By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2829. A bill to exempt the members and certain employees of the President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights from the operation of certain conflict-of-interest statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2830. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 2831. A bill to authorize the Public Health Service to admit to its hospitals persons committed by State courts who are beneficiaries of the Service or narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as American Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution providing for the exercise of the veto to prevent Communist China from becoming a member of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to building a post-office building at Bernalillo, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to constructing Chiflo Dam, on the Rio Grande above Cerro, Taos County, N Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to respecting proposed administrative requirements sought to be imposed upon the State of New York regarding public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2832. A bill for the relief of Leszek Kazimierz Pawlowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2833. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 2834. A bill for the relief of Jacinto Pilar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2835. A bill for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2836. A bill for the relief of Jack Getty Pinkerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2837. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Edith Esther Long Ears; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2838. A bill for the relief of Tokuji Baba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2839. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ushi Yamauchi and Hatsue Yamauchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2840. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2841. A bill for the relief of Yai Wing Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2842. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Masami Hori, Setsuko Hori, and Yoshiko Hori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2843. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Kusano Dung; to the Committee on the Judiciary

H. R. 2844. A bill for the relief of Hideko Nakano Kawano and Frances Hideko Kawano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2845. A bill for the relief of Suge Matsuhashi Gomoto and Misako Matsuhashi Gomoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2846. A bill for the relief of Masako Natori Kamemoto and Ann Akemi Kamemoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2847. A bill for the relief of Emiko Usuzaka Hanano and Allen James Hanano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2848. A bill for the relief of Etsuko Ogata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2849. A bill for the relief of Taeko Matsuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2850. A bill for the relief of Noriko Endo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2851. A bill for the relief of Miyoko Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2852. A bill for the relief of Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2853. A bill for the relief of Shizue Sakurada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2854. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Fumie Maeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 2855. A bill for the relief of Czeslaw Laskowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2856. A bill for the relief of Jan J. Wojciechowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2857. A bill for the relief of Daniel H. Dulity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2858. A bill for the relief of William C. Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2859. A bill for the relief of Miss Concepcion Pangtay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 2860. A bill for the relief of Inez Pryer (Sister Mary Carmel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2861. A bill for the relief of Serafina Perchiazzi and Roberto Perchiazzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

62. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to disapproving House Joint Resolution 131, and Senate Joint Resolution 20; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

63. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Petition of the New York State Junior Chamber of Commerce with reference to the statute of limitations in connection with the crime of espionage against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

64. Also, concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of New York, memorializing Congress to enact legislation which will exempt employees of the State and political subdivisions thereof from the present wage-stabilization order; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

65. Also, concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing the Congress of the United States respecting proposed administrative requirements sought to be imposed upon the State of New York regarding public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

66. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the U. S. A., branch 781, Detroit, Mich., protesting against religious persecution in Slovakia, in particular the imprisonment of Bishop John Vojtassak, Bishop Michael Buzalka, and Bishop Paul Gojdic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

67. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Detroit urging the Congress of the United States to give immediate approval of the agreement between the United States and Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 29, 1951)

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

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

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the sweet refreshment of sleep restoring the frayed edges of care and for the beckoning glory and the fresh vigor of the new day and a new week. Lead us this day in the paths of righteousness, for Thy name's sake. Enable us to fill swift hours with mighty deeds, to bear the fret of care, the sting of criticism, the drudgery of unapplauded toil; to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

think clearly, to act kindly, to play manfully our part in the life of our time, to strike our blow for freedom and, keeping to the end of our brief day the unbroken vigil of the inner light, to leave the world the better for our sojourn in it. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 22, 1951, 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.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the present week because of official business.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today, tomorrow, and Wednesday.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, meeting jointly, were authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MURRAY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. LONG, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency investigating the RFC was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet for the remainder of this week during the sessions of the Senate.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY—NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 716

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement concerning the joint public hearings to be held on S. 716, to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, and the companion House bill, H. R. 2379.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Public hearings will begin at 2 p. m. on Tuesday, March 6, 1951, in room F-82 in the Capitol. Those persons who desire to be heard should communicate with Mr. Richard Arens, staff director, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, room 449B, Senate Office Building.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, several members of the Committee on Banking and Currency will be called out of the city tomorrow, for the purpose of inspecting certain defense impact areas and the housing problems and plans, arising therefrom in connection with legislation which is before the committee. I ask that those members of the committee be excused until Thursday morning.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am wondering how many Senators are to be left on this floor. We have already excused members of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee and other committees. There is highly important legislation now before the Senate. I am sure that before there is a vote on the substitute to the bill, H. R. 1, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say I am not asking that members of those committees be excused today.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator not request that they be excused for the remainder of the week?

Mr. MAYBANK. No, I did not. I asked that they be excused tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that several of the Senators expected to be here today, because of the unfinished business, and they therefore scheduled the trip for tomorrow.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gillette	Maybank
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Nixon
Byrd	Holland	O'Conor
Cain	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hunt	Pastore
Carlson	Ives	Russell
Case	Jenner	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Duff	Lehman	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thye
Eastland	Long	Tobey
Ecton	McCarran	Watkins
Ellender	McClellan	Welker
Ferguson	McFarland	Wherry
Flanders	McKellar	Wiley
Frear	Magnuson	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	
George	Martin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY QUORUM CALLS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senate for a moment.

I have discussed with the distinguished minority leader the question of quorum calls. The Senate has been losing an average of at least 30 minutes each morning on quorum calls and much more than that during the day. While it is difficult to avoid all quorum calls preceding the consideration of unanimous-consent proposals, motions of major consequence, and similar important legislative matters, there is no reason why we cannot save the time unnecessarily lost through quorum calls upon the convening of the Senate. Therefore, it would be just as well if the first ringing of the bell at 12 o'clock were regarded hereafter as a call for Senators to be present.

Therefore, since it is agreeable to the minority leader, beginning tomorrow we shall not ask for a quorum call at the beginning of the day's session, but shall proceed immediately with the transaction of routine business on the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock. Senators who have routine business must be here at 12 o'clock. We can save at least half an hour of the time of the Senate each day, and we can probably conclude each day's session half an hour earlier every evening by following that course.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the minority have been advised of the announcement just made by the majority leader. The question was discussed at a policy meeting, and I was informed that the Members present felt that the majority leader should proceed in the fashion he has indicated. Notice has now been given. From now on all Senators should realize that there will be no quorum call at the beginning of the session, and that the Senate will immediately proceed to the transaction of routine business.

Of course this arrangement does not affect the regular procedure with respect to quorum calls in connection with important motions, unanimous consent requests, or questions of that kind. The purpose is merely to help expedite the work of the morning hour following an adjournment, or the transaction of morning business following a recess. I believe it is a good procedure. The minority will recognize the new procedure suggested by the distinguished majority leader and give full cooperation, now that the announcement has been made and every Senator has been put on notice as to the procedure.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, make reports from committees, make insertions in the RECORD, and transact routine business, without debate.

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

CONFIRMATION OF ROUTINE NAVAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report certain nominations in the Navy. They are routine nominations. None of them is above the rank of lieutenant commander. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the reports will be received. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 64)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, Eightieth Congress, approved June 29, 1948, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 26, 1951.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Mary Louise Donovan and Allan Henry Redfern from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CERTIFICATIONS OF COST OF DAMAGES CAUSED BY UNITED STATES MILITARY FORCES AT CERTAIN PUBLIC AIRPORTS

Two letters from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States military forces at certain public airports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NOMINATION OF JAMES E. COLLIFLOWER AS MEMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Secretary of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the nomination by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of James E. Colliflower for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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 New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States and known as the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

"Whereas the House of Representatives on February 6, 1947, and the United States Senate on March 12, 1947, both by the constitutional two-thirds thereof passed a proposed constitutional amendment to be known as the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution; and

"Whereas said proposed amendment was submitted to the States for ratification upon March 26, 1947, and said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, is in the following words, to wit:

" 'SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President, shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress': Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico (the house of representatives concurring), That the proposed amendment No. 22 to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of New Mexico, under the great seal, to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President, Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"CALVIN HORN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"SANTOS QUINTANA,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Joint resolution of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-Second Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate concurring, commending and endorsing the action of the Congress of the United States in branding Communist China an aggressor and opposing the admission of Communist China into membership of the United Nations and further recommending that said Congress take further action requesting economic sanctions be imposed upon Communist China by all the countries of the United Nations

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the senate concurring therein):

"Whereas the country of Communist China has been guilty of flagrant and naked aggression in its invasion of Korea; and

"Whereas said country of Communist China shows no evidence of being a peaceful nation, nor of abiding by the dictates of international law; and

"Whereas said country of Communist China persists in its open defiance of the United Nations and has clearly shown that it is not a peaceful and law-abiding member of the countries of the world, but on the contrary has been and continues to be guilty of international banditry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the senate concurring therein), That we do hereby most heartily commend the Congress of the United States of America for its action in requesting the United Nations to brand Communist China as an aggressor against the peoples of the world and we do further commend said Congress for its action in voicing its sentiment to the United Nations that said country of Communist China be not admitted into membership in the United Nations; be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to advise the United Nations that such Congress urges and requests the said United Nations to cause to be imposed against Communist China, economic sanctions to the end that no member country of the United Nations shall, in any manner, conduct trade with Communist China, nor will any such member nation furnish to Communist China any supplies of any kind or nature whatsoever; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

"ORY J. ARMSTRONG,
"Speaker of the House.
"CHARLES A. MAHONY,
"President pro tempore of the Senate."

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, United States Senators from Montana, and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana, requesting that Congress continue and enhance its program of rehabilitation of the landless Indian in Montana, known as nonwards

"Whereas before World War II the Government of the United States had undertaken a program of rehabilitating the landless Indians in Montana, which program was interrupted by the outbreak of the war and has not since been resumed; and

"Whereas many Montana Indians, who for the most part reside on the outskirts of various cities and towns in the State, are ill-fed, ill-clothed, and their living conditions are deplorable, in that said Indians do not receive the common necessaries of life: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Thirty-second Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1951 now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That we do most earnestly pray that the Congress of the United States resume and continue an adequate program of relief for the nonward Indians, commonly known as landless Indians of Montana, to the end that said Indians may ultimately become self-supporting and may in the meantime not be denied the common necessaries of life; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the state of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

"PAUL CANNON,
"*President of the Senate.*
"ORY J. ARMSTRONG,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Approved February 1, 1951.
"JOHN W. BONNER
Governor."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Washington, D. C., signed by Mrs. Alexander Stewart, legislative secretary, relating to the negotiation of peace in Korea, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of State Racing Commissioners, at Miami Beach, Fla., protesting against the enactment of legislation which would discriminate against racing as a national pastime, and so forth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENNER:

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

"Senate Enrolled Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation which will provide for the investigation of and the removal of the cause of flood conditions in the Maumee Valley

"Whereas the Maumee River, together with the St. Marys and St. Joe Rivers, forms a basin covering approximately 7,000 square miles, the acreage of which is devoted to highly beneficial agricultural pursuits and manufacturing activities; and

"Whereas the topography of said acreage is such that severe damage has resulted from flood conditions which, as estimated by the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the Fort Wayne area alone, amounted to losses of more than $6,000,000 between the years of 1913 and 1944; and

"Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers, in preliminary surveys made along the St. Marys River, estimated more than $280,000 in average annual losses on farm lands alone; and

"Whereas due to the ever-increasing tempo of the civil defense program, there is a pressing necessity for expediting flood control projects in the entire Maumee River Basin in order to protect the farm areas therein for all-out production of food, and the manufacturing centers thereof for all-out production of defense materials: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the house of representatives concurring)*:

"SECTION 1. The Eighty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation which will provide for the investigation of and the removal of the cause of said prolonged periods of floodwaters in said Maumee Valley.

"SEC. 2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana."

POWER OF THE PRESIDENT TO SEND TROOPS ABROAD—RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN SENATE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution introduced in the Senate of the State of Michigan by Senator Charles Feenstra, and adopted by that body February 7, 1951.

It is entitled "A Resolution Disapproving the Contention of the President That He Has Powers To Commit Armed Forces of the United States Without the Assent of the Congress and To Make Other Commitments Not Specifically Authorized by Law."

In placing in the RECORD this important resolution on a matter of greatest importance to this body and to the Nation at this time, I would also like to invite attention to my remarks on the Senate floor January 22, 1951, on the subject of Power of the President To Send Troops Abroad Without Specific Authorization by Congress.

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

Senate Resolution 19

Resolution disapproving the contention of the President that he has powers to commit Armed Forces of the United States without the assent of the Congress and to make other commitments not specifically authorized by law

Whereas in the present world crisis the President of the United States makes public claim that he has powers to send elements of the armed services of the United States to any portion of the world by virtue of his position as Commander in Chief and to commit them to such courses of action as he may deem advisable; and

Whereas the stationing of our forces indiscriminately under such a procedure may lead inevitably to conditions which will amount to a state of war, whether by offensive or defensive action; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States grants solely to the Congress the power to declare war, and by necessary implication the power to control actions which would lead to war, and such power is not affected by any treaty or constitutional statute now in effect, including the Atlantic Pact, which, as advocated by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, requires that the provisions of the treaty be carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Michigan disapproves both the claim of power by the President and his actions in committing armed service elements in accordance with this claim of complete freedom of action in international affairs, without the authority of the Congress, and the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That because the employment of the United States Marines in foreign lands does not constitute an act of war, the President shall not be restricted in his traditional authority to utilize the combat forces of the Marine Corps in the protection of the United States' interest abroad; and be it further

Resolved, That Senator TAFT of Ohio, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, and other leaders of both parties be supported in their fight to assert the right of the people to constitutional processes in their international relationships.

Adopted by the Senate February 7, 1951.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.

TEXTILE STRIKE—LETTER FROM CITY COUNCIL OF LOWELL, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter from William H. Sullivan, city clerk of Lowell, Mass., relating to the textile strike in that area, and ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF LOWELL, MASS.,
February 20, 1951.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Lowell City Council in regular meeting held on Tuesday, February 20, 1951, voted unanimously to instruct the city clerk to write to you and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from this section, enlisting your aid in bringing about a settlement of the textile strike in this area.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM H. SULLIVAN,
City Clerk.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN ALLEGANY COUNTY, MD.—RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, House Resolution No. 11, proposed by the Allegany County delegation, and adopted by the Maryland House of Delegates.

It deals with a matter which is of the utmost urgency to the people of that area because of the depressed employment situation there, a situation which demands any attention which can be given it on the Federal level.

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

House Resolution 11

Resolution requesting that residents of Allegany County be used on the flood prevention and control work now being carried on

Whereas there is a broad program of work being carried on in Allegany County for the more effective prevention and control of flood waters in that area; and

Whereas at the same time the Allegany County area has been one of the sections of the country most seriously affected by unemployment and economic insecurity; and

Whereas it would help materially in the economic rehabilitation of this area if residents of Allegany County were given primary consideration for the jobs made possible through the flood prevention and flood control work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the War Department give primary consideration to residents of Allegany County for the job opportunities made possible by the flood prevention and flood control project; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the House be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Army and to each of the eight Members of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

By the house of delegates, January 24, 1951.

Introduced, read the first time, and adopted.

By order

JOHN C. LUBER,
Speaker of the House of Delegates.
RAYMOND H. MILLER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates.

DISCONTINUANCE OF PAYMENTS TO VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF PRIVATE WILLIAM H. ROTAN POST, NO. 219, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on behalf of the members of Private William H. Rotan Post, No. 219, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Baltimore, Md., I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the post with regard to the discontinuance of payments to veterans.

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

Whereas in his recent budget message to Congress the President of the United States recommended the discontinuance of paying benefits to veterans in all cases that are not proven service-connected cases and that all such cases should be handled by local charitable institutions and welfare boards; and

Whereas as many of the veterans now drawing such benefits are just as deserving of those benefits as the service-connected cases and are unable to earn a livelihood because of their physical condition, to force them to apply to local welfare agencies would be a grave injustice; and

Whereas it has always been considered the duty of the Federal Government, and justly so, to take care of those men they have taken from their homes and their families to fight the battles of their country: Be it

Resolved by Private William H. Rotan Post, No. 219, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in regular meeting at Baltimore, Md., That this recommendation of the President be vigorously opposed, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, for its adoption and then forwarded to national headquarters for consideration; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Maryland asking that they oppose any such change in veterans' benefit laws.

WILLIAM W. CRANDELL,
Commander.
CHARLES F. SIMONS,
Adjutant.

MAINTENANCE OF ADEQUATE SERVICES TO VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF COOK-FULLER POST, NO. 70, AMERICAN LEGION, OSHKOSH, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution which I have this morning received from Cook-Fuller Post, No. 70, of the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, located at 540 Washington Boulevard in Oshkosh. This resolution pertains to the maintenance of adequate services by the Veterans' Administration to the veterans of that area. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD as an indication of the sentiments of many other veterans' organizations on this same issue elsewhere in my State and throughout our country.

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

Whereas it has been announced by the Veterans' Administration that due to budget cuts, all one-man Veterans' Administration offices are to be closed; and

Whereas this closing includes the contact office which has been operating in Oshkosh, Wis., since 1946; and

Whereas this office now serves some 35,000 veterans who have served their country in three wars, the largest veteran population served by any Veterans' Administration office in the State, with the exception of the regional office in Milwaukee; and

Whereas this office now makes some 500 veteran contacts a month, including veterans at the Winnebago State Hospital, State prison at Waupun, and the hospital for the criminally insane at Waupun; and

Whereas this office now is in a centralized location, over 50 miles from the nearest office to the north in Green Bay, over 100 miles from the nearest office to the west in Wausau (which office is to be closed in July), and over 80 miles from the nearest office to the south in Milwaukee; and

Whereas Mr. E. L. Dahlen, local Veterans' Administration contact representative, has been doing an excellent job of serving the veterans in this large and heavily populated area; and

Whereas it is believed that a discontinuance of such service would be a serious hardship to a very large number of veterans who are entitled by law and by service to their country to Veterans' Administration help; and

Whereas it is realized in these times of national emergency all nonmilitary expenditures must be reduced to an absolute minimum consistent with the welfare of the citizens of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Cook-Fuller Post, No. 70, of the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, does go on record as favoring a careful reexamination of the proposed reduction of Veterans' Administration services to veterans, with special emphasis to be placed on the maintenance of the greatest amount of service to the greatest number of veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Veterans' Administration headquarters, to the Bureau of the Budget, to United States Senators JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and ALEXANDER WILEY, and to United States Representatives WILLIAM K. VAN PELT and REID F. MURRAY.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 248. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating 1951 as Audubon Centennial Year (Rept. No. 129);

S. 249. A bill for the relief of Ruzena Pelantova (Rept. No. 130);

S. 277. A bill for the relief of Lily Pfannenschmidt (Rept. No. 131);

S. 300. A bill for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart (Rept. No. 132); and

S. 361. A bill for the relief of Herk Visnapuu and his wife, Naima (Rept. No. 133).

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

S. 60. A bill for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova (Rept. No. 134); and

S. 463. A bill for the relief of Alice de Bony de Lavergne (Rept. No. 135).

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

S. 336. A bill to amend Public Law 441, Eighty-first Congress, so as to provide for the annual proclamation of National Children's Dental Health Day (Rept. No. 136).

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

S. 699. A bill for the relief of James Shellenberger, Jr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 138).

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably an original joint resolution to extend the present rent-control law for 90 days. The joint resolution was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency today. In the discussion which led to the approval of this joint resolution, which merely carries further the law as it is today, the committee felt that extended hearings were necessary on any new rent-control law. The present law expires in March, and the committee could not go extensively into a new law. It is the desire of the committee, and so stated, that under the National Defense Act, when we rewrite the law which expires in June, a new title be inserted, under the national defense set-up, to take care of rent control. We believe that the people who own homes or those who rent should be treated on an equality with other people whose properties may be controlled or may not be controlled. Although all members of the committee who were present, of whom I think there were 10, voted for the joint resolution continuing rent control for 90 days, the right was reserved on the part of some members to decide whether they wish to vote for it when the resolution is considered on the floor. They merely acquiesced in its being placed on the calendar at this time

in the interest of protecting defense areas which are now under rent control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to continue for a temporary period the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original concurrent resolution, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 137) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

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

A-5986753, Diaz, Guadalupe, or Guadalupe Ramirez-Villasenor.

A-3403807, Marini, Domenico, or Dominic Marini or Richard or Ricardo Marino or William Simard.

A-9782970, Miah, Barik.

A-6965610, Pelosi, Elindo.

A-3089357, Rosenberg, Esther (nee Weinbaum).

A-6729104, Abramowitz, Kurt Emanuel.

A-9777120, Bojdoveanu, Rouja, or Rouja Theodor Bojdoveanu (nee Petrovic or Rouja or Ruja Draganova).

A-6526196, Bourgeois, Joseph Henry.

A-7083000, Caralis, Athina (nee Perimenis).

A-5882169, Caro-Solis, Saul, or Saul R. Solis; Tomas Saucedo; Saul R. Solid or Ralph Hernandez Calaviz.

A-7222504, Cumberbatch, Hilton, or William Cumberbatch or Goldbrun Cumbertatch or Joseph Bailey.

A-4555293, Ferreira, Antonio Hunurato, or Antonio H. Ferreira.

A6921618, McCormick, Phyllis Albertha, or Felice Albertha McCormick (nee Sicard).

A-7137857, Taylor, Myron Watson Maynard, or Myron Watson Maynard Clifford, Marian Watson Maynard Taylor, Marian Watson Maynard Clifford, alias Rose Watley, "Gwendolyn," Gwennie.

A-5873494, Wahlin, Peter Abram.

A-7050475, Carabajal, Ramon, or Ramon Cruz Carbajal-Duran or Ramon Carbajal or Ramon C. Carbajal.

A-7050476, Carbajal, Mario Reynaldo.

A-7050474, Carbajal, Martha Alicia.

A-1090895, Johnson, Eric Gottfried (alias Erick Johanson alias Eric Johansson).

A-7356436, Rodriguez-Alaniz, Rafael.

A-7356892, Rodriguez, Lucila Rios De.

A-6858998, Santana, Estuardo Ismael, or Estuardo Santana.

A-6219344, Tilbrooke, Margaret Teresa (nee Chisholm).

A-6612848, Anagnostopoulos, John N., or John N. Anagnoson.

A-6716148, Christopher, Herman Emanuel.

A-6208561, Masongsong, Francisco.

A-1085625, Papakritikos, Apostolos, or Apostolos Papalikas.

A-7078458, Petrunt, Elide Liliana Maria.

A-7358986, Richards, Ginette (nee Ginette Ben Loulou).

