T.
Gebhardt, William A., Jr.
George, Dannie E.
Gerety, Walter P.
Ginter, Duane L.
Gleason, James E.
Goff, Homer B., Jr.
Goforth, Gary K.
Goldberg, William
Goldman, James J.
Goldner, Robert S.
Goldsmith, Stanley I.
Gordon, Robert L.
Gorrell, Stanley L., Jr.
Grabow, Richard M.
Gradillas, Henry C.
Grant, David E.
Grant, Michael E.
Green, Ralph C.
Green, Thomas E.
Greene, Dennis S.
Greer, Wilbur K.
Griffin, Clarence M.
Griffiths, Richard E.
Griswold, Edward C.
Guida, Orlando C.
Guldner, Francis J.
Gunter, Stephen Z.
Hale, Richard E.
Hall, David W.
Hallock, Donald V.
Hallren, Thomas P.
Haloburdo, Joseph J., Jr.
Hammond, Leroy D.
Hancock, James H., Jr.
Harring, Anthony U.
Harrington, John F.
Harris, Bryan D.
Harris, Donald M.
Harris, Robert E., O4077273
Harrod, Tedford E.
Hart, Jack S.
Hartke, Harry J., III
Hartman, George E., Jr.
Haskins, David E.
Hassel, Roy A.
Hatch, John F., Jr.
Hays, Paul A.
Hefford, Robert A.
Helminiak, Thaddeus E.
Henderson, Richard H.
Hernandez, Ruben M.
Herrera, Charles D.
Herring, Bernard M., Jr
Hersey, Gordon L., O5700112.
Heverly, Charles S.
Hicks, Frederick G.
Hicks, Gerald F., Jr.
Higgins, William E.
Higman, James H.
Hilburn, Charles R.
Hill, Eugene G.
Hinds, William L.
Hiotakis, Socrates A.
Hirsch, Warner.
Hoagland, Merton B.
Hoffman, Jack B.
Hoffman, Lawrence W.
Hoffman, Robert F.
Hoke, Kay H.
Holbrook, Jack H.
Holmes, Jasper F.
Holroyd, Donald E.
Hopkins, David W., Jr.
Hopkins, Richard K.
Horne, Billie D.
Houts, Ray A.
Hovorka, Francis J., Jr.
Howell, Raymond K.
Hoyt, Edward L.
Hudson, DeWitt H., Jr.
Hughes, Frank A.
Hughes, Jimmie T.
Hughey, Billy G.
Humphrey, Raymond F.
Hunt, Gordon M.
Hurst, Thomas K.
Incremona, Richard S.
Irland, David L.
Isett, Robert L., Jr.
Istel, Yves-Andre.
Jackson, Walter W.
Jageman, George W.
Jambon, Orleans A.
James, Charles F.
Jefferis, Robert J.
Jentz, Edward M.
Johnson, Chester F.
Johnson, Jackie F.
Jones, Gilbert E., Jr.
Jones, Roger H.
Joyce, Warren C.
Julian, Charles T.
Kaeo, Peter K.
Kaine, Richard L.
Karalekas, Charles J.
Kastner, George D.
Kates, Robert J., Jr.
Kavanaugh, Paul F.
Kawabata, Kazuto
Kean, James A.
Keenan, Roy V.
Keller, Steven S.
Kelley, James F.
Kellman, Frederick W., Jr.
Kelly, James J.
Kelly, Thomas K.
Keneipp, George E., Jr.
Keogh, John J.
Kezer, Robert B.
Kimura, Kay S.
King, Donald P.
King, Randolph S., Jr.
King, William T.
Kirby, Lewis M., Jr.
Kleintop, Donald R.
Knight, James P.
Knowles, Emanuel H.
Konstans, Constantine
Kornack, Wallace R.
Kozel, Frank A.
Krantz, George E.
Kyle, Paul G.
Laabs, James A.
Lager, John A.
Lakies, Robert J.
Lane, Ralph B.
Laningham, William O.
LaRoue, William H.
Laughery, Kenneth R.