A-3719227, Vagianos, Pantelis, or Panteles Vagianos.

A-4189356, Woods, Michael Patrick.

A-7050345, Yong, Soo Yee, or Soo Yee Young or Joe Sing.

A-6775609, Accattatis, Francesco, or Francesco Accattatis Chalons d'Orange.

A-2924411, Banchieri, Albert Massimiliano, or Albert Massimiliano Mario Banchieri or Albert Banchieri.

A-4979213, Carmona, Gavina.

A-4979211, Carmona, Saturnino.

A-5636491, East, Vivian Carmen (nee Vincent).

A-6479442, Gabo-Pevsner, Naum Neemia, or Maoum Gabo-Pevsner.

A-6479443, Gabo-Pevsner, Nina Serafima, or Nina Serafina Gabo or Nina S. Gabo-Pevsner.

A-2127408, Garufi, Francesco Rosario.

A-6769748, Gergo, Alexander or George, or Sandor Gergo.

A-6095322, Margaritis, Anastasia Peter.

A-2874816, Rodrigues, Antonio Bento.

A-1072877, Towey, Oswald Joseph.

A-6821759, Villari, Francesco.

A-6481647, Carvajal, Enrique Barbour, or Enrique Barbour.

A-6634458, Barbour, Cecelia Celis Cardenas, or Cecelia Barbour C. (nee Cecelia Celis Cardenas).

A-9825165, Castanos, Nicolas John.

A-6989085, Collado y Tramullas, Concepcion.

A-6808719, Cordaro, Filippo, or Philip Cordaro.

A-6788968, Derouet, Monique Jeanne-Josephe, or Monique Derouet Baldwin.

A-6385971, Gemal, Fortune Debbah.

A-7049612, Hem, Margarethe Christine Elmy.

PR-946298, Hsiao, Jen Tsun, or Jay T. Shaw.

A-5585025, Iovine, Arcangelo, or Archie Iovine.

A-1063018, Kalitovich, Joseph.

A-1930221, Lindley, Catherine (nee Granger or Catherine Ralston).

A-6096815, Murono, Ginzo.

A-6153085, Murono, Hisako.

A-6440125, Ostern, Leif.

A-6383891, Russell, Birgitta (nee Lehmann).

A-4503752, Sharashewsky, Goldies or Shear.

A-5280295, Zaspal, Anton, or Anton Zaspel or Laspals (alias Frank Korout).

A-1442670, Biondo, Salvatore, or Sam Biondo.

A-7622115, Hee, Fong Man.

A-4087351, Rosenberg, Toby Lena, or Maria Luisa Nasco or Alejandrino Nasco Echegaray.

A-7201507, Schnitzer, Johann, or Johann Otto Schnitzer or John Schnitzer.

A-4464019, Anttila, Laina Maria (nee Tanttinen).

A-3046538, Cheng, Ta Kwai, or David Takwai Cheng.

A-6817757, Drucker, Michael.

A-7415595, Eaton, Daniel Richard, or Renee Yves Bernard.

A-1728513, Go, Chong-Hu.

A-1172299, Go, Lian Hiong, or Lim Lian Hiong.

A-4959615, Gramlich, Margaret Isabel.

A-7372122, Lanzendorfer, Karin Frienda Josephine.

A-1266444, Larishenko, Edward Rubes.

A-5041863, Markus, Sara.

A-7354825, Merdjanian, Antipas, or Antipas Panos Merdjanian.

A-1936121, Modny, Agnes (nee Agnes Regent).

A-6492530, Moskovic, Emil.

A-6492531, Moskovic, Juliana.

A-6544285, Palacios, David, or Estanislao Rodrigues-Mejia.

A-4928592, Romero, Manuel Gonzalez, or Manuel Perez Gonzales or Manuel Gonzalez.

A-475889, Schiff, Paul.

A-1049269, Szewecki, Lewek, or Leon Szewecki or Lewek Szenecki.

A-4446625, Tepe, Agnes Bridget Mary Rose (nee O'Connor).

A-6730882, Torres-Rojas, Jose.

A-6877241, Vlamis, Christos Demetrios, or Christ Vlamis or Christ Demetre Vlamis.

A-6481413, Frydman, Grzegorz, or G. Frydman.

A-6481364, Frydman, Gusta (nee Wincygster).

A-6953540, Gilson, Hermina or des Bouvrie.

A-3637489, Giokaria, Georgios or Gordon or Gorin.

A-6965216, Hall, Elfriede Maria (nee Schwarze).

A-7049908, Jubran, Abdallah, or Abdallah Jubran Sarsour.

A-6966515, Loukakos, Michael John or Lucacos.

A-6097338, Nostas, Hanna Giries Elias.

A-6446386, Nostas, Hanne Habib.

A-2535405, Spitz, Alice.

A-5545862, Vespa, Giovanni or Gianni, or John Vespa.

A-7057137, Walter, Grethe Ingeborg (nee Pedersen).

A-6707127, Alessi, Filippo.

A-7445217, Duran, Martha, or Martha Duran y Pruna.

A-3736574, Lee, Yat Chun.

A-4783986, Loncarevic, Stanko, or Stanley Novakovich or Stanley Novak.

A-9636577, Raniers, Leopold Leonard.

A-4264288, Saake, Georg Gottlieb.

A-6425252, Simon, Aziz Addine.

A-6616707, Singer, Alojzy.

A-6654673, Smucler, Aron, or Arcadia Smucler or A. Sinclair.

A-6562395, Tsangaris, Stephen Parascos, or Stefanos Tangaris.

A-7579922, Alves-Lico, Dorothy Louisa (nee Eveleigh).

A-7579923, Alves-Lico, Angela Louisa.

A-7044415, Anastaspoulas, Demetrios Gregorios, or Demetrios Anastaspoulas.

A-7354353, Beecher, Ahuura (nee Vahapata).

A-6880835, Benson, Brian Leslie.

A-5673907, Camblin, Vivian May.

A-2373537, Clark, Harry.

A-2544758, Clark, Maude M. (nee Smith).

A-4868622, De Bezeredy, Maria, or Maria Amalia Anna De Bezeredy or Maria Amalia Anna Saxinger or Maria De Beseredy.

A-6581688, Esber, Ragheb Jemil.

A-6053362, Farr, Cynthia Kirpalani (nee Cynthia Dick).

A-7247785, Friese, Ursula Johanna Monika.

A-6471814, Georgacas, Demetrius John.

A-6970888, Glasner, Juda.

A-6970889, Glasner, Debora Renee (nee Deutsch).

A-1242026, Hansen, Hildemar, or H. Hansen.

A-7367203, Nayudu, Yellesetty Rammohanroy.

A-5643308, O'Carroll, Anne Cecelia (nee Dillon).

A-2158680, Oundjian, Krikor.

A-9125849, Ritsos, George (or Giorgios).

A-7439360, Schallert, Nancy.

A-1765284, Spirou, Konstantinos Georgios.

A-5382864, Tacandgas, Thomas John, or Athanasios Ionnis Tacandgas.

A-1770211, Ali, Rais or Alli, or Ali Rais.

A-6079590, Anub, Benito.

A-4391511, Aumiller, Helen, or Magdalena Aumuller.

A-4680331, Blattner, Fritz Wilhelm, or Friedrich Blattner.

A-4571691, Chanin, Marcus, or Marc Janis y Janis or Marc Abronowitch Kanin.

A-5616924, Chanin, Eva, or Eva Richter De Janis.

A-6881989, De Chavarria, Piedad Palomares.

A-6042938, De Nichilo, Sergio.

A-3019542, De Nichilo, Anna Maria.

A-6148969, De Nichilo, Gioacchino.

A-7388956, De Miranda, Maria De La Lux Secura, or Luz Segura De Miranda.

A-4693815, Devide, Giuseppe.

A-5254901, Gergely, Olga, or Olga Gerbeley.

A-5554953, Herrera-Martinez, Pablo, or Pablo Herrera.

A-3504254, Hsuan, Hu Hui, or Hui Hsuan Hu.
A-4813201, Hsuan, Hu Hui, Mrs., or Chao, Ching Hui or Hu Ching Hui Chao.
A-7244991, Kane, James Joseph, or Joseph James Kane.
A-5982420, Klipstein, Hanna Lisa.
A-6897641, Lanfreschi, Frank or Francesco.
A-6400935, Linehan, Francis Joseph.
A-6833479, Lujan-Valenzuela, Adalberto, or Alberto Guzman-Alvarez or Alberto Alvarez Guzman or Alberto Guzman.
A-7140764, Mendoza-Solorio, Rafael.
A-9572109, Pasalbessy, Dominggues James.
A-6554374, Peopping, Ruby Mary (nee Nash, formerly Ruby Mary Brown).
A-3584974, Reikop, Alexander.
A-6286746, Schmidt, Willy Leo or Rosebel.
A-7145197, Soghikian, Azad.
A-5262976, Thelen, Fritz.
A-3510871, Venegas, Manuel Subia.
A-6564128, Woersching, Julia May (nee Hattaway).
A-9626236, Youzkatlian, Zacharia Hagier, or Zaren Yozgatlian.
A-1836208, Ahmed, Abed.
A-3094295, Andrelos, Erotokritos Joannis, or Edward John Andrellos.
A-4882300, Berkley, John Francis.
A-4738994, Dell'Accio, Raffaele.
A-6215501, Erman, Sadan.
A-7049551, Hill, Grace Amelia Margaret Clarke.
A-1405300, Klippstein, Beatrice May, or Beatrice May Gary.
A-4523682, Kouniades, Andreas Dimitrion, or Andrew Klonides or Andrew Couniadis or Kounides or Andrew Kimitrios Kouniadis.
A-4763835, Okland, Fritz Bernhard, or Fred Bernhard Oakland.
A-6261230, Papadopoulos, Basile Panagiotis (alias Peter Papadopoulos).
A-6920312, Quinn, Ghyslaine Mary, formerly Ghislaine Madeleine Juliette Leblond.
A-6772014, Remarez, Paulino (alias Antonio or Anthony Gonzales alias Pauline Antoni).
A-7112049, Sanchez, Angel Ruben Gonzalez Y, or Ruben Gonzalez.
A-1893678, Scalice, Giuseppe or Joe or Joseph or Scalisi or Scalica.
A-3238201, Schlitz, Violet Elizabeth, or Violet Elizabeth Cook.
A-5869795, Turnbull, Francis Elizabeth.
A-6363925, Turnbull, Elroy.
A-3150520, Van Der Steen, Theodore Johan.
A-1369347, Von Ehrenbilt, Adolf Tercelli.
A-2064405, Wright, Beatrice Ellington Hall, or Annis Veritas.
A-7043618, Yang, Alvie.
A-7043619, Yang, Tsan Zing (alias John Yang).
A-7043620, Yang, Stella Chuang-Hua (alias Stella Yang).
A-7043621, Yang, George.
A-6022377, Allen, Rosario Lagon (nee Rosario Nabasa Lagon).
A-7367899, Boyd, Johanna Maria, or Johanna Maria Graham.
A-4197503, Codazzi, Bruno.
A-7476983, De Alcantra, Catalina Vera, or Catalina Vera-Perez or Catalina Vera de Alcantar.
A-2075000, Gabel, August.
A-4543499, Gelber, Louis, or Label Gelber.
A-7205489, Giovannucci, Iole Dipillo.
A-1201411, Kamuroon, Mohamed Jin Allie, or Djen Ali or Jan or Jane Allie.
A-3018724, Kavouros, Demetrius, or Dimitrios Cavouras.
A-7469223, Lewinsohn, Norbert, or Norbert Lewinson.
A-6917696, Man, Chin.
A-6779026, Mansoor, Faraj Hanna.
A-6425810, Martos y Milla, Juan Antonio, or John Martos.
A-9698900, Mills, Joseph Charles, or Joseph Christmas Mills or Joseph Charles Mills or Joseph C. Mills.
A-1855582, Mui, Hoh Cheung.
A-6354136, Navarro, Felix Pulido.
A-5347946, Pan, Wen Yuan.
A-5604086, Pan, Julia Wen-Tsai, or Wen Tsai Sung.
A-2575134, Pappastathatos, Minas George, or Mike Pappas.
A-6501114, Rallis, Nicholaos Ioannis, or Nikola Rallis.
A-4662587, Triantafilidis, Athanasios Georgiou.
A-7092153, Chan, Lee Pui, or Jean Wong or Le Chan Pai.
A-5119426, Cheng, Lillian Lily, or Kily Ping Fung Lam.
A-6512370, Chudzinski, Charles Edward, or Charles Edward Schoessler.
A-6512371, Chudzinski, Richard Alexander.
A-5333077, Davis, Iris (nee Bowe).
A-9669924, Dias, Manuel.
A-9097795, Geen, Tan Tat.
A-7078940, Hakamaki, Vaino Albert.
A-9776937, Kommatas, Dionysios, or Dennis Kommatas or Cammatas.
A-6828844, Lozada-Calva, Alfonso, or Alfonso Loeada.
A-3173450, Mavros, Constantinis Theodoris, or Constantinis Mavros or Costos Mavros.
A-1183813, Needham, Martha Kate.
A-2205644, Radonich, Ljubica, or Lioubitza Radomitch or Violet Radon.
A-6865958, Readigos, Jose Jorge, or Jorge Readigos or J. Jorge Readigos or Jose Jorge Gonzalez Readigos.
A-6678463, Rodriguez, Alfonso, or Alfonso Rodriguez Sanchez.
A-9744479, Ronneberg, Henry Gert.
A-6794129, Soggin, Settimio Severo.
A-1784119, Vassarino, Salvatore.
A-7203596, Vanwolvelaerd, Marcel Lieven Charlotte, or Marcel Vanwolvelaerd.
A-7769251, Alexander, Goldie (nee Himelfarb).
A-6858745, Amezcua-Mora, Conrado.
A-4625033, Antonelli, Salvatore (alias Salvatore Antoniello).
A-7081459, Aviles-Huerta, Antonio.
A-1139212, Bonar, James, or Julian H. Sinaga or Julian H. Sinaga Oeyop Bin Ali.
A-3912749, Chandler, Mae (nee Jordan or Tallis O'Mae Jordan or Tallie or Tallis Joan Jordan).
A-6386987, Chavella-Alonzo, Alfonso, or Alfonso Chavolla-Vallejo.
A-1046047, Chen, James Ling, or Ling Chen.
A-4044569, Chen, Lenore Yung-Su Loe (nee Lenore Yung Sul Loe).
A-5969242, Christelstein, Alexander.
A-6266962, De Muchnik, Maria Rozwazofsky.
A-6972511, Di Salvatore, Romualdo.
A-5477978, Flores-Lopez, Antonio.
A-7809709, Freeman, Cecil Llewelyn.
A-6707226, Garcia-Lajarza, Manuel, or Arturo Navarro.
A-4978642, Gerstmeyer, Carl Frederick.
A-5531742, Gregorio, Joaquim.
A-5360625, Heredia-Alejandre, Ventura, or Ventura Alejandre Heredia.
A-7392100, Hyppa, Jr., Aili Maria (nee Aili Maria Pehkonen).
A-5777617, Kuoppala, Agnes Laila Elizabeth, or Agnes Kuoppalo (nee Saari).
A-5179136, Lazis, George Ath, or George Poulos.
A-7469772, McKenna, Eugene Glenn, or Eugene Glenn Obermeier.
A-2259768, Monteiro, Ignatius.
A-7028691, New Janet Tufts.
A-4462954, Peterson, Annie Pitblado, or Annie Pitblado McPherson.
A-7044267, Robinson, Jean Maida (nee Anderson).
A-4926231, Rotter, Fannie, or Fannie Bercovitch or Frymet Rotter.
A-3105013, Ruiz-Garcia, Enrique, or Enrique Ruiz.
A-6919537, Signorelli, Carmelina (nee Carmelina Albano).
A-1988401, Sung, Kim Joon, or John Starr Kim.
A-7181910, Tonyi, Edith Laura Gosz, or Edit Laura Scheiber.
A-6383873, Toussulis, George John.
A-3397295, Blonder, Ruth, or Ruchla Blonder, formerly Ringel.
A-5546071, Calogiromitros, Chrisostomos Kikolou, or Christ Mitros.
A-7083811, De Fimbres, Ofelia Cortez, or Ofelia Cortez-Aguirre.
A-5118393, Drekoff, Max Ernest.
A-6447597, Estevez, Domingo Manuel Medina.
A-7599891, Ezra, Moise.
A-9667778, Giannecchini, Giuliano, or William Ross.
A-2124287, Goldberg, Goldie or Olga, or Goldie Lemkin.
A-6903706, Gross, Regina Roszi Weisz.
A-7417044, Guzman-Cutierrez, Jose.
A-1336088, Johansson, Emil Johannes.
A-6958115, Kennedy, Adele Cardoso.
A-3988479, Kube, Ella Anna Bertha, or Ella Kube.
A-4741363, Kubota, Takejiro.
A-3657357, Leung, Woot-Tsuen Wu (nee Woot-Tsuen Ng).
A-7371646, Mamakos, Adamantia Kyriakos (nee Tragaki).
A-6277400, McFarlane, William Josiah, or Joseph McFarlane.
A-2181941, Ruela, Joao Jose Tavares, or Joao Da Silva Gravato or Johnnie Da Silva.
A-7137465, Santa, Josephine, or Josefina Reus or Josefa Ramira Manuella Reus Fernandez.
A-7127991, Silberstein, Elias.
A-2600963, Takeuchi, Yudzuru.
A-7070702, Vargas, Manuel, or Manuel Vargas-Ochoa.
A-2159492, Zanco, Michael.
A-6983533, Almeida, Antonio.
A-3829507, Batho, Blanche Mary (nee Gelyi).
A-4917584, Bianco, Salvatore Lo.
A-7354254, Cavazos-Cavazos, Fortino.
A-7354265, Cavazos, Ramona Arroyo De.
A-6461084, Chen, Margaret Mih, or Margaret Huan Ching Mih or Mi Huan Ching.
A-5808114, Churchwell, Violet Eileen (nee Flood).
A-6596296, Conde, Cristina Hontoria, or Cristina Hidalgo Hontoria.
A-3252394, Crabb, Roy Albert.
A-7044449, Cruz y Castaner, Antonio Maria, or Antonio Cruz Gomez or Tomy M. Cruz.
A-5716554, Daenen, Louis Lodewyk.
A-7445707, Desimone, Adelfina, or Adelfina Paliotta.
A-6602886, Ehrlich, Abraham Jacob, or Abraham J. Ehrlich or Abraham Altar Jacob Ehrlich.
A-9777195, Haldas, George, or Georgiou Haldas.
A-2081701, Kurej, Jan Andrejco, or John Andreko Kurey or John Kurey or John Andrez Kurey or John A. Kurey.
A-7197779, Ledig, Aurelia Geng, or Aurelia Patricia Geng or Aurelia Harrison.
A-7137606, Mandel, Edith Eszter, or Eszter Edith Kornheuser or Edith Kornhauser.
A-2851222, Marco, Oilia.
A-4822872, Meland, Johan, or John Meland.
A-6444910, Menendez, Miguel Armando.
A-6682966, Ovadia, Victoria Goldstein, or Vicky Ovadia.
A-7445703, Paliotta, Vincenzo, or James Paliotta.
A-5989882, Papavassiliou, George Basil, or George Papavas.
A-6660960, Wong, Amos Huie, or Yuen Meng Wong.
A-7395427, Wong, Bert, or Yuan-Shu.
A-7395428, Wong, Ruth, or Yuan-Hua.
A-6828954, Anagnostopoulos, John Demosthemes, or John Annes.
A-4826661, Blumen, Leopold, or Ludwig Busch.
A-5241078, Blumen, Julius Maximillian, or Julius Busch.
A-5965658, Cameron, Allan George.
A-3485104, Carone, Michele, or Nicola Vernola.
A-7171991, Courtney, Earle Mathew.
A-9777239, Esposito, Michele.

A-7505986, Farrell, Umeyo Wada, or Nickname May.

A-6811581, Iglesias, Manuel, or Inocente Manuel Iglesias Gonzalez.

A-7174027, Kavouksorian, John Kevork.

A-4996448, Langan, Lorna, or Mrs. John Langan or Lorna Brown or Joan Landon or Joan Manners.

A-4647200, Ozores, Indalecio, or Tony Marino.

A-5316466, Ozores, Carmen (nee Franklin).

A-3681423, Pernice, Mary (nee Mary Shegerian, alias Dikronouhi Shegerian, alias Dikronouhi Seropian).

A-4582340, Schatz, Bezalel.

A-7145196, Sochikian, Henri, or Henry Soghikian or Haigaz Soghikian.

A-6795534, Arellano de Ochoa, Maria Del Socorro (nee Maria Del Socorro Arellano, alias Socorro Arellano).

A-6916681, Bolling, Lida (nee Ling or Lida Ling Bolling).

A-2479066, Brandel, Berndt David Harald.

A-6699071, Bruce, Jane (nee McCue).

A-6699060, Bruce, Veronica.

A-3028281, Chang, Hsiao Hsueh.

A-3028280, Chang, Chou-Tung.

A-5130075, Cholinas, John George, or John Calafatis.

A-6257097, Dolik, Zaven.

A-4692905, Dorrnveld, Koop, or Jose Toombs.

A-7379199, Dowd, Gertrude (Geertruida) (Beertruida) (nee Sohl).

A-7366334, Gil Da Silveira, Henrique Melquiades.

A-4770842, Herr, Henry Curt.

A-6733437, Hoogland, Lucrecia (nee Diaz Sanchez).

A-4069836, Kapp, John, or Johan Kapp.

A-7193994, McCartney, Arthur Liu.

A-4509553, Medina, Mariano Jerez, or Mario Jerez Medina.

A-2444130, Mirabito, Giuseppe.

A-3696867, Montgomery, Murray Richardson.

A-7026985, Shegerian, Lily, or Lily Shegarian or Shousanik Seropian.

A-6677651, Olson, Kristine (nee Stromberg).

A-6550895, Tanju, Haluk, or Zeynelabidin Haluk Tanju.

A-6550896, Tanju, Muazzez (nee Yukseketepe).

A-6554484, Toohill, Birgit Bremmer, or Birgit Gorm Bremmer (maiden name).

A-6841083, Torre De Cohoon, Maria Luisa.

A-2355100, Weber, Harold.

A-6510177, Weinstock, Rachel Rosenberg, or Rachel or Rechel Weinstock.

A-4829458, Zumbo, Clara (nee Whitehead, formerly LeMiere).

A-2983976, Alupay, Petronilo Betanga.

A-5473507, Bredeson, Oscar E., or Oscar Bredson.

A-5449239, Cazulo, Julio Alvarez, or Julio Cazulo Alvarez or Jose Julio Cazulo or Julio C. Alvarez.

A-6393757, Cipelli, Maria Queberini.

A-2776551, De Pinho, Augusto Jose.

A-6228028, Farre, Armando Alcaniz (alias Armando Alcaniz alias Armando Alcaniz Ferrer or Martinez).

A-3838421, Gerontges, Ioannis, or John Rontges.

A-5240294, Gow, Donald Yardley.

A-7280505, Johnson, Randi Harda (nee Jacobsen).

A-5333149, Kampi, Peter, or Peter Campi or Joe Kiss.

A-4544484, Lederman, Hyman.

A-5294758, Lederman, Bertha (nee Rotenberg).

A-5626923, Lightenstein, Alois Raoul.

A-3977650, Marcozzi, Bernard, or Bernardo Marinelli.

A-6929708, Marguier, Andre Lucien.

A-1409019, Pasela, Joseph.

A-9632630, Petkovits, Francescos, or Frangiscos Ioannis Petcovits or Petkovich or Frank Petcovits.

A-5214886, Portokalides, Panayotis, or Panaghiotis Portokalidis or Paul Morris.

A-4198587, Sekropoulos, Evangelos, or Evangelos Sekros.

A-7145705, Smith, Wanda Cathleen, or Mary Carol Chachula.

A-7125064, Sowerby, Arthur De Carle.

A-2675276, Stewart, William, or William R. Stewart.

A-5411354, Tan, Edwin Shing, or Edwin Tom, or Tom Sun or Tom Soon or Edwin Tan or Shing Tan.

A-6729519, Taylor, Lilica Filomila, or Lilika Anastasios Bidouri (nee Vidouri).

A-7469180, Telles-Rodriguez, Rafael.

A-5263611, Veser, Josef Anton.

A-2519893, Yoneyama, Asaye Ichihashi (Asaye Ichihasi).

A-5096420, Maykemper, John Henry, or Henry Maykempe.

A-5096419, Maykemper, Maria.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 23, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 59) for the relief of Vernon Crudge.

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. HUNT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 950. A bill to amend the act authorizing the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of the Wind River Reservation for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of such tribes under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 951. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 952. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the Ogden (Utah) Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 953. A bill for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 954. A bill for the relief of Dr. Charles Gordon Rennick Sell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 955. A bill to exempt from tax the transportation of persons on boats used for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 956. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; and

S. 957. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Nebraska over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 958. A bill for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others; and

S. 959. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Cooperative Equity Exchange, Republican City, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 960. A bill to authorize an agreement between the United States and Mexico for the joint operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of the Nogales sanitation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 961. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to enter into supplemental agreements relative to post-office building leases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 962. A bill for the relief of Emily Carlstrom; and

S. 963. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Aldo Ghilarducci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 964. A bill amending chapter 213 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to limitation of action for falsification of evidence of citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 965. A bill to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act to provide that distinctive mark or insignia shall not be required in the uniforms worn by members of the National Guard of the United States, both Army and Air; and

S. 966. A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 967. A bill to provide for the payment of claims arising out of authorized training by members of the National Guard of the United States, Air National Guard of the United States, and Army National Guard and Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HENDRICKSON) introduced Senate bill 968, granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to mutual military aid in an emergency, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN (by request) introduced Senate bill 969, to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 970. A bill for the relief of Esther V. Worley; and

S. 971. A bill for the relief of Ralph Albrecht Hsiao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 972. A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to provide for the payment of a basic monthly allowance for quarters to personnel of the uniformed services on account of dependent minor brothers and sisters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 973. A bill to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. ECTON) introduced Senate bill 974, to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. THYE, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CORDON, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. GILLETTE) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 38, authorizing and directing an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission of the extent of concentration and monopolistic practices in the oleomargarine industry, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to continue for a temporary period the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

INTERSTATE COMPACT BETWEEN NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY FOR MUTUAL MILITARY AID

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact, negotiated and entered into between the States of New York and New Jersey, relating to mutual military aid in an emergency, and I ask unanimous consent that following these remarks there be printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared, briefly explaining the bill, together with the text of chapter 16 of the laws of 1951 of the State of New York, and the text of this bill. I should like to call attention to the fact that the text of chapter 2 of the Public Laws of 1951 of the State of New Jersey was printed in the RECORD of February 19, commencing at page 1308.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and properly referred, and without objection, the statement, the text of chapter XVI referred to, and the bill, will be printed in the RECORD at this point. The Chair hears no objection.

The statement by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES RELATIVE TO INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR MUTUAL MILITARY AID IN AN EMERGENCY

On the 12th of December 1950, Governor Dewey and Governor Driscoll, on behalf of their respective States, entered into a compact for mutual military aid.

The compact by its terms, does not become effective until approved by the legislatures of the signatory States and the consent of Congress is granted. Other States may become party to the compact (art. II). The compact has been approved by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey (ch. 2 of the Public Laws of 1951; approved February 1, 1951) and the Legislature of the State of New York (ch. 16, sec. 7, Laws of 1951; approved February 16, 1951). The New Jersey compact was approved by a unanimous vote of both houses of the legislature. The New York compact was unanimously approved in the assembly, and was approved by a vote of 34 to 1 in the senate.

ANALYSIS OF COMPACT

The purpose of the compact is to provide for the joint use of the military forces of the party States in case of an emergency. This emergency is defined to include invasion or other hostile action, disaster, or insurrection. The military missions provided for, in such a contingency, would include, among other things, the protection of interstate bridges, tunnels, ferries, pipelines, and all other vital installations, plants, and facilities, as well as the military support of civil defense agencies. Provision is also made for fresh pursuit of enemy forces across State lines (art. I).

A committee for mutual military aid is established to make plans for the employment of military forces pursuant to the compact (art. III). Such plans must be integrated with the emergency plans of the Armed Forces of the United States (art. IV).

In case of an emergency, the Governor of a signatory State may request the assistance of the military forces of another signatory State to carry out the purposes set forth above and the compact provides a procedure for the recall of such forces (art. IV).

Reciprocal legal protection for military forces while engaged in military duties beyond the borders of their home States is provided (art. VI). In addition provision is made for the sharing of costs and expenses arising out of the operation of the compact (art. VII).

It should be noted that the agreement provides a legal basis for the military protection of interstate bridges and tunnels by State forces. Representatives of First Army Headquarters have requested the aid of State forces in carrying out this mission.

The text of chapter 16 of the Laws of 1951 of the State of New York is as follows:

(Ch. 16)

An act to amend the military law, in relation to the militia and to approve an interstate compact for mutual military aid in an emergency, entered into by the Governor with the Governor of the State of New Jersey

The people of the State of New York, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Subdivision 5 of section 1 of the military law, as added by chapter 825 of the laws of 1950, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"5. Except as to military courts, the terms 'military' and 'military and naval' shall mean army or land, air or air force and navy or naval."

SEC. 2. Sections 2 and 6 of such law, as added by chapter 825 of the laws of 1950, are hereby amended to read, respectively, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Militia of the State; division and composition: The militia of the State shall be divided into the organized militia, the State reserve list, the State retired list, and the unorganized militia. The organized militia shall be composed of an army national guard and an air national guard which forces together with an inactive national guard shall comprise the New York National Guard; the New York Naval Militia; the New York guard whenever such a State force shall be duly organized and such additional forces as may be created by the Governor.

"The unorganized militia shall consist of all able-bodied male residents of the State between the ages of 17 and 45 who are not serving in any force of the organized militia or who are not on the State reserve list or the State retired list and who are or who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, subject, however, to such exemptions from military duty as are created by the laws of the United States.

"The State reserve list and the State retired list shall include the persons who are lawfully carried thereon on the effective date of this act and such persons who may be transferred thereto or placed thereon by the governor in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"The terms 'organized militia,' 'all or any part of the organized militia,' 'organized militia or any part thereof' and 'organized militia or any force thereof,' whenever used in this chapter, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall be deemed to include any unit, component, element, headquarters, staff or cadre thereof as well as any member or members."

"SEC. 6. Ordering organized militia into active State service. 1. The governor shall have power, in case of invasion, disaster, insurrection, riot, breach of the peace, or imminent danger thereof, to order into the active service of the State for such period, to such extent and in such manner as he may deem necessary all or any part of the organized militia. Such power shall include the power to order the organized militia or any part thereof to function under the operational control of the United States Army, Navy or Air Force commander in charge of the defense of any area within the State which is invaded or attacked or is or may be threatened with invasion or attack.

"2. Upon the request of either the sheriff of a county or the mayor of a city, whenever it shall be made to appear to the governor that there is a breach of the peace, riot, resistance to process of this State or disaster or imminent danger thereof, the governor may order into the active service of the State, for such period, to such extent and in such manner as he may deem necessary all or any part of the organized militia. The compensation of all officers and enlisted men, while on duty or assembled pursuant to this subdivision, and all expenses incurred in connection with such duty or as a result thereof shall be paid in the manner prescribed by section 211 of this chapter."

SEC. 3. Such law is hereby amended by inserting therein a new section, to be section 6-a, to follow section 6, to read as follows:

"SEC. 6-a. Organizations and volunteers from the unorganized militia. To the extent permitted by the Constitution of the United States, the governor may, at any time, order, authorize or recognize such organizations of the unorganized militia, or of designated classes thereof, or of volunteers therefrom, as he may deem to be for the public interest, and may prescribe therefor such parts of the regulations governing the organized militia as may be applicable thereto or establish such regulations therefor, or both, as he may deem proper. The governor may, at any time, provide for the separate organization, or authorize the enlistment in organizations of the unorganized militia, of persons volunteering for such service, not otherwise subject to military duty under section 2 of this chapter."

SEC. 4. Sections 7, 12 and 22 of such law, as added by chapter 825 of the laws of 1950, are hereby amended to read, respectively, as follows:

"SEC. 7. Draft of unorganized militia. 1. Whenever it shall be necessary in case of invasion, disaster, insurrection, riot, breach of the peace or imminent danger thereof or to maintain the organized militia or any force thereof at the number required for public safety or prescribed by the laws of the United States, the governor may call for and accept from the unorganized militia as many volunteers as are required for service in the organized militia or he may direct the members of the unorganized militia or such of them as may be necessary to be drafted into the organized militia or any force thereof.

"2. Whenever it shall be necessary in case of invasion, disaster, insurrection, riot, breach of the peace, or imminent danger thereof, the governor may direct the members of the unorganized militia or such of them as may be necessary to be drafted under such regulation as he may prescribe into the active service of the State, to serve as directed by him."

"SEC. 12. Vice chief of staff to the governor. There shall be a vice chief of staff to the governor who shall serve as such at the pleasure of the governor. The vice chief of staff shall be appointed by the governor from among the commissioned officers on the active list of the organized militia upon the recommendation of the chief of staff and, while holding such title, shall have the rank of a general officer or flag officer. He shall have such duties as may be prescribed by the chief of staff and shall act in place of the chief of staff during his absence or disability.

"SEC. 22. Service without the State. The governor may order the organized militia or any part thereof to serve outside of the borders of this State or of the United States in order to perform military duty of every description and to participate in parades, reviews, cruises, conferences, encampments, maneuvers or other training, and to participate in small arms and other military competitions and to attend service schools."

SEC. 5. Such law is hereby amended by inserting therein a new section, to be section 22-a, to follow section 21, to read as follows:

"SEC. 22-a. Compacts for military aid: 1. a. With the prior or subsequent consent of the Congress of the United States, the Governor is authorized to enter into, amend, supplement, and implement agreements or compacts with the executive authorities of other States and the Dominion of Canada and any of the Provinces thereof, providing for mutual military aid, and matters incidental thereto, in case of invasion or other hostile action, disaster, insurrection, or imminent danger thereof.

"b. Such agreements or compacts may include but shall not be limited to provisions for joint military action against a common enemy; for the protection of bridges, tunnels, ferries, pipelines, communication facilities, and other vital installations, plants, and facilities; for the military support of civil defense agencies; for the fresh pursuit, by the organized militia or military forces or any part thereof of a signatory into the jurisdiction of any other signatory, of persons acting or appearing to act in the interest of an enemy government or seeking or appearing to seek to overthrow the Government of the United States or of any signatory; for the powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities of the members of the organized militia or military forces of any signatory while so engaged outside their own jurisdiction; for such other matters as are of a military nature, or incidental thereto, and which the Governor may deem necessary or proper to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the people of this State; for the allocation of all costs and expenses arising from the planning and operation of such agreements or compacts.

"2. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed or interpreted as expressing a limitation, directly or indirectly, of the power of the Governor to enter into, and to amend or supplement, such compacts, with legal force and effect and without the legislative authorization expressed herein."

SEC. 6. Section 23 of such law, as added by chapter 825 of the laws of 1950, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. Application of this chapter to service without the State. The provisions of this chapter shall apply to the members of the organized militia while serving without the State and while going to and returning from such service without the State in like manner and to the same extent as while serving within the State. Courts-martial and courts of inquiry may be convened and held in units of the organized militia while serving without the State with the same jurisdiction and powers of punishments as if held within the State and offenses committed without the State may be tried and punished either without the State or within the State."

SEC. 7. The compact for mutual military aid in an emergency, entered into by the Governor on the 12th day of December, 1950, with the Governor of the State of New Jersey, as hereinafter repeated, is hereby approved according to its terms and, notwithstanding any defect, irregularity, or omission of any lawful requirement or lack of statutory authority therefor, is hereby legalized, ratified, and confirmed and the provisions of such compact shall have full force and effect:

"AN INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR MUTUAL MILITARY AID IN AN EMERGENCY

"ARTICLE I

"1. The purposes of this compact are:

"a. to provide for mutual military aid and assistance in an emergency by the military forces of a signatory State to the military forces of the other signatory States or of the United States, including among other military missions, the protection of interstate bridges, tunnels, ferries, pipelines, communications facilities, and other vital installations, plants and facilities; and the military support of civil-defense agencies;

"b. to provide for the fresh pursuit in case of an emergency, by the military forces or any part or member thereof of a signatory State into another State, of insurrectionists, saboteurs, enemies, or enemy forces or persons seeking or appearing to seek to overthrow the Government of the United States or of a signatory State;

"c. to make provision for the powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities of the members of the military forces of a signatory State while so engaged outside of their own States.

"2. a. 'Emergency' as used in this compact shall mean and include invasion or other hostile action, disaster, insurrection, or imminent danger thereof.

"b. 'State' as used in this compact shall include any signatory State.

"c. 'Military forces' as used in this compact shall include the organized militia, or any force thereof, of a signatory State.

"ARTICLE II

"This compact shall become effective as to the signatory States when the legislatures thereof have approved it and when the Congress has given its consent either before or after the date hereof. Any State not a party to this compact at the date hereof may become a party hereto.

"ARTICLE III

"The Governor of each signatory State or his designated military representative shall constitute the committee for mutual military aid for the signatory States. It shall be the duty of the committee for mutual military aid to make joint plans for the employment of the military forces of the signatory States for mutual military aid and assistance in case of emergency.

"ARTICLE IV

"1. It shall be the duty of each signatory State to integrate its plan for the employment of its military forces in case of emergency with the joint plans recommended by the committee for mutual military aid and with the emergency plans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"2. In case of emergency, upon the request of the Governor of a signatory State, the Governor of each signatory State, to the extent consistent with the needs of his own State, shall order its military forces or such part thereof as he, in his discretion, may find necessary, to assist the military forces of the requesting State in order to carry out the purposes set forth in this compact. In such case, it shall be the duty of the Governor of each signatory State receiving such a request to issue the necessary orders for such use of the military forces of his State without the borders of his State and to direct the commander of such forces to place them under the operational control of the commander of the forces of the requesting States or of the United States which may be engaged in meeting the emergency.

"3. The Governor of any signatory State, in his discretion, may recall the military forces of his State serving without its borders or any part or any member of such forces.

"ARTICLE V

"In case of an emergency, any unit or member of the military forces of a signatory State which has been ordered into active service by the Governor may upon order of the officer in immediate command thereof continue beyond the borders of his own State into another signatory State in fresh pursuit of insurrectionists, saboteurs, enemies or enemy forces or persons seeking or appearing to seek to overthrow the Government of the United States or of any one of the signatory States, until they are apprehended by such unit or member. Any such person who shall be apprehended or captured in a signatory State by a unit or member of the military forces of another signatory State shall without unnecessary delay be surrendered to the military or police forces of the State in which he is taken or to the forces of the United States. Such surrender shall not constitute a waiver by the State of the military forces making the capture of its right to extradite or prosecute such persons for any crime committed in that State.

"ARTICLE VI

"1. Whenever the military forces or any part thereof of any signatory State are engaged outside of their own State in carrying out the purposes of this compact, the individual members of such military forces so engaged shall not be liable, civilly or criminally, for any act or acts done by them in the performance of their duty.

"2. The individual members of such forces shall have the same powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as the members of the military forces of the State in which they are engaged, but in any event,

"3. Each signatory State shall save harmless any member of its military forces wherever serving and any member of the military forces of any other signatory State serving within its borders for any act or acts done by them in the performance of their duty while engaged in carrying out the purposes of this compact.

"ARTICLE VII

"1. Each signatory State shall provide, in the same amounts and manner as if they were on duty within their own State, for the pay and allowances of the personnel of its military forces, and for the medical and hospital expenses, disability and death benefits, pensions and funeral expenses of wounded, injured, or sick personnel and of dependents or representatives of deceased personnel of its military forces, in case such personnel shall suffer wounds, injuries, disease, disability, or death while engaged without the State pursuant to this compact and while going to and returning from such other signatory State. Each signatory State shall provide in the same amounts and manner as if they were on duty within their own State for the logistical support and for other costs and expenses of its military forces while engaged without the State pursuant to this compact and while going to and returning from such other signatory State.

"2. Any signatory State rendering outside aid in case of insurrection or disaster not the result of invasion or hostile action, shall, if it so elects be reimbursed by the signatory State receiving such aid for the pay and allowances of its personnel, logistical support and all other costs and expenses referred to in section 1 of this article and incurrred in

connection with the request for aid. Such election shall be exercised by the Governor of the aiding State presenting a statement and request for reimbursement of such costs and expenses to the Governor of the requesting State.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or restrict the power of any signatory State in case of an emergency affecting that State only, to provide for the internal defense of any part of the territory of said State or for the protection and control of any bridge, tunnel, ferry, installation, plant or facility, or any part thereof within the borders of such State or to prohibit the enforcement of any laws, rules, and regulations or the execution of any plan with regard thereto.

"ARTICLE IX

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each signatory State until the legislature or the Governor of such State gives notice of withdrawal therefrom. Such notice of withdrawal shall not be effective until 6 months after said notice has been given to the Governor of each of the other signatory States.

"In witness whereof, the States whose Governors have signed below, have become parties to this compact.

"December 12, 1950.

"[SEAL] THOMAS E. DEWEY,
"Governor of New York.

"Attest:

"THOMAS J. CURRAN,
"Secretary of State of the State of New York.

"[SEAL] ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
"Governor of New Jersey.

"By the Governor:

"LLOYD B. MARSH,
"Secretary of State of the State of New Jersey."

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as limiting or attempting to limit, directly or indirectly, the power of the Governor to enter into any such compact or minimizing the legal force and effect thereof, or indicating the necessity for legislative authorization, approval, ratification, or confirmation thereof.

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect immediately.

The bill (S. 968) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to mutual military aid in an emergency, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HENDRICKSON), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an interstate compact, relating to mutual military aid in an emergency, negotiated and entered into by the States of New York and New Jersey, which compact reads as follows:

"AN INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR MUTUAL MILITARY AID IN AN EMERGENCY

"ARTICLE I

"1. The purposes of this compact are:

"a. to provide for mutual military aid and assistance in an emergency by the military forces of a signatory State to the military forces of the other signatory States or of the United States, including among other military missions, the protection of interstate bridges, tunnels, ferries, pipelines, communications facilities and other vital installations, plants and facilities; and the military support of civil defense agencies;

"b. to provide for the fresh pursuit in case of an emergency, by the military forces or any part or member thereof of a signatory State into another State, of insurrectionists, saboteurs, enemies or enemy forces, or persons seeking or appearing to seek to overthrow the Government of the United States or of a signatory State;

"c. To make provision for the powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities of the members of the military forces of a signatory State while so engaged outside of their own State.

"2. a. 'Emergency' as used in this compact shall mean and include invasion or other hostile action, disaster, insurrection, or imminent danger thereof.

"b. 'State' as used in this compact shall include any signatory State.

"c. 'Military forces' as used in this compact shall include the organized militia, or any force thereof, of a signatory State.

"ARTICLE II

"This compact shall become effective as to the signatory States when the legislatures thereof have approved it and when the Congress has given its consent either before or after the date hereof. Any State not a party to this compact at the date hereof may become a party hereto.

"ARTICLE III

"The Governor of each signatory State or his designated military representative shall constitute the Committee for Mutual Military Aid for the signatory States. It shall be the duty of the Committee for Mutual Military Aid to make joint plans for the employment of the military forces of the signatory States for mutual military aid and assistance in case of emergency.

"ARTICLE IV

"1. It shall be the duty of each signatory State to integrate its plan for the employment of its military forces in case of emergency with the joint plans recommended by the Committee for Mutual Military Aid and with the emergency plans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"2. In case of emergency, upon the request of the Governor of a signatory State, the Governor of each signatory State, to the extent consistent with the needs of his own State, shall order its military forces or such part thereof as he, in his discretion, may find necessary, to assist the military forces of the requesting State in order to carry out the purposes set forth in this compact. In such case, it shall be the duty of the Governor of each signatory State receiving such a request to issue the necessary orders for such use of the military forces of his State without the borders of his State and to direct the commander of such forces to place them under the operational control of the commander of the forces of the requesting State or of the United States which may be engaged in meeting the emergency.

"3. The Governor of any signatory State, in his discretion, may recall the military forces of his State serving without its borders or any part or any member of such forces.

"ARTICLE V

"In case of an emergency, any unit or member of the military forces of a signatory State which has been ordered into active service by the Governor may upon order of the officer in immediate command thereof continue beyond the borders of his own State into another signatory State in fresh pursuit of insurrectionists, saboteurs, enemies or enemy forces or persons seeking or appearing to seek to overthrow the Government of the United States or of any one of the signatory States, until they are apprehended by such unit or member. Any such person who shall be apprehended or captured in a signatory State by a unit or member of the military forces of another signatory State shall without unnecessary delay be surrendered to the military or police forces of the State in which he is taken or to the forces of the United States. Such surrender shall not constitute a waiver by the State of the military forces making the capture, of its right to extradite or prosecute such persons for any crime committed in that State.