Lawton, Johnnie, Jr.
Layton, Michael L.
Leach, John H., Jr.
Leary, Gary L.
LeBlanc, Richard A.
Lednicky, Jerome J.
Lee, Daniel D., Jr.
Leech, Earl W.
Leighow, John K.
Leitzy, John D.
Lenoci, Joseph V.
Lesh, Burton A.
Lewers, Sam
Lewis, Gene P.
L'Hommedieu, Richard F.
Lillie, Charles F.
Lindsey, Jerry N.
Lindsey, Lawrence C.
Linkhart, Bennie R.
Lippincott, Philip E.
Liu, Herbert M.
Lobdell, Alban J., Jr.
Loftus, Martin R.
Lohbauer, Robert D.
Long, James S.
Loomis, Robert W.
Lorms, John L.
Lothrop, James H.
Luby, Joseph F.
Luna, Raymundo R.
Lundquist, Ronald W.
Lusk, James A.
Machen, Bobby
Mackey, Thomas A.
MacMillan, Thomas L.
Madden, Hugh A.
Maggelet, Theodore F., Jr.
Majure, Jerry A.
Malouf, Terrence G.
Manner, Eugene L.
Manning, Albert E.
Mansfield, Herbert S.
Marriott, James M.
Marsh, Philip H.
Martin, Mason E.
Martin, Robert W.
Martin, William J., Jr.
Martin, Yancey F.
Mathis, Milton H.
Maverick, Joseph L.
Mays, Carroll G.
Mazur, Robert J.
McAdams, Michael C.
McBride, Eugene R.
McCarthy, Harold J., Jr.
McCarthy, Robert A.
McClain, James H.
McConnell, Bruce D.
McCraith, William T.
McDonald, Francis W., Jr.
McDowell, Richard L.
McGee, Milton J.
McHugh, Thomas P.
McIntyre, William T.
McKenzie, Leon C.
McKinney, Avery E.
McKinstry, Thomas I.
McKnabb, Lee O.
McLam, Alan C.
McLaughlin, Alan J.
McNulty, William B.
McPherson, David C.
McWade, Albert S.
McWhirter, Julian H., Jr.
Mega, Thomas R.
Megna, Joseph J.
Mello, Earl S.
Meskunas, Edward F.
Messel, Albert K.
Metcalf, Robert H.
Meyer, Urban F., Jr.
Michel, Thomas E.
Mickel, Montie C.
Miller, Henry L., Jr.
Miller, Jacob W., Jr.
Miller, Warren N.
Mills, Charles S., Jr.
Mills, Peter K.
Mills, Robert M.
Mitchell, David D.
Moffat, George G.
Mondok, Robert R.
Monfalcone, Frank L.
Montgomery, Richard J.
Mora, Eugene J.
Morales, Steve G.
Morgan, Brendan
Morgan, Jerry D.
Morgan, Thomas A.
Morrison, Leo S., Jr.
Morrissey, John J., Jr.
Moser, William R.
Moses, Laurence G.
Mosher, Donald L., Jr.
Moulds, Donald G.
Muir, Glenn L.
Mullaly, James R.
Myers, John T.
Nader, Walter E.
Nagle, Robert F.
Nardino, Gaeton A.
Nash, Gene C.
Naumann, Ralph E.
Neal, Charles D.
Nelson, Theodore R., Jr.
Newell, Edward W.
Newman, Robert C.
Nicholas, Frank E.
Nichols, Richard E.
Niles, Gary W.
Nolte, Joseph H., II
Nord, Odell M.
Noznesky, Peter H.
Nuenke, William L., III
Nutt, John W.
O'Brien, James W.
O'Brien, Robert A., Jr.
O'Connell, William J.
Olson, Martin G.
Orlov, William S.
Overby, Rogers L.
Owens, Sammy L.
Owens, Sherril
Ownby, Robert G.
Pallo, Carl A.
Palmer, Arthur N.
Palmer, William T.
Panico, Lawrence J., Jr.
Parker, Joel R.
Parker, Robert S.
Patrick, Burton D.
Patterson, James T.