"ARTICLE VI

"1. Whenever the military forces or any part thereof of any signatory State are engaged outside of their own State in carrying out the purposes of this compact, the individual members of such military forces so engaged shall not be liable, civilly or criminally, for any act or acts done by them in the performance of their duty.

"2. The individual members of such forces shall have the same powers, duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as the members of the military forces of the State in which they are engaged, but in any event.

"3. Each signatory State shall save harmless any member of its military forces wherever serving and any member of the military forces of any other signatory State serving within its borders for any act or acts done by them in the performance of their duty while engaged in carrying out the purposes of this compact.

"ARTICLE VII

"1. Each signatory State shall provide, in the same amounts and manner as if they were on duty within their own State, for the pay and allowances of the personnel of its military forces, and for the medical and hospital expenses, disability and death benefits, pensions and funeral expenses of wounded, injured, or sick personnel and of dependents or representatives of deceased personnel of its military forces, in case such personnel shall suffer wounds, injuries, disease, disability, or death while engaged without the State pursuant to this compact and while going to and returning from such other signatory State. Each signatory State shall provide in the same amounts and manner as if they were on duty within their own State for the logistical support and for other costs and expenses of its military forces while engaged without the State pursuant to this compact and while going to and returning from such other signatory State.

"2. Any signatory State rendering outside aid in case of insurrection or disaster not the result of invasion or hostile action, shall, if it so elects, be reimbursed by the signatory State receiving such aid for the pay and allowances of its personnel, logistical support, and all other costs and expenses referred to in section 1 of this article and incurred in connection with the request for aid. Such election shall be exercised by the Governor of the aiding State presenting a statement and request for reimbursement of such costs and expenses to the Governor of the requesting State.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or restrict the power of any signatory State in case of an emergency affecting that State only, to provide for the internal defense of any part of the territory of said State or for the protection and control of any bridge, tunnel, ferry, installation, plant, or facility, or any part thereof, within the borders of such State or to prohibit the enforcement of any laws, rules, and regulations or the execution of any plan with regard thereto.

"ARTICLE IX

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each signatory State until the legislature or the Governor of such State gives notice of withdrawal therefrom. Such notice of withdrawal shall not be effective until 6 months after said notice has been given to the Governor of each of the other signatory States.

"In witness whereof, the States whose Governors have signed below have become parties to this compact.

"December 12, 1950.

"Approved December 11, 1950.

"NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN,
"Attorney General of the State of New York.

"By WENDELL P. BROWN,
"Solicitor General.

"THOMAS E. DEWEY,
"Governor of New York.

"Attest:

"THOMAS J. WARREN,
"Secretary of State of the State of New York.

"ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
"Governor of New Jersey.

"Approved December 11, 1950.

"W. J. DOUGHERTY,
"For the State Comptroller.

"Approved December 12, 1950.

"THEODORE D. PARSONS,
"Attorney General of the State of New Jersey.

"By LEON S. MILMED,
"Deputy Attorney General and Counsel to the Governor.

"Approved December 12, 1950.

"J. LINDSAY DE VALLIERE,
"Director, Division of Budget and Accounting and State Comptroller of the State of New Jersey.

"By the Governor:

"LLOYD B. MARSH,
"Secretary of State of the State of New Jersey."

SEC. 2. Without further submission of the compact the consent of Congress is given to any State to become a party to it in accordance with its terms.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute on the bill just introduced by the senior Senator from New York.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], dealing with the interstate compact between the States of New York and New Jersey relating to mutual military aid in an emergency. I should also like to express my gratification that the great States of New York and New Jersey have given us this tangible evidence that they are working closely together to provide the greatest possible cooperative protection in case of an emergency. It is this sort of cooperative action which, in my judgment, should be the foundation for an effective civil-defense program. I feel sure that the essential security of one of the most vital areas in our country will be greatly increased by this interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been requested.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2½ minutes on the bill just introduced by the senior Senator from New York.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the bill just introduced marks a new effort on the part of its sponsors and those who gave it impetus to bring added vigor to the true spirit of intergovernmental cooperation in the fullest sense of those words.

It bespeaks a genuine tribute to the statesmanship of the able leaders who gave it voice.

Governor Driscoll, of my own State, and Governor Dewey, of the great State of New York, have by this effort raised their banners high in the field of statecraft in the interest of our national welfare, and the advancement of liberty and justice the world over. I salute them for their contribution to national unity in this crucial hour of our Nation's history.

That such a compact is legally essential under the Constitution which binds us so closely as one people I have some doubt, particularly in the light of the complete cooperation which enabled our great Union of States to render such an able account of their devotion to each other in World War II, but these are not times to treat with legalisms.

This bill, Mr. President, is a declaration of a principle which cannot too often be expressed in our legislative endeavors and processes.

Specifically, its passage will give cumulative expression—but with the forceful voice of two of the original States of the Union—to the basic purposes of which lead us to the happy course of constitutional government, with its great system of checks and balances.

The compact which the passage of this bill will approve should give new hope to the United Nations in its determination to make the free world an arsenal against aggressors who seek to destroy free enterprise and the peace and happiness which stems therefrom.

The enactment of this bill will serve notice to the enemies of truly cooperative efforts that our way of life is the answer to their vicious propaganda that democracy is but a high-sounding term.

This bill, Mr. President, reiterates and emphasizes the fond hopes of our founding fathers.

Mr. LEHMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 2 minutes in respect to a bill which has just been introduced by my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], my colleague, and by the two Senators from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH and Mr. HENDRICKSON].

During the last war, while I was Governor of the State of New York, both in preparations for possible attack and in the implementation of our military and civic plans for defense, the State of New York worked in the closest association with the State of New Jersey. We did not submit a formal compact to the Congress for its approval; but the association was of the closest character, and was very effective. In addition to working with New Jersey, the State of New York, through its defense council, also worked with the other contiguous States, including the State of Pennsylvania, the State of Ohio, the State of Massachusetts, the State of Vermont, and the State of Connecticut.

I strongly favor the closest kind of association between the States in a given area, not only in time of war, but at all other times. I think it leads to good government and to the greatest possible security for our people.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, which was submitted to me by the Department of Justice, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me by the Deputy Attorney General, explaining the provisions of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Nevada. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 969) to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 19, United States Code, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, February 1, 1951.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Department of Justice recommends the amendment of sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, so as to broaden the protection of those sections to apply to all persons in the free exercise or enjoyment of rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

At present, section 241 of title 18, United States Code, protects any citizen against conspiracies to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate him in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same. Section 242 of that title makes it a criminal offense under color of law or custom willfully to subject any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

There appears to be no justifiable reason for limiting the protection of section 241 to citizens or the protection of section 242 to inhabitants. The amendments proposed will provide Federal protection to all persons in the exercise of rights guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment to the United States Constitution which, in part, provides that no State shall deprive any person of

life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The practical effect of the proposed amendments will be an extension of Federal protection to foreign nationals temporarily sojourning in the United States. In many cases which have come to the attention of the Department of Justice, prosecutions for alleged violations of section 242 of title 18 have not been possible because the complainants were visiting aliens who could not be considered as inhabitants of the United States.

Attached hereto for your consideration is a draft of a measure which would effectuate this recommendation.

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

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

STRENGTHENING OF LAW WITH RESPECT TO BRIBERY AND GRAFT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a short statement in connection with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection the Senator from Delaware may proceed.

The bill (S. 974) to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. ECTON), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in brief, the bill will prohibit the questionable practice which has been constantly called to our attention by congressional committees whereby Government employees who held positions either in the procurement, lending or revenue collecting agencies of the Government subsequently obtained rather lucrative positions with the same corporations they favored in negotiating contracts or loans.

This legislation has been worked out with the cooperation of the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the bill has been drawn in line with the suggestions incorporated in his letter to me under date of August 18, 1950, a copy of which I am forwarding to the committee which will consider the bill.

In his letter the Comptroller General says:

The broad subject of Government officers and employees going to work for Government contractors long has been of deep concern to the General Accounting Office. Certainly there can be no objection to any legitimate efforts of such people to obtain employment in private industry, or to efforts of private industry to secure the services of qualified employees. But it is equally certain that arrangements of this kind must be consistent with the public interest. I think you will agree that there is inherent in the public service, and in dealings with the Government, the requirement for exceptionally high standards of conduct.

The real danger lies in the illicit inducement of Federal personnel by Government contractors, and solicitation by those personnel of an advantage from the contractors. As shown in my reports to the Congress and testimony before its committees, this may take the form of highly remunerative positions, or expensive entertainment, or other things of value, in return for special favors or privileges for the contractors. Often it originates or is implemented by veiled or outright connivance on the part of the Government people involved. Whether consummated or not, such dealings are inimical to the interests of the United States. They are nothing less than plain bribery.

The Comptroller General then suggests certain amendments to strengthen those sections of the criminal statutes, Nos. 201 and 202, dealing with bribery of Government officers and employees, and they are contained in the first part of my bill.

Two new sections are added at the end of chapter 11. These are designed to provide information which will form the basis for more effective action to implement the criminal statutes as well as the present safeguards for the expenditure of public funds. These sections are self-explanatory, and they are as follows:

SEC. 224. Former officers and employees required to report employment with Government contractors.

Whoever, having been employed in any agency of the United States, including commissioned officers assigned to duty in such agency, within 2 years after the time when such employment or service in an agency of the United States has ceased, knowingly shall accept, receive, or enter into any employment, appointment, agency, or service with or for any private individual, firm, company, corporation or contractor which, during the period of service of such officer or employee in an agency of the United States, transacted business with such agency, and shall not promptly notify in writing (1) the agency concerned and (2) the General Accounting Office, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 225. Employers of former officers or employees required to report.

Whoever knowingly shall employ, appoint, or accept the services of, any person employed in an agency of the United States, including commissioned officers assigned to duty in such agency, within 2 years after the time when such employment or service in an agency of the United States has ceased, and shall not promptly notify in writing (1) the agency concerned and (2) the General Accounting Office, shall be fined not more than $2,000 and imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

The mere existence of these provisions on the statute books would have a powerful deterrent effect. The intent and the overt act to defeat the public interest or defraud the United States, by connivance between Government employees and contractors for future employment, would be punishable. Yet those whose arrangements are entirely legal and ethical would not be penalized. They would have ample protection to do what the honest businessman does in the every day course of business. At the same time the Government, through information given to the agencies and to the General Accounting Office as the agent of the Congress, would have effective means to check on the legality of the dealings with special reference to established safeguards for the expenditure of public funds.

No one can doubt that such legislation is necessary and I cannot urge too strongly, in view of the expanded wartime Government procurement, that it be given immediate favorable consideration.

I think the hearings that are being conducted currently in regard to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other lending agencies, and numerous hearings which have been held in the past, will support the need for this type of legislation.

MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES IN OLEOMARGARINE INDUSTRY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution authorizing an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission of the extent of the concentration and monopolistic practices in the oleomargarine industry. This joint resolution is similar to Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, which I submitted in the last session of Congress. Some changes have been made to reconcile this proposal with provisions in the appropriations act affecting the Federal Trade Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution, together with a statement prepared by me explaining and justifying the proposal, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) authorizing and directing an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission of the extent of concentration and monopolistic practices in the oleomargarine industry, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution authorizing and directing an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission of the extent of concentration and monopolistic practices in the oleomargarine industry

Whereas Public Law 459, Eighty-first Congress, approved March 16, 1950, removed certain taxes on oleomargarine; and

Whereas the primary objective of such law was to make colored oleomargarine available to the public at lower prices; and

Whereas it appears that in 1947 only four corporations accounted for more than 60 percent of domestic shipments of oleomargarine, and only eight corporations accounted for nearly 90 percent of such shipments, valued at more than $200,000,000; and

Whereas it appears that through such concentration of the oleomargarine industry in a few corporations the public may be deprived of the benefit of the lower prices which would otherwise be expected to result from the enactment of such law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Trade Commission is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation of (1) the extent to which the production and sale of oleomargarine is concentrated in a few corporations, (2) any practices in the oleomargarine industry which may have the effect of depriving the public of lower prices, and (3) the extent to which persons, firms, and corporations engaged in the production or distribution of oleomargarine may be engaged in unfair or improper methods of competition or practices violative of the antitrust laws.

SEC. 2. The Federal Trade Commission shall make its report to the Congress on the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, not later than March 1, 1952, and shall make such interim reports to the Congress as may be deemed desirable.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

On behalf of myself and Senators WILEY, FERGUSON, MAGNUSON, CLEMENTS, FLANDERS, JOHNSON of Colorado, THYE, DWORSHAK, MUNDT, HUMPHREY, AIKEN, CORDON, YOUNG, and GILLETTE, I am introducing a concurrent resolution directing the Federal Trade Commission to conduct an investigation into the monopolistic practices and conditions prevailing in the oleomargarine industry. This resolution is basically similar to Senate Concurrent Resolution 86 of the last Congress, which I sponsored in cooperation with several of these same Senators. This resolution calls upon the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the oleomargarine industry and to recommend to the Department of Justice whether action should be taken under the Antitrust Act. The Commission is also directed to report to the Congress upon its findings.

Those of us who sponsored the resolution in the last Congress felt that irrefutable evidence existed to merit its prompt adoption. Unfortunately, in the last session, Congress was not able to give consideration to our resolution. I am convinced now, however, that this resolution will be approved and the highly important investigation it authorizes will go forward, as it should.

Evidence I shall cite shows that there is greater need now for this investigation than when we first introduced the resolution a year ago. New trends in prices have occurred that give proof of the existence of administered or manipulated prices; manipulated to help in pending State legislative fights. The industry has been found advertising its vegetable-oil spread as a dairy product and is utilizing other unfair trade practices to increase its share of the market. These and other trends which I will discuss in detail suggest to me that it is imperative that this Congress authorize an investigation into the prices, trade practices, and profits of this industry which is dominated so closely by six large concerns.

Let us review some of the facts and trends that concern me.

First, the oleomargarine industry, already characterized by all of the usual signposts of monopoly and administered prices, has revealed even more suspicious and convincing indications of monopolistic trends and intentions in recent months. We know that six large enterprises produce more than 60 percent of all the oleomargarine manufactured in this country. One of these six is the oleo and vegetable-oil cartel of Lever Bros. Moreover, at last count there were only 33 concerns of all sizes engaged in this flourishing business which shows one of the sharpest growth curves of any American industry.

I doubt strongly if there are more than three or four other major industries in which only six concerns account for more than 60 percent of the total output. There are scarcely any in which 33 manufacturers comprise the entire industry. There are more than 4,000 creameries selling butter.

In addition, it is important to remember that the six major oleo concerns are engaged in an all-out drive to increase their hold on the table-spread market. Most of these six have announced plans for increasing their production facilities. These six are the ones who took the leadership in the legislative fight for the right to imitate butter in every particular. Since the new Federal oleomargarine statute took effect last June they have carried out a wide variety of intensive and costly promotion campaigns to capture a wider share of the spread market for themselves.

No one can object to such aggressive selling, if it is conducted in harmony with principles of fair trade and providing it is not carried to the point of driving smaller enterprises out of the industry. Moreover, those of us who are extremely sympathetic with the plight of the dairy farmers—with their vital and valuable butter market being lured away—are especially concerned that these sales methods be subjected to scrutiny by the Federal Trade Commission.

But there are far more impressive indications of monopoly and administered prices in the oleomargarine field., Consider the most singlar behavior of prices of yellow oleomargarine in the months just before and the months just after the recent Federal law eliminating the tax on olemargarine took effect.

Numerous and exhaustive surveys of the market conducted by dairy farmer organizations in 1948, 1949, and early 1950 showed that the retail price of yellow olemargarine in States where the sale of yellow oleo was permitted was often 20 cents a pound and even more above the price of uncolored oleomargarine. In some towns this spread was found to be as great as 35 cents a pound. Yet, the Federal tax that existed at that time was only 10 cents a pound so that the colored product should have sold for only 11 cents a pound more than the uncolored, allowing for packaging and other costs associated with the coloring.

Then came the Federal law, ending the tax and thus widening the market for oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter. The oleomargarine industry then began an all-out campaign to persuade State legislatures to repeal State laws in some 15 States which still forbade the sale of olemargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter. Sorely hampering them in this fight was the old abnormally large price spread that had prevailed before repeal of the Federal tax. Recalling this, numerous consumers doubted that legalization of yellow oleomargarine would assure them a low-priced table spread. They expressed concern that once the yellow product was legalized and could be sold as a direct imitation of butter, that the manufacturers would begin to raise its price.

The oleo trust promptly perceived the danger in this situation and by virtue of their apparent tight control over prices, began to do something about it. The trend and relationship of yellow to uncolored oleo prices reversed itself. Whereas in the first month or so after tax repeal the colored product sold on the average for almost a cent a pound more than the uncolored, a shift had occurred by September of 1950. The shift first came to light during the Michigan contest over repeal of that State's ban on yellow oleo, when the oleo industry advocates began telling Michigan housewives that yellow oleo was actually cheaper than uncolored oleo in States which permitted sale of the colored product.

Since then, as the industry's campaign has been broadened to other States, the peculiar price relationship has become Nation-wide.

Before the Federal oleo law was enacted, colored oleo was higher priced than uncolored, even if you figure off the 10-cent tax which was then imposed on the colored product. In August 1950—2 months after the law became effective—the Bureau of Labor Statistics still showed the national average price of colored oleo higher than that of uncolored.

	United States	
	Average	Range of prices
Margarine:	*Cents*	*Cents*
Uncolored (19 cities)_____pound__	32.6	20–51
Colored (37 cities)_____do____	33.3	22–45

But in September 1950, and since then, the Bureau of Labor Statistics show a topsy-turvy reversal in the prices of colored and uncolored oleo. Colored oleo has averaged lower in price than the uncolored.

	Average price	
	Nov. 15	Oct. 15
Margarine:	*Cents*	*Cents*
Uncolored (19 cities)_____pound__	33.2	33.3
Colored (37 cities)_____do____	32.5	32.7

This shift occurred at the start of an intense national campaign to promote wider use of yellow oleo. Here is a fair question: If the price of colored oleo in relation to uncolored can shift downward so suddenly in a drive for broader markets, who can guarantee it won't shift upward again to broaden future profits?

I assert that the change in price behavior here displayed could only occur in an industry where the leaders who were carrying on their great legislative fight enjoyed a monopolistic stranglehold on their prices and markets. Here is a clear-cut example of administered prices. In this case they were administered to aid in a legislative fight, manipulated to deceive the consumers and voters. This kind of manipulation and administration of prices is clearly of the character the Federal Trade Commission should investigate wherever and whenever it occurs.

Remember that yellow oleo should cost more than the uncolored because of the coloring and the packaging involved when it is sold, like butter, in quarters.

The official Government figures record another trend in oleo prices that should interest consumers and also should merit investigation by the Federal Trade Commission. During the period while prices of the colored product were being manipulated in a way calculated to benefit legislative campaigns, such prices were still being raised more than butter or food prices in general. From June to December, the increase in uncolored oleo prices was 16.3 percent, according to the Department of Labor, while the price of butter increased only 7.3 percent, and the price index of all foods rose by 5.3 percent.

Some of us predicted a year ago that the gap between oleo and butter prices would

be narrowed if the oleo industry was given the power to imitate butter exactly. The industry with its monopoly hold on the market has not been long in justifying our prediction.

There are other developments in recent months that support the need for a thorough investigation of the oleo monopoly. A great number of clear violations of the provisions of the new Federal statute have occurred. Manufacturers and distributors alike have openly attempted to pass their product off as a natural dairy product and have even so advertised it—all in violation of the plain wording of the Federal statute. These activities are clearly within the purview of the Federal Trade Commission since they constitute unfair-trade practices and are carried on in a direct effort to dominate the table spread market.

It is also interesting to observe that not only do the industry's pricing practices betray signs of strong control and manipulation, but so also does its utilization of vegetable oil. In 1949 and early 1950 cottonseed oil was the major source of the fat utilized in the production of oleomargarine. This was in the period when the debate was under way in Congress over the Federal statute. In recent months, the principal source of the oil has been soybean oil, which also happens to be the only important farm product used in oleo produced in the States which now have State bans on the sale of the colored product.

I do not doubt that relative-cost trends explain this shift in utilization, even though it did occur at a most convenient time. The interesting thing is that the shift could occur in a strikingly uniform manner as if the entire industry had met and decided to change its source of raw material. Such uniformity of policy is another characteristic of monopoly that the FTC may wish to examine. All policies and changes seem to occur with a precise sense of timing in this industry.

Conscious as it is of the welfare of our agriculture, the Federal Trade Commission should perhaps consider what this ability to shift in oil utilization may foreshadow for our domestic vegetable oil industry. One of the big six in the oleo industry is the world's greatest producer of vegetable oils grown and processed by low-paid labor. What assurance is there that this cartel and the other major concerns in the industry may not shift to foreign oils once they have won the right to sell colored oleo and no longer need the votes of American farmers growing vegetable oils? Such shifts are easy for a monopoly.

Finally, we need an investigation to find out more about the profit margin in this rapidly growing food product. I am informed that during all the time the Federal oleomargarine bills were pending before the Congress the industry refused to present any data showing the cost of manufacturing its product or the profit margin that it obtains. The dairy farmer cooperatives and creameries freely submitted such data with regard to butter but the committees considering the legislation were told by the margarine association that no data on costs or profits were available.

We do know that the margin on oleo must be many times greater than the margin on butter. The oleo industry is able to spend each year from six to twelve times as much on advertising as is spent on butter. This alone is a convincing evidence of a substantial margin. Moreover, Government figures show that about 70 percent of the dollar paid by the consumer for butter goes to the farmer, whereas only about 35 percent of the retail oleo dollar goes to the farmer. Yes, all the available evidence, including indications of manipulation and administered prices suggest the existence of a substantial profit margin. Moreover, the margin would appear to be widening in recent months. The prices of both colored and uncolored oleo have increased more rapidly than have the prices of the particular vegetable oils that were being used in its manufacture.

The Federal Trade Commission should be directed to find out what are the facts about oleo profit margins. This product is widely promoted as a low-cost spread. Is it being sold to consumers at prices permitting unusually high profits? Do these profit margins permit manipulation and administration of prices in the interest of monopoly or to the detriment of the dairy farmer? An answer to these important questions is clearly in the national interest and should benefit consumers and dairymen alike.