Patterson, Raydean H.
Patterson, Willard L.
Peach, James G.
Pearce, Gary S.
Pearce, Joseph R.
Peck, Norman L.
Peiper, Richard W.
Pepples, Ernest C., Jr.
Perry, Arthur L.
Peterson, Robert A.
Pickenheim, Paul J.
Pierre, Allan
Pierson, Richard W.
Pietro, Louis R.
Piskurich, Stephen F.
Plowman, James T.
Pluta, Russell F.
Podraza, James D.
Polansky, Barnard
Pope, Edwin K., Jr.
Porter, Royce L.
Potamos, Christ F.
Powell, William S.
Prewitt, Herbert F.
Price, Clifford B., Jr.
Price, Roy C.
Prince, Jimmy G.
Puett, Joseph F., Jr.
Pysz, Bernard F.
Quinn, Thomas M.
Quintard, Jerry L.
Rambadt, Donald C., O4062070
Ramos, Jose R.
Randle, Robert F.
Ratterman, Bernard W., Jr.
Real, John P.
Reifsnyder, Robert L.
Reilly, Wayne G.
Renkin, Herbert L.
Renzi, Gene C.
Reyburn, Dwight S.
Rhicard, Clinton P.
Rice, Hughes H., Jr.
Richards, Garth S.
Richey, Charles G.
Riedl, William H.
Riley, John G.
Ring, Taft C.
Ritchie, Thomas A.
Roberts, Birchard R.
Roberts, Franklin D. R.
Robertson, George M.
Rodenbaugh, Donald A.
Rodgers, Thurman D.
Rogers, William R.
Rogler, Francis E.
Ronco, Lawrence T.
Roquemore, Leroy C.
Rose, Gordon D., O4057792
Rose, James E.
Routh, Rob R.
Ruane, Douglas A.
Rubin, David B.
Russell, Herbert G., Jr.
Russell, Milton C.
Russo, Rocco L.
Salmon, William C.
Salmonsen, Peter C.
Salvador, Louis A.
Samsel, Clyde M.
Sanders, Milton D.
Sanders, Thomas C.
Sanford, Thomas H.
Sargent, David E.
Sargent, Norbert J.
Satterthwaite, George, II
Schooley, William R.
Schoppert, Richard C.
Schubert, John E., Jr.
Schwager, Robert S.
Schwartz, Jerome J.
Scott, John O.
Scott, Joseph W.
Scoville, Oscar G.
Seay, Michael
Sedgwick, Clyde N.
Seggel, Lawrence R.
Seiler, Jerry R.
Serna, Albert I., III
Serrin, Phillip A., II
Sess, Thomas N.
Settle, Joseph E.
Shaffer, William M.
Shamrock, Keith J.
Shands, Henry L.
Sharp, Charles W.
Shaver, Charles W., Jr.
Sheely, James R.
Shelton, James E.
Shepard, James C.
Shiner, Charles R., Jr.
Shoptaugh, Leland D.
Short, Kenneth R.
Shultz, Charles H.
Silnes, Sigvart R.
Simmons, Cecil K.
Simon, Ernest A.
Simonic, Donald F.
Simpson, George E.
Sims, Wesley N.
Sindoni, Samuel S.
Sjoholm, Gustav E.
Skaife, Stanley T.
Skillman, Charles S., Jr.
Slabikosky, Andrew J.
Slofer, Bernard P.
Slowinski, Donald J.
Smith, Edmund G.
Smith, Jimmy W.
Smith, Melford E.
Smith, Reidar H.
Smith, Tommy W.
Smith, Walter D.
Smolenyak, George C.
Smyth, Rome D.
Snooks, James P., III
Somerville, Paul F.
South, Jerry C., Jr.
Spann, James B.
Specht, John H.
Spencer, Wayne D.
Spodobalski, Anthony C.
Spring, Bradford H.
Spurgers, Roy K.
Staggs, Leon D.
Stapp, Richard E., Jr.
Steger, George F.
Stewart, Jessie E.
Stinson, Kenneth B.
Stipe, Aquila E.
Stocky, Peter D.
Stokes, John P., 3d
Stokes, Preston W.
Struck, Robert J.
Strunk, Gary D.
Sullivan, Garland W.
Sullivan, James K.
Sullivan, John H.
Swartz, Stanley R.
Sykes, Charles L.
Symons, Frederick E.
Takach, Michael A.
Takenaka, Harold H.
Taylor, John E.
Taylor, Joseph S.
Taylor, Warren L.
Tengan, James T.
Terry, Robert
Teso, William A.
Thomas, Richard K.
Thompson, Billy M.
Thompson, Chadwick C.
Tilleux, Gerald E.
Timmons, Robert W., Jr.
Tobiason, Allan R.
Tobiason, Robert G.
Todd, George K., Jr.
Towne, Larry B.
Traficante, Anthony J.
Trees, Lester W., Jr.
Trueheart, William H., Jr.
Tuck, John S.
Turk, Theodore M.
Turner, Neil B.
Tweddell, Johnny B.
Tynan, Robert E.
Urban, Eugene W.
Vail, Robert B.
Vaille, John D.
Van Ausdall, Rice L.
Van Buskirk, Kenneth C., Jr.
Vanden Boom, James R.
Vaughan, William A.
Vockery, William L.
Waite, Darrell M.
Walk, Charles W.
Walker, Costelle B.
Walker, Harry D.
Walker, Jack E.
Walsh, Fenwick A, Jr.
Walsh, Martin P.
Walton, LeRoy
Warren, John H.
Warvi, Martin M.
Waterman, William R.
Watson, Gerald G.
Weeks, Richard G.
Weems, Sands S., III
Werner, Leonard L.
West, James M.
West, Lionel M., II
Weston, Ray D.
Wexo, Richard O.
Whaley, Cole B., Jr.
Whigham, Thomas J.
White, James E.
White, Richard C.
White, Stanley Z.
Wiger, Leslie T.
Wilkinson, Byron R.
Williams, Forrest H., Jr.
Williams, Graybill E.
Williams, Samuel
Williamson, Duane E.
Williamson, James C.
Wilson, Albert H., III
Wilson, Gordon B.
Winter, John M., Jr.
Witbrodt, Donald J.
Wolff, Robert A.
Wood, Billy B.
Wood, Peter W.
Wood, Wade, III
Wooley, John E.
Wright, Samuel J.
Yaag, John W.
Yakovakis, James S.
Yankee, Richard A.
Young, Lloyd D.
Youngs, Philip C.
Yuhn, John T.
Zarb, Frank G.
Ziemba, Gerald P.
Zigmant, William J., Jr.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 8, 1957:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that our beloved country, dedicated and devoted to Thy glory and the blessedness of mankind, may be defended by Thy power against all evil.