Let me also say something about the propriety of such an investigation under current conditions. I am convinced that there is no branch of farming more essential to our defense economy than dairying. After our experience in World War II, I don't think this is open to question. We need to adopt every measure we can to strengthen dairying and to eradicate promptly any threats to its ability to supply our Armed Forces and civil population with healthful dairy products at the lowest possible cost. At times like this we cannot long permit monopolistic activities which can disorganize vital dairy markets and jeopardize the flow of milk at economical prices. We should certainly ascertain whether monopolistic forces are using unfair tactics and pressure methods to take an even greater share of the butter market from our dairy farmers.

STUDY OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 86), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study of the antitrust laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation and effect, to determine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable to—

(a) clarify existing statutory enactments, and eliminate any conflicts which may exist among the several statutes comprising such laws;

(b) rectify any misapplications and misinterpretations of such laws which may have developed in the administration thereof;

(c) supplement such statutes to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of such statutes; and

(d) improve the administration and enforcement of such statutes.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. GEORGE, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 924) to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions, and it was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

INVESTIGATION OF PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM—INTERIM REPORT ON LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE (S. DOC. NO. 9)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I ask unanimous consent that the recent report of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee entitled "Interim Report on Lackland Air Force Base" be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The subcommittee made a thorough investigation at the base and its efforts have already resulted in constructive steps being taken. We are confident that additional steps will be taken as a result of the subcommittee's findings and recommendations. The committee is to be congratulated on this report, and I am sure Senators will be interested in reading this report; and I ask that it be printed as a Senate document.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

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

William Quillen Treseder, of Utah, to be United States marshal for the district of Utah, vice Gilbert Mecham, retired.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL BEFORE CONFERENCE OF GRAND MASTERS OF MASONS IN NORTH AMERICA

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL before the Conference of Grand Masters of Masons in North America, at Washington, D. C., February 20, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY SPEECH BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by him to the Nonpartisan League of New York, at New York City, on February 25, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NORTH DAKOTA WINTER SHOW—ARTICLE FROM THE DAKOTA FARMER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Governor Was Right," published in the February 17 issue of the Dakota Farmer, which appears in the Appendix.]

A MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF WESTERN EUROPE FROM SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio message to the people of Western Europe, recorded by him on February 21, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON UNITED EUROPE—ADDRESS BY PAUL-HENRI SPAAK, FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF BELGIUM

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the American Committee on United Europe, delivered by Hon. Paul-Henri Spaak, former Prime Minister of Belgium, in Baltimore, on February 13, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR LODGE, OF CONNECTICUT

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day dinner address delivered by Governor Lodge, of Connecticut, in Minneapolis, Minn., on February 17, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHEMICAL WARFARE—ARTICLE IN THE NEW YORK JOURNAL OF COMMERCE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Chemical Men Hit United States Delay on Expansion," published in the New York Journal of Commerce of February 19, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials regarding the proposed amendments to the Selective Service Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOES GOP FOREIGN POLICY REST SOMEWHERE BETWEEN DIVERSE VIEWS OF TAFT AND DEWEY?—EDITORIAL FROM THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Does GOP Foreign Policy Rest Somewhere Between Diverse Views of TAFT, Dewey?" published in the February 14 issue of the Salt Lake Tribune, of Salt Lake City, Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR TAFT ANALYZES OUR RESPONSIBILITY AND COMPETENCE—EDITORIAL FROM THE DESERET NEWS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator TAFT Analyzes Our Responsibility and Competence," published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, of February 14, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAX SITUATION—POEM BY MRS. GRACE C. SOLOMON

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "It's the Limit," written by Mrs. Grace C. Solomon, of Salt Lake City, Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

RAIN MAKING—TWENTIETH CENTURY LEGAL PHENOMENON—ARTICLE BY RALPH E. COREY

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Rain Making Calls for United States Control," written by Ralph E. Corey, and published in the Harvard Law School Record, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTH DAKOTA MELODY

[Mr. CASE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "South Dakota Melody," written by Marie Christopherson, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION OF PHEASANTS AND OTHER GAME IN SOUTH DAKOTA

[Mr. CASE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Woody Plantings Furnish Winter Habitat for Chinese Pheasants," published in the Reporter and Farmer, of Webster, S. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY CARLOS P. ROMULO ON PEIPING'S REPLY TO THE CEASE-FIRE PROPOSALS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement made by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, in the Political Committee of the United Nations on January 18 of this year. General Romulo's statement consists of an analysis of Peiping's reply to the United Nations proposals for Korean peace and a recommended course of action for the United Nations First Committee comprising a condemnation of Chinese Communist aggression in Korea, and continued resistance to the aggressor in Korea on the basis of strengthened support for the United Nations military effort there.

Since the delivery of this statement, or course, the United Nations has acted to declare Communist China an aggressor, although it has yet to implement that declaration. General Romulo's statement remains timely for two reasons, and for those reasons I highly commend its study to Members of Congress and the public:

First. The course of action urged upon the United Nations by General Romulo is highly revealing of the determined support our Philippine friends are according the United States in the UN.

Second. General Romulo's analysis of the Peiping reply and counterproposals exposes in stark detail the fact that Communist China is not interested in peace but is determined to continue its aggression in Korea.

It is important that this attitude of the Chinese Communists be exposed and made clear. A clear understanding of the Peiping proposals should dispel the notions of any who are prone to wishful thinking and thereby have been blinded to the facts. The indisputable fact is that Mao Tse-tung is engaged in a war of aggression, and, moreover, that in snubbing the peace making efforts of the United States he has announced his association with Soviet Russia in a calculated policy of world disruption and domination.

General Romulo's analysis of the Peiping proposals is a brilliant exposure of their design.

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

STATEMENT OF GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, FOREIGN SECRETARY OF THE PHILIPPINES, IN THE FIRST COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON PEIPING'S REPLY TO THE FIRST COMMITTEE'S CEASE-FIRE PRINCIPLES, JANUARY 18, 1951

Mr. Chairman, last Saturday, the First Committee decided to transmit to the Peiping regime the principles governing a cease-fire in Korea and invited that government to indicate whether it would accept those principles. Today we have Peiping's reply in the form of a cablegram from the Foreign Minister of that regime.

This meeting has been called to consider this reply. The Philippine delegation believes that a great deal of futile discussion might be avoided through a careful analysis of the reply in the light of the five principles which had been approved by the First Committee.

The five principles may be summarized briefly in sequence as follows: first, a cease-fire; second, further efforts to find a basis for peace; third, the withdrawal in gradual stages of all non-Korean forces; fourth, the setting up of an interim administration for Korea; and fifth, negotiations through an appropriate United Nations body on far eastern problems, including those of Formosa and of the representation of China in the United Nations.

Peiping's reply, while purporting to contain so-called "counter-proposals," may be summed up in the very words used in the communication before us. The words occur at the end of paragraph 3 as follows: "The principle of a cease-fire first and negotiations afterwards would only help the United States to maintain and extend its aggression, and could never lead to genuine peace. Therefore the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China cannot agree to this principle."

It must be noted at this point that the first principle approved by the First Committee did contain the firm assurance, to wit: that a cease-fire arrangement "should contain adequate safeguards for ensuring that it will not be used as a screen for mounting a new offensive."

Peiping thus rejects not only the basic principle of a prior cease-fire but also goes so far as to impugn the good faith which inspired the assurance just cited.

Further, the rejection of the principle of a prior cease-fire is reiterated in subparagraph (a) of paragraph 3 of the cablegram, which reads as follows: "Negotiations should be held among the countries concerned on the basis of agreement to the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and the settlement of Korean domestic affairs by the Korean people themselves, in order to put an end to the hostilities in Korea at an early date."

These words mean one thing only, and it is this: that Peiping wants negotiations first and a cease-fire afterwards. This is a total reversal of the sequence of steps suggested in the proposals of the First Committee. I doubt that any form of words can convey more clearly the idea that Peiping completely rejects not only the plain substance of the proposals of the First Committee but also the succession of the stages between cease-fire and negotiations, which formed part of the very core and essence of the proposals themselves.

Let us consider next whether there is any basis for the belief that paragraph 3 of the cablegram contains any so-called counterproposals. This is a point of great importance, since, if these indeed are genuine counterproposals, then the First Committee would be bound by the normal process of negotiation to treat them with due attention and regard.

Peiping proposes the following: First, withdrawal of foreign troops and settlement of Korean affairs by the Korean people themselves, and cessation of hostilities at an early date; second, negotiations for the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan straits and on related far-eastern problems; third, the seating of the Peiping regime in the United Nations from the very beginning of the conference to be attended by the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States, France, India, and Egypt; and fourth, the holding of the conference in China.

In what sense can these be regarded as counterproposals? In diplomatic usage, counterproposals are normally understood to represent an attempt at rapprochement, an effort to narrow down the gap that separates the parties to a dispute. They must, therefore, suggest either an entirely new approach to the question in dispute or a

modification of the terms previously advanced by the party making the counterproposals such that the possibility of an agreement may be enhanced.

I believe it will be found, on close examination of these so-called counterproposals, that they are nothing of the sort. They represent no new approach to the problem, and, except for two details, they represent no change whatever from the conditions previously set forth by the Peiping regime.

Let us go back to the communication of the Peiping government dated December 22, 1950, which is contained in the Report of the Cease-Fire Group (Document A/C. 1/643). The last paragraph of this cablegram reads in part as follows: "We firmly insist that as a basis for negotiating for peaceful settlement of the Korean problem, all foreign troops must be withdrawn from Korea, and Korea's domestic affairs must be settled by the Korean people themselves. The American aggression forces must be withdrawn from Taiwan. And the representatives of the People's Republic of China must obtain a legitimate status in the United Nations."

These are, almost word for word, identical to the demands contained in the cablegram we have just received. It is true that two new details have been added to the original demands; namely, that seven countries are specifically named to the negotiating body, France, India, and Egypt being added to the four mentioned in the proposals of the First Committee, and that the conference be held in China. I leave it to the committee to decide whether, with these additional demands, it may properly regard the communication from Peiping as embodying any counterproposals which the committee can seize upon as a basis for further efforts at peaceful settlement of the Korean problem.

The principle of cease-fire first and negotiation afterwards has been firmly established as the only basis for the committee's efforts at peaceful settlement. It was clearly set forth in all the communications sent by the cease-fire group to Peiping, in particular, its cablegram dated December 19 in which it was stated that the negotiating committee "could become an effective channel for seeking a peaceful solution of existing issues in the Far East," but that to make this possible, "a cease-fire arrangement must be put into effect."

Among the many statements that have been made in the Committee in support of this principle, I wish to call to mind the repeated insistence of the delegation of Israel that a cease-fire unquestionably must precede negotiations. On January 11, the distinguished delegate of India, Sir Benegal Rau, gave his delegation's interpretation of paragraph 5 as follows: That it was understood "that if there is no cease-fire, the implementation of the principles would become impracticable and the proposed body unable to function." At the same meeting, Sir Gladwyn Jebb affirmed the sequence of cease-fire and negotiations in these words: "If the present offer of a cease-fire to be followed by negotiations nevertheless is rejected by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, then the fighting in Korea would continue, and the United Nations would not abandon its principles."

Last Saturday, in explaining the abstention of the Philippine delegation on the five principles, I expressed objection to paragraph 5 on the ground that it represented a surrender of principle which Peiping would seize upon as a sign of weakness and an occasion for making further demands. I also stated, in connection with paragraph 5, that Peiping would probably accept this paragraph and reject all the rest. It is with no satisfaction whatever that I now point out how well the reaction of Peiping has been anticipated.

But if it was comparatively easy to anticipate Peiping's attitude, then it is equally just to say that the attitude of the United Nations from this time onward has been predetermined. It has been predetermined by the whole course of United Nations policy on the Korean problem since June 27, 1950. It has been predetermined by the declarations made by various delegations in this Committee during our debate on the five principles. It was, as a matter of fact, predetermined long ago by the purposes and principles which we solemnly embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

I wish to repeat the statement of Sir Gladwyn Jebb because I believe that it indicates the precise point at which the United Nations, and the First Committee, in particular, ought to resume its labors. These are his words: "If the present offer of a cease-fire to be followed by negotiations nevertheless is rejected by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, then the fighting in Korea would continue, and the United Nations would not abandon its principles."

These, then, are the two tasks before the First Committee:

First, to take a course which would enable the United Nations to stand by its principles. This would require, in our opinion, that the United Nations condemn the Communist Chinese aggression in Korea, as it has already condemned the North Korean aggression.

Second, to continue resisting the aggressor in Korea. This would require that further measures be taken, on the advice of the Collective Measures Committee, to support and strengthen the military effort of the United Nations in Korea.

We are confident that the First Committee will not permit itself to be diverted from the speedy accomplishment of these clear and unavoidable responsibilities. The free men of all nations wait anxiously upon the action we are about to take.

RAILWAY LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD five telegrams addressed to me by representatives of railroad unions in Massachusetts dealing with the work of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with the long-drawn-out railroad dispute.

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

WEST SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *February 24, 1951.*
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Washington, D. C.:

The membership of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen have been highly gratified by the recent action of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on opening hearings on the apparent failure of the Railway Labor Act. We feel that these hearings will bear out our convictions as the indisposition of the railroad management to use effectively the tools provided by the act. We urge you to use every effort at your command to enable these hearings to be concluded and an equitable settlement reached without delay.

J. C. CORCORAN,
Secretary, Pioneer Lodge, Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen.

BOSTON, MASS., *February 23, 1951.*
Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D. C.:

Members of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen are very appreciative of action taken by Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in holding hearings on operation of Railway Labor Act to determine whether stalemate in current wage-rule movement is due to defects in act or failure of parties involved to cooperate. We urge investigation be carried on without delay in effort to solve dispute which has been going on 23 months.

J. L. MCQUADE,
General Chairman, Boston & Albany Railroad.

BOSTON, MASS., *February 23, 1951.*
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate committee is now holding hearings on the 23-month-old dispute between the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and three other operating unions versus railroad management. We are indeed grateful for the action which has been taken by the Senate committee and respectively urge that this investigation be carried on with as little delay as possible.

WALTER B. BLAKE,
General Chairman, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Boston & Maine Railroad.

BOSTON, MASS., *February 23, 1951.*
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare is now holding hearings on the dispute between the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and three other transportation brotherhoods which has been going on for 23 months with the railroads who are hiding behind the Government seizure of the railroads as an excuse to avoid a collective bargaining with their employees. Suggest that you follow testimony given at this hearing and favor legislature to have the Government take over the profits of the railroads. They will then bargain at once with their employees. All brotherhood members of Massachusetts appreciate the Senate investigation and hope that same will continue without delay.

J. R. MCISAAC,
State Legislative Representative Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *February 23, 1951.*
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Membership of Lodge 631, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, located at Boston, Mass., are pleased to learn that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will commence hearings on the operation of the Railway Labor Act on February 22. Operating railroad employees in Massachusetts who have been waiting satisfactory adjudication of a dispute under the act for nearly 2 years will apprecate any action on your part to insure a full hearing and expeditious conduct of the investigation.

C. T. SAVAGE,
Secretary, Lodge 631, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

WALTER E. COSGRIFF OF THE RFC

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have been under investigation for some time. A report which reflects on members of the board of the RFC has been made by a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Public hearings by this subcommittee are now in progress.

I do not rise today to discuss any of the charges which have been made or the findings of the committee. However, as a matter of simple justice to one of the new members of the board, a citizen of the State of Utah, Mr. Walter E. Cosgriff, I desire to make clear that he is in

nowise involved in the activities of the RFC which were criticized in the subcommittee report.

Mr. Cosgriff was appointed by the President last summer to fill a vacancy on the board. He was not an applicant for the position. I have seen correspondence and memoranda relating to his appointment which demonstrate beyond doubt that the President in fact practically drafted Mr. Cosgriff.

When first offered the appointment, Mr. Cosgriff declined, stating that he was not interested. The President, however, was insistent to such an extent that he convinced Mr. Cosgriff that he should accept as a matter of patriotic service.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that what I have just said is based on a personal examination of correspondence and other factual material.

The activities of RFC which were the subject of the report, and are now under investigation by the Senate subcommittee, all happened prior to Mr. Cosgriff's connection with the RFC. He is not implicated in any manner whatsoever with any of the matters under investigation.

Let me also say that Mr. Cosgriff is one of the younger bankers in the State of Utah, a man who before coming to Washington directed operations in several western States. As a young man, he succeeded to the management of a banking enterprise which had been built by his father. Since his father's death, Walter Cosgriff has operated and expanded this business and has made an outstanding success of it, so that today it is one of the largest and most successful banking enterprises in the intermountain West. He has an excellent reputation for integrity, ability, and efficiency, not only in Utah, but in every other State where he has operated.

The appointment was not political. It came to Mr. Cosgriff because of his ability, his independence, and his reputation as an able citizen who had made an excellent record in the business and banking field.

Mr. President, I am making this statement today to the Senate and to the people of the United States so there will be no misunderstanding with respect to Mr. Cosgriff and his relation to the RFC and the investigation which has been and is now being conducted.

A VOLUNTEER FREEDOM CORPS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Dr. V. S. Krajcovic, of the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia, concerning proposed legislation which a group of Senators, including myself, are sponsoring, relative to a Volunteer Freedom Corps.

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

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR LIBERATION OF SLOVAKIA,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1951.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I take great pleasure in congratulating you on your bold and courageous attitude on matters pertaining to the future of the American foreign and military policies and also in respect to other nations which at the present time are enslaved by international communism. I especially appreciate the fact that you and your colleagues in the United States Senate are creating an opportunity for us and other nations to fight for their freedom as evidenced in the proposed bills, S. 238 and S. 239.

I am certain that all liberty-loving Slovaks, those who as refugees have found at least a temporary haven in the countries of western democracies and those who heroically are resisting communism in their oppressed Slovakia, are eagerly waiting for the day when they will be able to contribute to the attainment of the objectives which you have so well set forth and when they will join with your efforts to meet the challenge and opportunity in this field.

The formation of the Volunteer Freedom Corps, if organized in special national units which in due course of time would become the nucleus for future national armies, Slovak, Polish, Ukrainian, Czech, Hungarian, etc., would immensely enhance the advantages of your American strategy in Europe.

But I feel sure that your broad, objective, and democratic program of mobilizing some 2,000,000 anti-Communist Slavs eager to oppose the Reds on personal, spiritual, and national grounds has to be implemented with an appropriate and parallel political program, which would be the other side of your proposal aiming purely and simply at the enhancement of the American strategy in Europe. If Europe has to be free, she must fight for freedom. Not only for that freedom which certain nations lost as a consequence of Soviet encroachment after the year 1945, but also for the freedom of those nations who have never experienced the privileges of freedom like the Slovaks, Ukrainians, White-Ruthenians, and other nations who form the other half of the Soviet Russia.

A bold political program of freedom for all nations which is only a logical and further application of Wilsonian principles of self-determination would strengthen the objectives which you have in mind and thus offer the oppressed people something more and something better than the Communists are giving them or leading them to believe they are giving.

I know that the Slovaks, Ukrainians, or White-Ruthenians will fight with everything that stands at their disposal once they are assured of the prospects of future freedom, an outlook, which the Germans in World War II or even Napoleon long ago omitted to offer in a similar situation.

I do want you to know that through your proposed Volunteer Freedom Corps you are giving the hope for freedom to millions of oppressed people. I am convinced that once your program is carried out, it will greatly help all oppressed nations and it will contribute to lead to the ultimate goal we are seeking: Freedom, prosperity, and general happiness of the whole world.

Respectfully yours,
Dr. V. S. KRAJCOVIC.

AMERICAN GROUND TROOPS IN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the New York Herald Tribune for today, Monday, February 26, 1951, appears an article entitled "Point of No Return," written by Walter Lippmann. The article merits the attention of every Member of the Senate, because in it Mr. Lippmann points out the real issues raised by my Senate Resolution 8.

At long last it appears that those of us who are trying to have developed a sound national defense policy, a policy behind which all our people can and would rally, are making progress. Mr. Lippmann has been in the forefront of this patriotic campaign to see that our country is properly defended in this time of peril.

As Mr. Lippmann points out in this article, which I hope every Member of the Senate will read, and which I wish all Americans could read, the issue raised by the Wherry resolution is of transcendent importance; and until this issue is resolved there can be no sound defense policy.

In view of the importance of this matter I ask unanimous consent to have the article placed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my statement.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 26, 1951]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

POINT OF NO RETURN

Many must be wondering why, after General Marshall's disclosure that our present plans are to send only four more divisions to Europe, the issue is not settled in Congress. For Senator TAFT has not been opposing, in fact he has supported, an American contribution within such limits as General Marshall talked about. While Mr. Hoover and Senator WHERRY would presumably prefer to see even fewer American soldiers on the ground in Europe, the administration could settle the matter if it came to an understanding with Senator TAFT.

Why has that not been done? Apart from the partisan politics of the thing the real reason is that as a matter of fact the administration and the informed opposition both know that the basic issues of military policy in this whole business are still unsettled. The issues have to do, not so much with the number of divisions which are sent to Europe this year, but with the over-all size of the American Army, and its relation to sea and air power.

Almost no one is disposed to disagree seriously about the six divisions for Europe that General Marshall mentioned. The argument, though it is as yet still below the surface of publicity, is about the 46 divisions, or more, which the Army planners are contemplating. There is profound doubt in wide circles which are competent to judge questions of this kind whether ground forces of this order of magnitude could be built up except at the expense of the full development of sea and air power, and whether the attempt to build up such an army would not put an intolerable strain upon our manpower and upon our economy.

The costs of a military expansion on this scale—if one includes as one must the corresponding increase required in air power—are startling even by our present budgetary standards. It would be a fair guess to say that the cost would be at least twice, probably nearer three times, the present military appropriations. That would mean a military establishment costing something near to half the national income. To use half the national income for military purposes is, even in a period of full-scale war, about as far as total mobilization can go.

What General Eisenhower and General Marshall said about the size of the army in Europe would have ended the great debate if it could have been taken as a true reflection of the military policy of the Pentagon—that is to say of a policy in which air and sea power were paramount. That at bottom, and leaving aside all the trimmings, is what Mr. Hoover and Mr. TAFT, and also Mr. WHERRY and multitudes who have not agreed with them about many other questions, have been arguing for and groping for. There is little doubt that policy of the paramount sea and air power is what the

overwhelming majority of the Congress and of the people believe in.

But this is not the settled and agreed policy of the Truman administration. A deep struggle is still going on inside the administration and inside the Pentagon over the allocation of American resources and manpower. The heart of that struggle is over the size of the ground army. The agitation in Congress, which has not yet been fully clarified and defined, is primarily about whether the army should be expanded to such a size, and then, if it is to be expanded, whether Congress should not have something to say about what Mr. Truman does with that huge army.

These are issues which one can without exaggeration call vital to the future of this country. For a military establishment with a standing army of about 50 divisions, plus the tactical air power needed for such an army, plus the strategic air force, plus a navy which can command all the oceans, plus an adequate defense of North America, could not be a permanent military establishment. It would require the prolonged conscription of our young men and the levying of a terrible toll upon their education and their hopes. It would require an austerity of life by our people which they have never approached in this century. It would require an iron regimentation of all their affairs and a harsh intolerance of dissent. No free nation, unless it were directly threatened by invasion, could or would long endure the burden of such a military establishment.

Were we to attempt to impose such a burden, the cry would become irresistible to have a war and get it over with. Rather than bear the ills we had, we would fly to others we know not of. We would find life so grim and the future so bleak that the temptation would almost certainly be irresistible to embrace the hallucination that the third world war could be fought and won and finished, and that after that the world would be happy again. The third world war can be fought. There is no prospect whatsoever that it could be finished. Nothing is so certain, no prophecy is so sure, as that once the third world war started, it would spread like a prairie fire and would become an uncontrollable, inconclusive, interminable complex of civil and international wars.

It is essential that we reach a level of armaments which, on any calculation of risks that are undertaken in Moscow, is decisively deterrent. That done, and we are well on the way to getting it done, it is essential to hold our armaments at a level which we can and will maintain not merely for an emergency but for the long future.

To raise the level too high, to subject the country to an intolerable strain, is to make the great military mistake which has ruined so many other nations. It is to arm past the point of no return. It is to create armaments that are so heavy to bear that they must be used in the hope of getting rid of the burden. Wars that are inspired not by self-defense or by clear policy but by internal pressures and irrational hopes invariably end in ruin and disaster.

AMERICAN GROUND TROOPS IN EUROPE — ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there appears in the Washington Evening Star for today, February 26, an article entitled "'Great Debate' Wide of Mark," written by Constantine Brown, the distinguished commentator. I think the article goes to the very heart of the issue involved in the Wherry resolution, and I hope every Member of the Senate will read it. Because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

"GREAT DEBATE" WIDE OF MARK—DISCUSSION HAS APPEALED TO EMOTIONS RATHER THAN REASON ON TROOPS ISSUE

(By Constantine Brown)

The hearings on the Wherry resolution—dubbed by politicians the "great debate"—are due to end shortly. There has been much talk, flamboyant oratory, and a certain amount of misinformation during the weeks of discussion before the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees. But, by and large, the discussions were wide of their mark.

Senator WHERRY proposed that no American ground forces be sent to Europe under article III of the Atlantic Pact unless the basic policy of sending them is approved by the Senate. If such approval were given, the executive branch could deploy American forces at will.

Nobody wished to prevent the President from sending more troops to Europe. Mr. Truman could have sent as many additional forces as he wanted across the Atlantic and it would have caused no debate. All he had to do was order them as reinforcements for the troops in Germany.

There is—and can be—no restriction on the Commander in Chief in strengthening, with as many divisions as he desires, the contingents in Germany and Austria, and it would have mattered little where they were stationed.

The focal point of discussion was whether the Chief Executive had authority to send ground forces to Western Europe under the Atlantic Pact before an act of aggression had been committed against one of the signatories. Assurances were given in the Senate by Secretary of State Acheson and Chairman CONNALLY, of the Foreign Relations Committee, before ratification of the Atlantic Pact, that we were under no obligation to send troops to the member nations before an aggression occurred.

If the "great debate" had been more realistic and less intended to appeal to the emotions rather than reason, it could have been explained that, from the military point of view, it was better to have enough troops in Europe before an aggression than after.

The effort of the great majority of witnesses to minimize the likelihood of Soviet attack in the near future prevented such a frank statement. Most of the military and civilian witnesses seemed to think that a Russian aggression should not be expected before all the members of the western coalition had ample time to reorganize the 60 divisions which General Eisenhower considers sufficient to repel a Soviet attack.

Because of political considerations, and in deference to the diplomats of the Western European alliance, the fact that there are today no less than 31 fully trained Spanish, Yugoslav, Greek, and Turkish divisions, which need only some supplemental military equipment—tanks, self-propelled guns, radar, and motorized transport—was touched on only gently. The military men, under insistent questioning by Senators RUSSELL, BYRD, HICKENLOOPER, and KNOWLAND, admitted that this represented a real force, which should be incorporated at the earliest possible moment in the defenses of free Europe.

But it was former Governor Harold Stassen who expressed diplomatic thinking abroad when he said, "We must not put the cart before the horse." He suggested that the members of the Atlantic Pact must be fully organized—and additional American divisions must be on European soil—before the Mediterranean countries, with a far larger number of organized forces than the Atlantic nations, can be accepted into the western coalition.

The word "isolationist" was used liberally although neither Senator WHERRY, sponsor of the much-discussed resolution, nor his supporters think, even vaguely, in terms of abandoning Europe. The great difference between the Hoover-Wherry point of view and that of their opponents is that the former puts the accent on over-all defense of the world against the Communist drive, leaving out of our plans the nations which do not wish to make sacrifices proportionate to those we are making.

The critics of Herbert Hoover and Senator WHERRY speak only in terms of Western European defense. They seem to think that so long as the Elbe or Rhine lines can be defended there is no cause of worry for the rest of Europe. It is true that the State Department speaks in general terms of resisting Red aggression against Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, and the Middle East. But for the time being there is no definite political commitment to those countries except for assurances to Greece and Turkey.

The real question—which has been so much overlooked—is whether the 12 countries which belong to this new alliance should keep it as a kind of club, in which one black ball will reject any newcomer, or whether all the peoples on this side of the iron curtain should be asked to join in the common defense.

PROSCRIPTION BY FRENCH GOVERNMENT OF WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, so widespread are the insidious activities of Communist propagandists throughout the world that any action by any government to curb such dangerous activities makes a real contribution to the defense against Communist aggression. It is most gratifying to note the action of the French Government, recently announced, banning the Communist-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions—WFTU—and notifying that organization to close its headquarters in Paris.

Senators will recall, I am sure, the situation that developed back in 1949, when an overwhelming majority of the free and democratic trade-unions of the world, spearheaded by the American Federation of Labor, seceded from the World Federation of Trade Unions because it had become obvious that Soviet Russia was bending every effort to take control of the WFTU for use as a propaganda and organizing instrument among workers throughout the world in its policy of aggressive imperialism.

The headquarters of this enemy to social and world reconstruction was established in Paris but its tentacles spread throughout Europe and its agents were particularly active in Geneva, Switzerland, during the 1949 and 1950 sessions of the International Labor Union, which I was delegated to attend as the representative of the United States Senate.

To combat the tactics of the WFTU the free trade-unions of the world, including our American unions, established in December of 1949 a strong new

international body, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, with headquarters in Brussels. This new confederation represents 50,000,000 workers in approximately 60 countries and in the short time of its existence has become a symbol of the power and influence of the trade-union movement in democratic societies. Today it stands as an effective instrument in the fight for freedom and human dignity and against oppression and slave labor.

While the free and democratic ICFTU has been strengthening the forces of genuine democracy by laying the ground work for the improvement of the living conditions of all workers, particularly those in the underdeveloped areas, the Communist federation has become a mouthpiece and spy center of the Cominform, from which stems the world-wide Communist infiltration activities of Soviet Russia.

The action of the French Government in deciding that France is no place for Communist spies, is another heartening evidence of the reawakened alertness of this great country which has ever been allied with the principles of American freedoms, back even to the days of the Colonies' fight for independence. It is a forward step for which public thanks are due and are hereby expressed to the French Prime Minister, Mr. Pleven, who has been the honored guest of our Nation.

With this step the French Government is following up an earlier dissolution of headquarters of the Seamen and Dockers Department of the WFTU, which for a time was headed by Harry Bridges. This organization had attempted to create unrest on the water fronts against American shipments of goods to Europe, shipments intended to strengthen the Western European nations for the defense of Europe's freedom against totalitarian imperialism and aggression. The Communist Seamen and Dockers Trade Department has moved behind the iron curtain, from Marseille to Gdynia in Poland. We expect the WFTU also to retreat behind the curtain.

The democratic countries have been too patient in the past in permitting the propaganda tools of the Soviet to carry out their destructive work openly and without restraint. The action of the French Government shows not only courage but also foresight and real strength.

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD 11 telegrams which I have received, asking me to support House bill 1, and in opposition to Senate bill 84.

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

FARGO, N. DAK., *February 24, 1951.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 1 better for serviceman. Tremendous savings manpower and expense, certainly the taxpayers are interested in saving fifty million a year. We want your support of H. R. 1.

MILTON F. WEBER,
President, Fargo Association of Life Underwriters.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *February 24, 1951.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request your opposition to S. 84 and your support for H. R. 1 which is better for servicemen. Tremendous saving of taxes and manpower.

C. RAY CULVER, NORMAN GRENZ, RICHARD MUELLER, ART JOB, E. W. PEDERSON, NORMAN SCHULTZ, LYNN J. CULVER, E. A. KELLER.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *February 25, 1951.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support of H. R. 1. Present NSLI plan admittedly unworkable proves futility and extravagance of Government in business.

INSURANCE FEDERATION OF NORTH DAKOTA.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *February 25, 1951.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The entire membership of the North Dakota State Life Underwriters Association urges your support of H. R. 1.

F. A. MCDONNA,
State Secretary.

MINOT, N. DAK., *February 24, 1951.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand House bill 1 now in Senate Finance Committee and giving GI's ten thousand gratuitous insurance may be shelved in Senate committee in favor of NSLI. As a veteran of two World Wars and one who would like to see some semblance of economy in Government I earnestly urge that you use your influence in favor of House bill 1 for our men in uniform and to avoid the appalling waste of Government in business.

J. H. KOHNEN.

MINOT, N. DAK., *February 24, 1951.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please oppose adoption S. 84 and favor adoption H. R. 1 as reported by Senate Finance Committee for the best interests of all disabled veterans.

MINOT CHAPTER, NO. 4, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
E. G. PIERSON, *Adjutant.*

MINOT, N. DAK., *February 24, 1951.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Souris Valley Life Underwriters Association of northwest North Dakota today received word regarding the substitute bill S. 84 in lieu of H. R. 1. We are thoroughly familiar with the gratuity insurance bill and feel that it is a better bill for the servicemen for many reasons. Primarily the tremendous savings in dollars, less manpower, and expense for administration. It provides the protection without sales and educational procedure. The following members who are servicemen and life-insurance men and women ask your support of H. R. 1.

Herbert H. Bertsch, Lyle Witham, Paul Avery, Thomas Fitzmaurice, Alfred Shrirley, Leon J. Hyland, T. H. Luedke, Albert Rageth, H. M. Peterson, M. L. Randall, E. H. Kitchian, Lucas Svingen, J. H. Kohnen, H. R. Larson, E. S. Covell, Helen E. Haas, A. D. Ellis, Duane L. Robinson, Donavan A. Olson, Clarence W. Hall, Milton F. Breding, John J. Billstein, A. A. Ramstad, Thora M. Ramstad.

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *February 24, 1951.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your support H. R. 1, not S. 84. H. R. 1 saves manpower and expense, better for servicemen.

C. A. West, W. C. Weaver, A. C. Ulseth, O. L. Ugland, R. R. Truebloo, L. C. Thompson, Al Strand, W. E. Pond, Cy Meuller, Earl McFadden, M. B. Lester, M. C. Klabo, D. H. Jones, V C. Jeffrey, J. Ingwaldson, G. O. Hanson, G. E. Hanson, W. O. Greenleaf, A. B. Dill, H. O. Christenson, Ed Boe, Pearl Bohnen, H. J. Bergeth, H. C. Barnes, L. L. Arnold, F. L. Benson, P. M. Onstad, R. F. Reiton.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *February 25, 1951.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support H. R. 1 instead S. 84 introduced by committee.

W. E. ARENSTEIN,
H. J. SCHWANDT.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *February 25, 1951.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Membership Missouri Slope Life Underwriters unanimously favor H. R. 1 over S. 84.

W. E. ARENSTEIN,
Secretary.

FARGO, N. DAK., *February 24, 1951.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We favor H. R. 1 instead of S. 84.

A. W. CRARY AGENCY,
A. W. CRARY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the unfinished business, House bill 1, the Senator from Georgia has offered an amendment by way of a substitute, which is now the pending question. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That any person in the active military or naval service, or reporting for such active service under orders of competent authority, who, on or after June 27, 1950, and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this act, while in such service, or while reporting under orders for such service, dies, or has died, in line of duty, shall be deemed to have applied for and to

have been granted national service life insurance in the amount of $10,000, and such insurance shall be deemed to be or to have been continued in force to the date of death of such person: *Provided*, That the amount of insurance herein granted, when added to any other insurance in force under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, shall not in the aggregate exceed $10,000: *Provided further*, That the insurance herein granted shall be payable in 240 equal monthly installments, with interest at 3 percent per annum, to the following beneficiaries and in the order named:

(A) To the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unremarried;

(B) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares;

(C) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a very simple issue is raised by the substitute amendment which I have offered. The Finance Committee reported the bill, H. R. 1, with certain amendments. The bill presents a distinct and definite theory regarding Government life insurance. I have prepared and offered a substitute amendment which sharply raises the issues. If the Senate should approve the substitute amendment, of course, it would go to conference, and the entire issue would be in conference. In the event the matter should go to conference, it would be substantially the same as referring it back to the Finance Committee for further consideration because we would probably wish to look at the bill, H. R. 1, again.

Without noticing certain minor features of House bill 1, which may of themselves be important, the bill is intended to do one thing, namely, to take the Government out of the insurance business so far as permitting issuance of further Government insurance. In other words, it is intended that there shall be no more national service life insurance issued to any veteran, in the event the bill, H. R. 1, is passed, with one single exception, namely, that if the veteran has a service-connected disability which disqualifies him for insurance in the ordinary private life-insurance companies of the country, then he may obtain national service life insurance.

That is what the bill, H. R. 1, is intended to do. It is intended to draw the line sharply, and to say that, after the passage of the bill, there shall be no more national service life insurance issued. The substitute which I have offered does not do that. The bill, H. R. 1, does something else, of course; and there are other features, but they are not so much in controversy. It does give indemnity insurance of $10,000 to every person who enters the service after June 27, 1950, which was approximately the date of the outbreak of the Korean war.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield, though I should like to make my statement contrasting the proposed substitute and the bill, H. R. 1.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. The question I wanted to ask would, I think, tend to bring out a point which at least impressed me as to the purpose of the bill, H. R. 1, as it came from the House. The chairman of the Finance Committee stated that the purpose was to eliminate, after a certain date, policies which had been carried by the Government for national life insurance; but, to me, the main purpose was to give to each man who entered the service a free $10,000 policy, during all the time he was in service, and extending for 120 days thereafter. To me, that was the main purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. I was simply trying to contrast what I was offering in my substitute, and the bill, H. R. 1. I may say that I did not offer the substitute on behalf of the committee. I wish that understood. The committee, as a whole, has not approved the substitute.

The bill, H. R. 1, provides a gratuitous indemnity in the amount of $10,000 to the survivors of all men who lose their lives in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950, without cost to the serviceman.

In addition, the man, upon discharge, will be protected for a period of 120 days in order to permit him to readjust to civilian life and determine the sort of insurance protection he wishes to obtain from commercial sources.

Beneficiaries are limited to the immediate family of the serviceman, and the indemnity is payable only in monthly installments of $92.90 over a 10-year period.

Any man unable to obtain commercial insurance after discharge at standard rates because of service-connected disability will be eligible to carry a national service life insurance policy. In addition, a man having total service-connected disability will have his premiums waived. Veterans with disability must apply for this type of insurance within 1 year from the date service connection of such disability is determined by the Veterans' Administration.

Veterans having World War I and World War II insurance may maintain such insurance if they are recalled to active duty, or they may avail themselves of the gratuitous insurance. The bill as it passed the House provided for the surrender of permanent-type insurance at cash-surrender value, and the reinstatement within 90 days after separation from active service, without medical examination, upon repayment of the cash-surrender value and required reserve. The House bill also provided reinstatement rights on 5-year level premium term insurance policies upon evidence of good health and attained age.

The Senate Finance Committee has modified the bill in certain respects, but it is not necessary for me to discuss those modifications now, since I am offering the substitute.

The substitute departs from the bill as it passed the House in one important respect. It protects the veteran who went into the service, and those who, in response to competent authority, were proceeding to enter service, if death occur at any time after the 27th day of June 1950, or within 120 days after the enactment of the pending measure, if it shall be passed and signed.

Mr. President, it will be seen at once that so far as concerns the benefit to soldiers who are or have been killed as a result of the action in Korea, their beneficiaries will receive $10,000, under the bill as it passed the House, or under the substitute I am offering.

However, the House has prohibited the issuing of any further national service life insurance policies after the effective date fixed in the bill. The substitute which I have offered does not cut out further national service life insurance. It permits the veteran to buy national service life insurance while he is in the service.

Mr. President, I myself have not felt that we should discontinue the national service life insurance for veterans, and in this view several other members of the Finance Committee concurred, particularly the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who reserved the right to offer a substitute, as the chairman of the committee did. There is much sentiment in the country for the discontinuance of the national service life insurance issued to veterans by the Government. Very naturally, the insurance underwriters would like to have such insurance discontinued by the Government, and I do not make the slightest criticism of them for that position.

The simple purpose in offering the substitute is to give the Senate opportunity to decide between the discontinuance of the national service life insurance or the continuance of Government insurance to veterans, substantially as they have had their insurance rights preserved. They commenced in World War I and were preserved through World War II.

If it were possible at this time to eliminate entirely the Federal insurance system we would have one picture; but that is not possible. So the House proposal, it seems to me, merely adds this gratuitous indemnity, and takes away from the veterans for the future the right to obtain Government insurance, but does not and cannot terminate, for two generations at least, the national service life insurance.

Mr. President, at the end of November there were outstanding 478,403 policies—nearly half a million—held by World War I veterans. The amount of such insurance held by World War I veterans was $2,089,401,196 as of November 30, 1950. As of January 1, 1951, there were 5,963,760 policies held by veterans of World War II. The amount of insurance held by those veterans under these policies is $38,836,174,000. So the total number of policies in force at this time, including Government life insurance, war risk insurance, and national service life insurance, is 6,442,163, and the total amount of insurance in force at this time under these policies is $40,925,575,196.

It is obvious, therefore, that while there might be some saving in administrative costs if we discontinued for the future the war risk insurance and the

national service life insurance for all veterans, the Government has no honorable way to proceed except by the administration of the act to protect the nearly 6,500,000 policyholders.

Some of these policyholders, however, will of course enter into the Korean war, and might surrender their policies and take this gratuitous indemnity; but it is not very likely. In fact, I am advised that of the soldiers who entered the service since the beginning of the Korean hostilities, that is, from October 1950 to January 1951, more than 118,000 have applied for and have taken insurance, as they have a right to do under existing law.

Therefore, Mr. President, whatever may be said about economy—and I am as strong for economy as any other Senator can be—it is obvious that the Federal Government cannot honorably discharge its obligations to nearly 6,500,000 veterans of World Wars I and II without maintaining the Federal Government's insurance system. That being so, it seems to me that it would be better to give gratuitous insurance, without any cost whatever, to servicemen who have been killed or who may be killed in the Korean war. That is what the substitute would accomplish. It would not interfere with the insurance system which is now in existence. It would not defeat the right of a veteran to take out national service life insurance in service and continue to carry it. It would continue the law as it is, with the single exception:

> That any person in the active military or naval service, or reporting for such active service under orders of competent authority who, on or after June 27, 1950, and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this act, while in such service, or while reporting under orders for such service, dies, or has died, in line of duty, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted national service life insurance in the amount of $10,000 and such insurance shall be deemed to be or to have been continued in force to the date of death of such person.

Without reading further, the other provisions simply designate the beneficiaries, very much as is provided in the existing law.

Mr. President, I wish it to be understood that I do not regard the Committee on Finance as being bound by the provisions of the substitute. On the contrary, the Committee on Finance is entirely free to disagree with the substitute, in which event we would proceed further with the consideration of H. R. 1. But I think it would be well to have the judgment of the Senate expressed on the clear-cut issue of whether we wish to discontinue the Government's past program of insurance for its veterans. For that reason I am offering the substitute at this time, so that we may have a vote of the Senate on the issue.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to support the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia. The situation is fairly complicated. The House has passed H. R. 1, which represents a complete revolution in the entire national life insurance program. It changes the program in this way: It provides that every man coming into the service shall get life insurance while he is in the service, without paying anything for it, but when he leaves the service he is through; he can not have the advantage of continuing the insurance, or of being able to convert it into various other types of insurance, which is an advantage enjoyed by the veterans of World War II. So that the serviceman would get something and would lose something. Perhaps it would be cheaper for the Government if we passed H. R. 1, and I have no great objection to the principle involved. However, in the first place, it seems to me that we would be making a change without at least having considered the implications involved.

I feel very strongly that probably eventually the soldiers in Korea will have granted to them the same conversion rights which were granted to the veterans of the Second World War. In that case the Government would have all the obligations, but without benefit of the premiums which would otherwise be paid under the present system. Therefore I doubt very much that it would save the Government any money in the long run. Certainly it would not in the event of another war.

I do not believe that the advantage which is seen in H. R. 1 by the insurance companies, for instance, or by those who feel it would save the Government some money would be a permanent advantage. H. R. 1 does have the advantage of putting everybody in, so to speak, so that a man who neglects to take out insurance gets the insurance anyway. That is certainly an advantage. It may be that we wish to do something of that kind. Under S. 84 we would do it for the servicemen in Korea. We are not determining what we will do for others beyond the 120 days after the passage of the act. We do not know what we will do.

The result of passing S. 84, or the George substitute, would be to send the bill to conference, where, without question, the Members of the House, who have been very much interested in H. R. 1, will press upon us the necessity of accepting H. R. 1. Perhaps a compromise could be worked out. If so, I feel we could come back to the Senate, present the question frankly, and determine what the Senate wishes to have done. At times I have thought it would be better to recommit the whole question to the Committee on Finance so that it could consider it again. In such event we would not have the advantage of knowing why the House believes H. R. 1 to be an improvement over the existing system. Passing S. 84 would bring about a conference, in which the whole question would come under consideration. In such conference we could yield to the House, but we could also present our arguments with respect to S. 84.