Vouchsafe to purge our minds and hearts from everything that is contrary and displeasing to Thy holy will and save us from those personal and national sins which expose us most justly to Thy righteous judgments.

May our Speaker and the Members of Congress always be wise in counsel, calm in action, and sincere in motive as they cope with the various problems and events in our national and international life.

Inspire them to legislate in the fear of the Lord, courageously striving to promote and support that which they conscientiously feel will assure the safety and honor, the temporal and spiritual welfare of our Republic.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

IS A SECOND PEARL HARBOR POSSIBLE?

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, assuming the details of an article in this morning's paper are correct, we learn that the United States aircraft carrier *Bennington*, in Sydney, Australia, was left without a guard at the top of the gangway with only a skeleton night crew aboard. As a result, 10 university students, masquerading as pirates and carrying cardboard cutlasses and a flag with skull and crossbones, were able to row out to the side of the carrier and get aboard her and work their way unnoticed to her bridge, where they startled the sleeping officers and crew by sounding the chemical warfare alarm.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House Armed Services Committee will investigate this incident, because the news item indicates our Navy ships are not on the alert for an attack at all times. It points up that a possible second Pearl Harbor attack might succeed.

Not long ago I urged an investigation by the committee as to our west coast defenses on account of the possibility of such a sudden attack. I have stated that it appears to me there may be an undue concentration of our Pacific Fleet combat vessels based in southern California. Time and again I have urged our officials to have certain west coast naval units based in Puget Sound and other ports such as San Francisco, and thereby disperse them against attack. It seems to me without combat units based in either Oregon, Washington, or Alaska, a defense vacuum exists. The logical home port to fill this need would seem to be in the vicinity of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

Meanwhile our Navy should be on the alert at all hours of the day and night. How much in the way of secret instruments or equipment could have been stolen by an enemy agent if this incident had been by other than jokesters, I do not know. But again I say the circumstances surrounding the student boarding of the aircraft carrier *Bennington* should be fully looked into by our appropriate committee as should the dispersal of fighter units on the west coast.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report