Perhaps it would be practical to give a man who went into the military service the option of taking out insurance without paying premiums, or of paying adequate premiums for it, with the right to continue it after he leaves the service, and to convert it, as a veteran of World War II is able to do. I think the latter course would perhaps be less subject to future pressure, although I do not know. Perhaps other compromises could be worked out at the present time. The insurance people are for it. The Veterans of Foreign Wars are for it. I think the AMVETS and the Disabled Veterans are for it. The American Legion, on the other hand, is very much opposed to it. They have the best means, with their committees, of making the most complete study of the whole subject of national insurance of any national service organization.

It seems to me that we should not pass H. R. 1 at this time, but should adopt the substitute and pass the bill in that form. In that way we would take care of the immediate emergency. When the boys were sent to Korea they did not know how serious the situation would become. The question of insurance was not put up to them in the light of the fact that we were going into what is really a war. Consequently, I think it would be fair to extend free insurance to them, as proposed by the substitute. It would be understood that they had made application for it up to 120 days after the passage of the act, at which time they would have to begin to pay premiums. It seems to me it would be the best way of taking care of the present situation.

If the bill is sent to conference, I can say that those of us who will be on the conference committee will try to work out the best possible solution of what is an extremely complicated situation. I should like to see all Senators who are interested in the question agree on one solution of the problem.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak for less than 5 minutes to a point of personal privilege.

Mr. President, I recently received a post card from San Francisco which was signed by Ed Guerin. Unfortunately Mr. Guerin did not provide a return address.

Mr. Guerin took me seriously to task for being an abuser of a senatorial privilege. He said:

> With your time in the Senate almost exclusively given to calling for Government economy it might be well to call your attention to Scripps-Howard writer, Daniel, article of the 16th, wherein he states that you are one of the chief beneficiaries of the "telegraph racket," and that a $1,400 political campaign by telegraph by yourself had recently been disallowed as being entirely too raw. How about it?

It goes without saying that I wanted first to read the Daniel article and second that I wanted to provide Mr. Guerin with the facts involved.

I have secured the article by James Daniel, Scripps-Howard writer, which appeared in a San Francisco newspaper on January 16. The article had been written and forwarded from Washington, D. C., the day before. The article, which I shall offer to the RECORD in its

entirety, carries this concluding sentence:

Senator CAIN, an advocate of Government economy, was disallowed $1,400 in telegrams sent to GOP party workers last year.

It is good to be able to say, Mr. President, that there is not a single word of truth in this sentence, insofar as it refers to a disallowed claim.

How accurate any other portion of the news story is I am not qualified to say.

After reading the Daniel article I managed to talk with him by telephone. This conversation was pleasant and Mr. Daniel appeared to be without personal prejudice to me. I inquired if he would like to provide me with the source of his information. He said he would rather not do that because the individual was favorably known to him and considered by him to be a responsible person. Mr. Daniel agreed to come by my office so that we might get acquainted and so that I might be given a perfectly proper opportunity to convince him that while his informant might be generally reliable and accurate, he was completely unreliable and inaccurate in his reference to me.

The only reason I have bothered to express myself on this question is that I expect to be happily engaged in 1952 with things political and I have no wish to be required at that time to respond to allegations which were created out of fancy and nonsense.

I came to the Senate in 1946. At no time has any telegraph or any other claim of mine been disallowed by the Rules Committee or by any other committee of the Senate. I am guided by the rules of the Senate and will continue to live and be guided by those rules.

For the information of Mr. Daniel and his informant I am quite willing to say that I spent something more than $300 in 1950 to encourage and assist my Republican associates and friends in Washington State. These charges, however, were assessed against me, and not against the Rules Commitee of the Senate. I wish that I might have been able to spend more for the benefit of a cause and a party which I hold in high regard.

I enjoyed my conversation with Mr. Daniel. In talking with him I even chuckled, because as I pointed out to him I can get in ample trouble because of things I actually do. This was to say that no purpose is served in being charged with derelictions which are completely contrary to the facts.

The only request I make of Mr. Daniel, or any other writer is that he check his information before offering a story under his by-line. But this request in itself creates a dilemma. Many a news story would never be written if the author made certain to establish his information as being a fact. I can appreciate that the demands for copy sometimes require the writer, without verification, piously to hope that he is right in what he writes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Daniel article in its entirety be made a part of my remarks at this point.

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

SENATORS HIT ON TELEGRAMS—SOME CHARGED WITH ABUSING PRIVILEGE

(By James Daniel)

WASHINGTON, January 15.—The Senate Rules Committee is threatening to crack down on some Senators who have been abusing their privilege of sending telegrams at Government expense.

Unless Western Union bills decline, the committee has informed the Senate membership, consideration will be given to abolishing a choice privilege—telegraphing texts of their speeches at Government expense to newspapers and radio stations. Often the bill for telegraphing one speech has exceeded $1,000, the committee said.

Currently, Congress operates under a double standard.

LIMITS ON HOUSE

House Members are limited to $500 a year for their official telegrams and long distance calls, regardless of the size of their district or the distance from Washington.

The Senators have no limit. They are permitted to run up any size bill, as long as certain rules are observed. When the rules are violated, they get into an argument with the Rules Committee.

The last Senate tabulation was made in 1948. Then it was found that Senators' Government-paid telegrams were costing more than $340,000 a year—about $3,500 per Senator. This compared with $183,000 a year in 1940.

In the final months of 1950, the Senate's telegraph bills began to grow alarmingly. The Rules Committee checked and found that the increase was partly in response to a much greater volume of correspondence with the voters. But some Senators appeared to have no excuse.

FORM LETTER SENT

So, a few days ago the committee had the Sergeant at Arms send a form letter to all Senators.

The letter reminds them that it is forbidden to send personal telegrams or telegrams of congratulation and condolence. This is aimed at Senators who habitually wire greetings to the parents of new-born constituents and regrets to the survivors of those who have died.

Furthermore, the Senators were requested to restrain themselves in the matter of sending out form telegrams acknowledging receipt of advice on pending legislation. The form, or multiple-address telegrams are limited to 150 in 1 month for a Senator representing up to 3,000,000 persons, 300 for a Senator whose State has up to 6,000,000 persons, and 450 for Senators from larger States.

The Rules Committee has not singled out any Senator as Western Union's best customer, but three are acknowledged by their colleagues to be well up in the running.

THREE NAMED

One of these, Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, telegraphed a two-page news story to Washington correspondents this week on how he had told the Senate that if he were an Asiatic slave of European colonialism he, too, would turn Communist. The point was made in belaboring the Marshall plan.

Senators WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, and HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, of Washington, rank with Mr. MALONE. Senator CAIN, an advocate of Government economy, was disallowed $1,400 in telegram sent to GOP party workers last year.

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITY ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], a question.

If his substitute were enacted, what would be the status of the serviceman who is disabled and has no national service life insurance? Could he apply, and what would be the health requirements under the act? If a serviceman had no insurance status, could he apply, and what would be the health requirements?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, under the substitute which I am offering, the serviceman could buy insurance while he was in the service, or within 120 days after the passage of the act. Of course, if he were totally disabled he would be compensated for his disability.

Mr. THYE. He would be compensated. However, the family would not have the protection which it would have if he had the service insurance.

Mr. GEORGE. No; not unless he had taken the insurance.

Mr. THYE. That is the question which arises in my mind.

Mr. GEORGE. He is automatically given the insurance, and it is automatically continued for 120 days after the passage of the act, during which time he may take insurance if he wishes to take it. He may buy it at any time.

Mr. THYE. I will say to the able chairman that personally I think his substitute is the better of the two insurance proposals. Over the week end I have received a telegram from the national American Legion commander, wherein he expresses the sincere hope that the substitute offered by the able chairman will be the measure which will receive favorable consideration. I shall certainly support the substitute proposal.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on the 19th of December Frank Edwards, the well-known commentator, over a Nationwide hook-up spoke about House bill 1. Up to that time I had received very few telegrams or letters in that connection. Immediately afterward I began to be flooded with letters and telegrams from veterans all over the Northwest, particularly from North and South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota. I therefore wrote to Mr. Edwards. I should like to quote a portion of his broadcast. He said:

Yesterday the House approved and sent to the Senate one of the neatest pieces of deception in many months. It was bill which is being widely publicized as a generous gesture to give the members of the Armed Forces a free $10,000 life-insurance policy.

The League Reporter, out tomorrow, will expose the scheme by which the Nation's big insurance companies are endeavoring to outmaneuver the boys in the Armed Forces. It works like this:

This bill which the House passed yesterday is a cleverly designed piece of bait. It would give all servicemen a free $10,000 pol-

icy, payable in case of death. So far so good—but that isn't the whole story.

As introduced this GI insurance scheme would play right into the hands of the big private insurance companies. For under this proposal a serviceman's insurance is void the minute he leaves the service—and he must then protect himself and his heirs by purchasing much costlier policies from the private companies. He has not only given his youth and perhaps his health to fighting a war, but he has also aged during the process and must pay the premium for his higher aged group.

Some of the veterans' organizations apparently misunderstood the real significance of the insurance bill. The League Reporter makes it plain that it is a device to destroy the GI insurance program by replacing it with a plan which would enable the insurance companies to profit at the expense of the veterans.

Mr. President, thereafter I received a copy of the League Reporter to which Mr. Edwards refers. It contains an editorial which I read, as follows:

VETERANS' INSURANCE GRAB

The big insurance companies are trying to profit at the expense of war veterans.

They are trying to ram through Congress a bill making it impossible to sell national service life insurance—GI insurance—to ex-servicemen. This would apply even to those who suffer disabilities in civilian life that would prevent them from buying commercial policies.

In other words, after a soldier, sailor, or marine is discharged from the Armed Forces, he would have to buy insurance from a private commercial company. He couldn't convert insurance he paid for in the service to a civilian-type policy.

The private firms want Uncle Sam to give all servicemen free coverage of $10,000 in death benefits. They try to argue that the taxpayers are burdened unduly by GI insurance.

But most of the costs of GI insurance are paid for by the men themselves, not by the Government—so that argument falls flat on its hypocritical face.

The House has passed a bill cut along the lines specified by the big insurance companies who own $63,000,000,000 in assets. It was introduced by Dixiecrat JOHN RANKIN (Mississippi).

Whether it will pass the Senate depends in large measure on whether veterans, and friends of veterans, write to their Senators protesting the attempted grab.

At the same time, I saw an article published in the Washington Daily News of January 4, 1951, written by Douglas Larson. The headline is "Bill threatens insurance rights of 10,000,000 vets." The article is as follows:

An estimated 10,000,000 World War II veterans are in danger of losing their GI insurance rights.

This threat is contained in a bill which was passed by the House during the final special session of the Eighty-first Congress. Although it didn't pass the Senate, it is all set for quick passage by the new Eighty-second Congress.

The bill also marks a sharp cut-back from the World War II standard in the amount of benefits to be given many Korean vets and all future veterans.

FREE IN UNIFORM

It would give a free $10,000 policy to every man in service. And it would permit every veteran who had been made uninsurable by his service to buy a nonparticipating GI policy for the future.

But it would not permit the vast majority of veterans to hang onto their Government insurance after they get out of service. Veterans organizations consider GI insurance, after service, to be one of the most valuable benefits which Uncle Sam has provided. This benefit has also been used as a prime recruiting argument by the services.

I may say that after I read this article I called up some of my American Legion friends, and they corroborated exactly what the article says. I continue reading from Mr. Larsen's article:

The most serious impact of the bill, however, would be on the estimated 10,000,000 World War II veterans whose GI policies have expired, but who have the right under present law to get new GI policies in the future. The bill which passed the House before Christmas eliminates that right by prohibiting the issuance of any more national service life insurance policies.

WANT TO RETURN

It is the opinion of most insurance experts of the veterans' organizations that the great majority of GI's who dropped their policies when they got out of service did so with the express plan of getting new GI policies sometime in the future when they could better afford it.

Also in doubt in the House-passed bill is the future of the policies which have been kept in force but which haven't been converted to a permanent plan. There is some opinion that the bill would also eliminate that choice by GI policyholders.

Main supporters of the bill are the Bureau of the Budget and groups of private insurance company executives. It is the theory of budget officials that giving the men policies, without charging premiums, would eliminate much of the costly administrative problems which were involved in NSLI. And it would help take the Government out of the insurance business inasmuch as the men would lose their policies as soon as they were discharged.

LEGION ANSWER

In answer to this, an American Legion spokesman points out that a record would have to be kept of the date every man left service. There would be costly litigation for the men who claimed that they were rendered uninsurable by service. There would have to be machinery to pay beneficiaries the $10,000 which would be spread over 10 years.

And further, opponents of the new bill point out, the so-called free insurance isn't insurance at all. It's simply a death gratuity and does not provide the same protections and benefits of true life insurance.

It has always been the opinion of many private insurance executives that GI insurance has been an unwise thing. They think Uncle Sam should not be in the insurance business at all.

WIN THEIR POINT

Under the new bill, these executives would win an important point. While the men are in service they would have free protection. But as soon as they got out they would have to buy insurance from a private company if they wanted it.

The insurance experts of the veterans organizations hope some compromise will be worked out. They are for the free insurance while the men are in service, which would also be given the survivors of the Korean dead. And they might go along with having insurance end with a man's discharge. But they hope that the 10,000,000 veterans who have been thinking they could get a new GI policy any time they wanted it will not be cheated out of this right.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said some saving may result from adoption of the pending bill. In that connection I wish to say that I secured from the Senate Appropriations Committee the amount of money that had been appropriated since World War II which has been given to other countries, including veterans of the other countries. The sum total is $36,554,873,729. I ask unanimous consent that the compilation prepared by the secretary of the Senate Appropriations Committee may be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Gross foreign aid (grants and credits) postwar period, July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1950	$28, 055, 000, 000
ECA appropriation, 1951	2, 250, 000, 000
Plus loan authorization	62, 500, 000
Assistance to the Republic of Korea, fiscal year 1951	90, 000, 000
International development, 1951	26, 900, 000
Mutual defense assistance, 1951	5, 678, 023, 729
Government and relief in occupied areas, 1951	288, 000, 000
Government in occupied areas of Germany	27, 000, 000
Aid to Palestine refugees	27, 450, 000
Assistance to Korea (deficiency appropriation in Public Law 583, 81st Cong., 2d sess., approved June 29, 1950)	50, 000, 000
Total	36, 554, 873, 729

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is my understanding from talking with some of the ex-servicemen who are competent, and who have made an investigation, that the total amount of saving resulting if the bill is adopted, would be only in the neighborhood of $800,000,000. I take it from what my distinguished friend the Senator from Georgia, said it might be even less. But assuming it is $800,000,000, I would compare that amount with the billions upon billions of dollars we have given to other countries, including veterans in those countries. If we should pass House bill 1, and reject the substitute, Senate bill 84, which I certainly am supporting, we would not be treating our veterans fairly. I might add that when H. R. 1 was reported from the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] prepared an amendment which he intended to offer, and which as I understand has been offered. I too prepared an amendment which is printed and lying on the desk.

In my opinion, however, Senate bill 84 takes care of both the amendment of the junior Senator from New York and the amendment of the senior Senator from North Dakota.

In fairness, I have today placed in the RECORD the nine telegrams I received from individuals who are life-insurance agents of my State, some of whom are officers of life-insurance companies, so that the Senate as a whole might have

the benefit of both sides of the argument. But frankly, as I see it, it is a choice of whether we are going to help a group of private insurance companies which already have a surplus of some $63,000,000,000, or whether we are going to support our veterans who offered their lives in wars gone by and who are now fighting in Korea. Therefore I am supporting the substitute, Senate bill 84.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair.) The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. *Provided further,* That the first sentence of section 602 (m) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) In any case in which the insured provided for the payment of premiums on his life insurance by authorizing in writing the deduction of premiums from his service pay, such insurance shall be deemed not to have lapsed or not to have been forfeited because of desertion under section 612, so long as he remained in active service prior to the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1946, notwithstanding the fact that deduction of premiums was discontinued because—

"(A) the insured was discharged to accept a commission; or

"(B) the insured was absent without leave, if restored to active duty; or

"(C) the insured was sentenced by court martial, if he was restored to active duty, required to engage in combat, or killed in combat."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to correct an apparent injustice which was suffered by the families of some half-dozen servicemen in World World II. I am not sure about the number, but I understand it is about six. To illustrate what I am trying to do, I wish to use the authentic case of a young boy who enlisted in the Marines on May 28, 1943. A week later he took out his insurance. Shortly after that he decided he did not like the Marines, and went home; and some 3 months later he was picked up, returned, court martialed, sentenced to 2 years imprisonment and a dishonorable discharge. The service cut down the sentence to 1 year and a bad-conduct discharge. They further cut it down by saying that after 6 months' time had been served he could then be restored to the service, and at the end of 6 months more of satisfactory service he would be restored to full honorable status.

He did reenter the service at the end of 6 months. He served not only 6 months, but 8½ months, and then was killed at Iwo Jima. Undoubtedly he was unaware of the fact that his insurance had lapsed or was not restored when he reentered the service. In fact, the Navy had not taken the steps it should have taken at the end of 6 months to correct his record on the books to that of an honorable status; but the young man was killed. It appears that toward the end of his service the premiums had not been paid, probably without his knowledge.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand the Senator's amendment, all it does is in respect to the forfeiture section of the bill. The amendment provides that a policy shall not be forfeited under section 612, if for desertion.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The amendment does not cover munity, treason, or spying.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; and such a policy will be payable, under the amendment, only in the event the soldier who did desert, thereafter re-entered the service and was killed in the service, in line of duty. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I would say that the mother of this young man was able, with the help of friends and neighbors, to pay the back premiums to the Veterans' Administration. In the meantime, Congress had amended the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940. This matter is covered in Report No. 1705 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. That action was taken in June, as I recall. At that time Congress undoubtedly thought it was taking care of cases of this sort.

The chief of the Life Insurance Claims Division of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. F. B. Simms, notified the widowed mother, who was very poor, in a letter from which I shall read, although I shall not state her name, for obvious reasons:

It has now been established that the insurance granted your son was in full force and effect at the date of his death, and that you are entitled to the proceeds thereof. Your Claim Form 355 is of record; however, it will be necessary that you indicate on the enclosed Form 1501, Election of Mode of Payment, the manner in which you desire payments made to you.

Appropriate action will be taken to settle this insurance as soon as Form 1501 is received.

So the Veterans' Administration notified her that everything was in order and that she would receive the money. However, the top flight of the Veterans' Administration placed a different interpretation upon the act of Congress than the Congress itself had done, as set forth in the report of the Senate committee to this body. The report made it very plain that cases of this kind were expected to be covered; but the top flight of the Veterans' Administration placed a different interpretation upon the law, and denied payment of the insurance to this widowed mother.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Did the Senator state the number of cases to which the amendment would apply?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand there are about six. I notice that in a letter to the Senator from Georgia, the Veterans' Administration states that the amount involved in this connection will not be large; and I understand that there are approximately half a dozen cases of this sort.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment would apply to a relatively small number of cases, in any event. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, to a very small number of cases, in any event.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference. Of course, I do not know whether the conferees on the part of the House will be disposed to accept the amendment. I understand that a bill to correct the situation has been introduced in the House of Representatives.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; I think a bill to correct this situation was introduced and was reported last year. However, if House bill 1 and the substitute which has been introduced by the Senator from Georgia are going to go to conference, it seems to me that there never will be a better time to correct this injustice, which both the Senate and the House of Representatives in times past have indicated they wish to have corrected.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would have no objection to having this matter go to conference. The claim the Senator has discussed seems to be a very just one.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the attitude of the chairman of the Finance Committee. Of course, the number of cases involved in this connection is so small that this situation does not attract much attention; it is almost too small to be bothered with. However, I believe that action of this kind has been supported by the three major service organizations, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am greatly interested in this proposed legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York is about to offer another amendment, may we take action now on the amendment I have submitted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York wish to speak on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection whatsoever to the amendment. However, I wish to speak in support of Senate bill 84.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from New York in a moment.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very deeply interested in the pending legislation, for I introduced an amendment to H. R. 1, which has roughly the same effect as the pending proposal by Senator GEORGE. Indeed, at the time I stated that I would be very glad to support S. 84, as introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Although S. 84 does not go quite as far as does the amendment I submitted, yet in its salient features, it meets the requirements I have set forth.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am glad to support the pending substitute. If that does not prevail, of course I shall call up my amendment. It would be my hope that the chairman of the Finance Committee would be willing to take my amendment with him to conference, so that if the provisions of his bill do not prevail in the conference, the provisions of my amendment can be discussed and included in the consideration.

I hope that the amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, an amendment which I think has considerable merit in many ways, will also be taken into consideration by the conferees.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the substitute is approved, I do not think it will be necessary to have the Senator's amendment go to conference. If the substitute is not approved, then it would be very proper to attach the Senator's amendment.

I may say to the Senator that if the substitute is approved and goes to conference, before we take a step which would depart from the purpose of the Senator's amendment and the purpose of the substitute, both of which in their main features, at least, are identical, the matter would be brought back here, with opportunity being afforded to offer such amendment as might be desired. In fact, I think we would then take the substitute back to the Finance Committee, if we were unable to obtain agreement with the House of Representatives for a further hearing, in which event the Senator's amendment, of course, would be in order.

So far as I am concerned, I would have no objection to the amendment, because it is in harmony with my own belief in regard to what should be done with this bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator, and I support Senate bill 84 with a great deal of satisfaction. I feel that if we should pass House bill 1, which would take away from the men in the armed services the protection which was given to those who fought in World War I and the men and women who fought in World War II, we would be depriving them of a very real benefit. Certainly we would not be justified in so doing.

There has been much argument to the effect that passage of House bill 1 would be an economy measure, that it would save the Government substantial sums of money. I think I am safe in saying that today no one in this Chamber is more anxious than I to effect economies, in order that defense needs and the other urgent needs of the Government may be met on a pay-as-you-go basis. But I do not believe that passage of House bill 1 would result in very substantial economies; certainly not in the early future.

In the first place national service life insurance is substantially self-sustaining. The premiums are sufficient to pay the cost of the insurance in most particulars, except the cost of administration. In the second place, the bill does not provide for winding up the affairs of the national life insurance, because, as has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, there are still in force about 6,500,000 policies which were taken out during the course of World War I and World War II. We would have neither legal nor moral right to cancel those contracts, or even to amend them or to change their provisions. So, it is perfectly evident that for a very long period—a period possibly as long as 50 or 60 years—we will still have to keep up the administrative machinery to service the policies which are in force during that long period of time. So, the only additional cost of continuing this life insurance would be, as I have pointed out, the cost of administration; and that could not be on a very substantial scale, because the machinery already exists, and will have to be continued for 40, or 50 or 60 years in order to service the existing policies.

I know there has been opposition to continuance of national life insurance. I know that the life insurance companies, of course, have been very critical of it, and have been very much in favor of the passage of H. R. 1. I give them credit for good faith, but there is no doubt that by the passage of H. R. 1, without the features which appear in Senate bill 84 and in my amendment to H. R. 1, the life insurance companies would get rid of the competition of NSLI. I see no reason why they should be concerned over the fact that a substantial number of young men and women would be covered by national war life insurance, because I think there is a direct advantage to the insurance companies by reason of the education-in-insurance which this large number of young men and women receive in taking out national service life insurance.

A careful survey of the situation would disclose, I think, that a very substantial number of men who are covered by national service life insurance in amounts varying from $1,000 to $10,000—and, after all, the limit is $10,000—have later, because of the experience they have had with the national service life insurance, taken out substantially larger insurance coverage in the commercial insurance companies. I know that was the experience in my own case. I still am covered by insurance of World War I, but, because I had that insurance, I studied the whole insurance problem and the protection which comes from it, and in later years I was very glad to take out very substantial coverage in the commercial insurance companies. That is exactly the experience which my son and daughter have had, both of whom were covered in World War II by insurance.

One of the chief differences between Senate bill 84 and H. R. 1, as amended by my amendment, is in the treatment accorded disabled veterans. I should like very much to see better treatment accorded to disabled veterans. I would assume, however, that if Senate bill 84 were adopted as an amendment, the conferees could take care of the disabled veterans. I would certainly favor that. As I recall that point was raised by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I have no doubt, from what has been said on the floor by the Senator from Georgia, that he intends to take that matter to conference and to see that disabled veterans who would not be covered under Senate bill 84, but who would be covered under H. R. 1, will be cared for.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. LEHMAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. THYE. Is it not a fact that, in the event a soldier had been disabled at a time too early to permit him to qualify, he could not in any case pass an examination which would permit him to take out insurance with an old line insurance company. We must, therefore, protect that veteran in every conceivable manner, so that, if so much time has elapsed that he is not able to qualify or could not qualify, we may make certain that he is eligible for insurance?

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator, and I fully agree with him. It seems to me that the only point at which H. R. 1 has some superiority over the substitute S. 84, offered by the Senator from Georgia, is in the protection it gives to disabled veterans. But I have no doubt whatever that if we adopt Senate bill 84 as an amendment, the matter will be taken up in conference, and the protection will be afforded to the disabled veteran.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield, gladly.

Mr. THYE. With respect to the amendment offered by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], it occurs to me that, while it possibly involves but a few veterans, yet, to a veteran or a veteran's family to whom it does apply, it as important as if it were applicable to a million men or their families, because it is that one family which is affected, and it will suffer great hardship unless it is protected, as it should be, as in the case of any other veteran. So while the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, in my opinion, may affect only five or six families, yet to the families to whom it would apply it is of supreme importance. Therefore, as we examine this entire question, and as the conferees sit down to draft the final wording of the bill, if we bear in mind those specific instances, and cases similar to those metioned by the Senator from Vermont, we shall then make certain that no individual or family will suffer hardship because of the fact that the act is not sufficiently broad to cover all of them. The family of one veteran is as dear to him as is another veteran's family to the other veteran.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that H. R. 1, in providing a free indemnity for the family of any man who is killed during his service in the military forces and in also providing insurance for the man who is disabled, proposes very constructive legislation. The provision that was at one time in effect, namely, that disability must be evidenced within 120 days after discharge, is a very unfortunate one. It is the experience of all of us who have been in touch with such matters that in many cases a service-connected disability does not disclose itself within a period of 100 days. We know that in many cases a service-connected disability may not

show itself for a year or two or even longer. I believe such a man should be insured and I hope that this situation can be taken care of in conference.

Mr. President, a great many complexities have been pointed out in this discussion thus far. There is no doubt that the problem is a complex one, and one which is not easy to work out in perfection in all its details. But I am supporting Senate bill 84, which is offered as a substitute. I urge that the Senate agree to the substitute. I believe that in the present complex situation, we can and should place a great deal of confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Finance who has shown in this matter a great sympathy for the veteran. He is thoroughly familiar with this problem; he wants to help the veteran, and I know that when the bill goes to conference he will urge the fullest protection for the veteran, consistent with the interest of the United States Government and the people of the United States.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I strongly urge the adoption of Senate bill 84 as a substitute for H. R. 1.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, I wish to make a very brief statement regarding House bill 1. The bill was very exhaustively considered by the Senate Committee on Finance. Long hearings were held. It was reported favorably by the committee, and, so far as I know, unanimously. Senate bill 84 was not offered as a substitute for H. R. 1 while I was attending the sessions of the committee.

I believe that for the purpose of the RECORD it should be shown that H. R. 1 emanated from the House of Representatives after a very exhaustive investigation conducted by a special committee entitled "Government Operations Subcommittee," of which Representative PORTER HARDY, Jr., of Virginia, was the chairman. There was submitted a report entitled "Seventh Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments."

Mr. President, this committee went into the subject in great detail, long hearings were held, and the result was the unanimous approval of H. R. 1, which not only passed the House once, but passed the House twice, and the last time came to the Senate and was acted upon by the Senate Committee on Finance, and favorably reported as it now appears before the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss the details of Senate bill 84 and H. R. 1, except merely to call attention to the fact that the proposed legislation was endorsed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS. As has been stated, it provides free insurance of $10,000, without cost to the soldier, on and after June 27, 1950.

When the bill came to the Senate Committee on Finance a number of clarifying amendments were adopted, one of which was offered, as I recall, by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I think his amendment greatly improved H. R. 1 as it passed the House.

H. R. 1 has been endorsed by the President and the Bureau of the Budget. The Comptroller General estimates that the cost to the Government would have been reduced by $587,000,000 if H. R. 1 had been in force between 1940 and 1949.

I realize that the bill as amended will go to conference, and perhaps some solution can be worked out, but let me make the statement that Senate bill 84, as offered by my very distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, for whom I have the greatest affection and respect, and, I may say, love, completely nullifies the philosophy of H. R. 1, destroys the basic principle and basic purposes of H. R. 1. I do not believe there would be any argument about that, so perhaps there is no reason to discuss that point.

For the purpose of the RECORD, because I believe both sides should be shown in the RECORD when the Senate takes action, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted an excerpt from the report of the House committee on this subject, beginning at page 60, under the heading "General observations," and continuing through the heading "Findings," going to the bottom of page 68, which I think gives a very clear reason why the House took the action which was taken by it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

XIII. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

A. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS AND THE CONGRESS

Officials of the Veterans' Administration testified that it is the policy of the now Administrator not to recommend legislation to the Congress. It would appear that those in charge of the executive and administrative operations of a program would be the first to know of defects, deficiencies, ambiguities, and excess cost arising from legislative enactments that could be corrected by amendatory legislation. In the opinion of this subcommittee any executive department or agency which fails to bring such matters to the attention of the Congress immediately upon their discovery in the light of operational experience is not fully discharging its duty. Matters which were disclosed in this subcommittee's hearings, many of which must have been known to the Veterans' Administration for years, if timely brought to the attention of Congress could have been promptly corrected and have resulted in substantial savings and increased efficiency. It is therefore suggested that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs reevaluate his present policy regarding the fiduciary relations inherent in his public office.

B. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NSLI FUND AND THE NSLI APPROPRIATION

As was shown earlier in this report, the two principal sources of NSLI income are from premium payments and transfers from the NSLI appropriations. Charges against premium income, generally speaking, occur only from risk arising from normal civilian hazards; the NSLI appropriation is charged with all risks that the Administrator may determine are traceable to the extra hazards of military duty. Confusion exists in that the incomes from both sources are deposited and commingled in the NSLI trust fund in the Treasury. The picture would be much clearer if the two sources of income were kept in separate accounts.

By so doing, the Government's liabilities could then be appropriated on a fiscal-year basis as they accrue instead of the present method of immediately charging the national debt with large estimated future contingent liabilities. In addition it would protect the interest of the Government in the event the estimated liabilities proved greater than those actually incurred.

Under existing procedures the Government, from the NSLI appropriation, reimburses the NSLI fund for the estimated then value at date of death of all extra-hazard death-claim settlements where the beneficiary chooses a lifetime income settlement option. If the amount initially transferred in the settlement of a specific claim proves to be inadequate, there is no doubt but that the Government at a later date, perhaps 30 or 40 years hence, will be charged with any additional annuity difference.[1] However, if the amount initially estimated to be the then value, in a final analysis, proves excessive, such excessive Government payments will remain in the NSLI fund for eventual disbursement to policyholders in the form of dividends. While any conclusive comment on this point is problematical, this is a clear illustration of what the VA could properly term a "heads I win, tails you lose" proposition.

C. BENEFITS PROVIDED UNDER THE GUISE OF INSURANCE

This report has previously pointed out that, had the deficiency appropriations for annuity differentials and accrued interest been rejected by the Congress, there would still have been more than a sufficient amount to have met all obligations without at any time jeopardizing the soundness of the NSLI trust fund. These comparisons were made to show that the premiums collected were sufficiently large to absorb these liabilities.

In the operations of United States Government life insurance no charges were ever made against the USGLI appropriation for annuity-differential payments or accrued interest. However, it is the position of the Veterans' Administration that under section 607 (a) of the NSLI Act the Government, without exception, assumes all cost of liabilities determined to be extra hazard.

Notwithstanding that a reading of the act might give the layman the impression that the maximum insurance coverage obtainable is $10,000, the operational provisions of the act, as we have seen, provides for about $12,000 insurance coverage if an annuity-settlement option is selected.

This situation has been brought about by attempting to use insurance practices as a vehicle to grant annuities and to provide monthly annuity payments in amounts in excess of those, predicated upon face value, that prudent insurance practice would justify. The cure for this situation would appear to be a determination by the Congress of specific benefits to be paid for life indemnities and disabilities, and abandonment of disguising these benefits under the term "insurance."

FINDINGS

I

The National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 was passed by the Congress during the closing days of the third session, Seventy-seventh Congress. The initial legislation, which later became the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, was prepared by the Veterans' Administration.

No professional consultation or advice was sought regarding this initial legislation.

The report by the conferees of the House and Senate regarding that portion of the bill

[1] The fact that these charges would be made if required was testified to by VA officials appearing before the subcommittee.

dealing with national service life insurance made the significant recommendation that "this legislation be carefully reviewed and more thoroughly studied." Until the inquiry of this subcommittee, no comprehensive study such as that recommended by the conferees has ever been conducted.

No hearings whatsoever were held by the House or Senate on the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940. This act was passed as a rider to a revenue bill and was introduced in the Senate, the House having passed the initial legislation.

The basic National Service Life Insurance Act has been frequently amended; all such amendments have had the effect of liberalizing benefits of the basic legislation.

II

The national service life insurance has not met the objectives of Government life insurance. It has failed to provide uniform protection in the form of income for the dependents of persons dying while serving in the Armed Forces, and it has failed to lessen demands for pensions.

The gratuity provisions included in the national service life insurance program are superimposed upon the present Government pension system.

III

Federal Government contribution for administrative expenses and benefit payments coincident with national service life insurance operations have cost the Federal Government, from appropriated funds, more than $5,500,000,000 in the last 10-year period.

There is no evidence that the Congress of the United States has ever been fully or adequately appraised of the total cost to the Federal Government of the national service life insurance program.

All costs of the national service life insurance program borne by the Federal Government are continuing costs from both an administration and benefit-payments standpoint.

IV

The National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 was proposed and passed primarily to protect the equity value of the United States Government life insurance policyholders in the USGLI fund. In the event of a future national emergency, a fourth Government insurance program may be proposed for reasons similar to those advanced when national service life insurance was established.

There is serious doubt that the manpower to administer national service life insurance or any other Government insurance plan would be available in the event of a future national emergency.

National service life insurance may not be a proper vehicle through which to grant insurance protection to participants in a future emergency in that the present policyholders, especially veterans of World War II, may become vested with an interest in the national service life insurance fund in which it would be unfair and inequitable to permit future policyholders to participate.

V

Since October 8, 1940, more than twenty-two and a half million national service life insurance policies have been issued.

Three out of every four, or slightly more than 75 percent, of all former national service life insurance policyholders have permitted their national service life insurance policies to lapse. Of the veterans of World War II, only one out of six are covered by NSLI.

One million four hundred and fifty-one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven, or 25.9 percent, of NSLI policies currently in force are held by in-service personnel.

Only 78 percent of those currently serving in the Armed Forces have taken out national service life insurance. These individuals have varying amounts of NSLI in force, ranging from $1,000 to $10,000. Less than 60 percent have the full $10,000 protection.

One out of every nine combat casualties of World War II had no national service life insurance whatsoever.

The average face value of policies issued from Pearl Harbor day to VJ-day was slightly over $7,000. The average face value per policy as of March 31, 1950, was $6,422.

VI

The use of the word "insurance" in characterizing national service life insurance operations is a misnomer.

The paradox of national service life insurance is made clear when it is realized that the Federal Government underwrites the extra hazards of military or naval service only to the extent to which an individual was insured for normal civilian risk under the national service life insurance program. The insured having in force national service life insurance on a personal paying basis, generally speaking, is a condition precedent before the United States Government becomes liable for any death-benefit payments.

This condition presents an inequity and results in discrimination among beneficiaries, reiterating at this point that one out of every nine combat casualties during World War II had no national service life insurance whatsoever.

VII

The use of the American Experience Table of Mortality for calculating annuities was outmoded by 1940, and its use has had the effect of granting annuity payments considerably in excess of what more modern actuarial calculations would justify.

Testimony before this subcommittee revealed that the use of the American Experience Table of Mortality was deliberately adopted in order that the annuity payments to beneficiaries of World War II would be no lesser amount than similar payments being made to beneficiaries of World War I casualties. The legislative history does not indicate that the Congress, or the conferees of the Congress, were fully apprised of this deliberate action.

The continued use of the American Experience Table of Mortality for calculating annuities can only be interpreted as a subsidy to the national service life insurance fund.

Through October 1, 1948, the use of this mortality table has required the Government to appropriate to the national service life insurance fund in excess of $502,000,000 in annuity differential payments. These costs are continuing costs and are being charged against the NSLI appropriation on a case-by-case transfer basis. Whereas the use of the American Experience Table of Mortality, in view of unforeseen risks of World War II, may have been prudent for the calculation of NSLI premiums, there was, and is, no justification under accepted insurance practices to use this table for national service life insurance annuity calculations.

The use of any annuity table without regard for the difference in life expectancy of male and female lives is contrary to modern insurance practice.

Under the National Service Life Insurance Act as presently written and administered, the total cost to the Government of a $10,000 face value policy may be in excess of $12,000.

VIII

Although the Veterans' Administration has conducted many studies from time to time, such as the possibility of installing mechanical equipment for premium billing and posting, or matters regarding centralization of the numerous district offices, action has been negligible.

The administrative officials of the Veterans' Administration in charge of the national service life insurance operations have done little in the effectuation of efficiencies in administrative operations. This is due in part to their being uninformed as to operational cost breakdown and in part to a tendency to study problems for long periods of time without reaching conclusions.

IX

Through the conclusion of the fiscal year 1948 (ending June 30, 1949), the total Federal contribution to the national service life insurance fund was greater than the total amount collected from the insured in premium payments.

X

On an over-all average, an amount exceeding 75 percent of the total premiums paid on national service life insurance was returned to the insured in the form of dividends during the first 6 months of 1950.

XI

The present rate of interest (3 percent) paid on invested national service life insurance funds is considerably in excess of the interest rate being paid by the United States Treasury in securing adequate sums required to fund and refund the debt obligation and current expenses of the Federal Government.

Payment of this liberal rate of interest is an undisclosed subsidy to the national service life insurance fund.

Continuation of payment by the Treasury Department of 3 percent interest on the NSLI trust fund is of questionable justification.

XII

The testimony before this subcommittee did not clearly establish a moral or legal necessity for the Government to pay accrued interest claimed to be due the national service life insurance fund because of delays in transferring moneys from the national service life appropriation to the national service life insurance fund.

XIII

The insuring of aviation cadets under present applicable statutes is excessively costly.

It would be tens of millions of dollars less costly for the Government to assure each aviation cadet in training that his dependents in the event of his death during such training would receive a gratuitous life indemnity from the Government of $10,000.

XIV

The decision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs regarding the possible recovery of dividends by the Federal Government on insurance premiums paid by the Government for aviation cadets personnel is of doubtful propriety.

The policy determinations of the Veterans' Administration are inconsistent. This is illustrated by the fact that no charges were made against USGLI appropriations for annuity differential payments or accrued interest, while under NSLI these charges were made against NSLI appropriations. The law in each case was the same.

Under the GI educational program the Veterans' Administration has upon occasion advised the Congress of certain discrepancies and abuses occurring from time to time resulting in the extravagant expenditure of public funds. As a policy matter the Veterans' Administration has not felt disposed to make similar suggestions regarding national service life insurance operations.

XV

Upon analyzing testimony of the Veterans' Administration, substantiated by supplementary testimony of the Bureau of the Budget, there is no evidence that the Congress has ever been fully or adequately advised as to the over-all cost of the national service life insurance program.

The requested NSLI appropriations for administrative expenses cover only a portion of the total administrative cost of national service life insurance operations.

National service life insurance administrative costs are at least twice the amount reflected for such costs in the annual budget

request. The present budget procedures do not adequately inform the Congress or the taxpayers as to the true administrative costs of NSLI, all such costs being borne by the Federal Government.

National service life insurance administrative costs appear to be exorbitantly high. Although certain causes or justifications were offered as partial explanations, there appears to be a strong reluctance on the part of the Veterans' Administration to effect any significant changes in present methods or procedures which, if adopted, would result in greater efficiency and greater economy of operations.

XVI

The administrative and clerical duties performed by the various personnel of the Armed Forces relative to the maintenance of in-service national service life insurance policies has had and continues to have the effect of dissipating military appropriations and manpower.

In addition to this fiscal cost factor, during the war years, hundreds of officers and thousands of enlisted personnel devoted full time to in-service national life insurance administrative duties.

Cost to the armed services of administering in-service national service life insurance policies from October 8, 1940, through March 31, 1950, is conservatively estimated at $96,409,212.

XVII

The delegation of powers granted by the Congress to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, through section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, has had the effect of circumventing the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

To a considerable degree this delegation of authority virtually eliminates the system of checks and balances inherent in our democratic form of government. The constitutionality of this delegation of authority is questioned, but aside from any constitutional considerations, this subcommittee questions the wisdom of such a broad grant of authority.

XVIII

National service life insurance policies are contracts which consist of the applicable statutes, the lawful regulations of the Veterans' Administration, and the policy.

These contracts may not be unilaterally terminated by the Government. However, there exists no legal or equitable reason why the Government cannot specify a cut-off date for eligibility for national service life insurance, thus terminating the present inequitable, relatively inefficient and costly program.

All outstanding national service life insurance policies are definite irrevocable contracts between the Federal Government and the insured.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I

In view of the many administrative difficulties encountered in the administration of NSLI and the resultant effect upon the policyholders as well as the significant, if not exorbitant, costs to the United States in financing its obligations under this program, it is recommended that—

The appropriate committees of the Congress consider the feasibility, desirability, and appropriateness of establishing a gratuitous life indemnity for all men serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, such indemnity in lieu of, and not superimposed upon, the present insurance program available to military personnel.

If the present plan of Government insurance is to continue, then it is recommended that—

There be a complete legislative appraisal of the present National Service Life Insurance Act giving special attention to the following features thereof:

1. Changing the manner in which the Government liabilities to the funds are currently being calculated and charged.

2. The rate of interest paid on invested NSLI funds.

3. The continued use of the American Experience Mortality Table for calculating both premiums and annuities.

4. The ineffectiveness of the present insurance program in providing 100-percent insurance coverage for Armed Forces personnel, and the varying amounts of payments being paid NSLI beneficiaries.

5. The relative efficiency, and at what cost, can the present program be operated in the future.

6. The demands upon the time of military personnel in the administration of in-service policies, and the dissipation of military appropriation for in-service administrative expenses coincident with NSLI operations.

III

The recommendations of the subcommittee regarding certain policy determinations of Government agencies are as follows:

Veterans' Administration: The present policy of the Veterans' Administration regarding this agency's fiduciary relationship with the Congress of the United States should be carefully reappraised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should review his policy determination with respect to future-dividend payments on policies held by aviation cadets, with a view to redetermining the legality and propriety of having excess premium payments revert to the Federal Government.

Treasury Department: It is recommended that the Secretary of Treasury reexamine the propriety, or necessity, of continuing to pay the present rate of interest of 3 percent on invested NSLI funds. Any excess payment in this regard which could be regarded as a subsidy to the NSLI fund should be deleted.

IV

Section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act stands out, among similar grants of authority by the Congress, as being most absolute and the most definite in its finality.

This subcommittee recommends that the Congress review the extent to which it has relinquished its control of public expenditures under the absolute authority granted the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs through section 608 of the National Service Life Insurance Act.

V

If the Congress of the United States should not grant a gratuitous life indemnity to all members of the Armed Forces at this time, this subcommittee recommends unanimously that such a program be immediately adopted for insuring aviation cadets. By so doing the continued wasteful and extravagant means of insuring aviation cadets could be discontinued without impairment of any benefits extended under present law.

VI

Because of the present world situation and the resulting demand upon this Nation to greatly expand its military force—all persons serving in these forces having the immediate need for life indemnification or insurance protection—it is recommended:

That the appropriate committees of the Congress give full consideration to the immediate effectuation of some interim legislation, covering the insurance needs of the thousands now entering the Armed Forces. Such legislation should be so framed as to provide 100-percent coverage to all Armed Forces personnel; be more easily administered; if possible, less costly to the Federal Government; and have the effect of replacing the availability of national service life insurance to new entrants into the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask also that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD a letter written to me by Representative PORTER HARDY, JR., the chairman of the subcommittee to which I have referred.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1951.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The major objection to S. 84 is that, instead of curbing the unnecessary growth of the Insurance Division of the Veterans' Administration, it would actually expand that agency to a point which I cannot comprehend. In fact, in view of the impending universal military training and service program, governmental insurance could, and probably would, become the largest Federal bureau if S. 84 is passed. You are thoroughly familiar with the effect which the universal military service and training program would have upon the number of people eligible for governmental insurance. Already this number has been greatly increased by the enlargement of our military forces since last June. Accepting the present indicated level of military forces at 3,500,000 and the proposed period of service at 26 months, I believe we will have approximately 900,000 men coming out of uniform every year. I believe that under S. 84 these would all be eligible for governmental insurance, and if my interpretation is in error, we could certainly expect that the law would be amended to make these people eligible.

If the law and policies with respect to the draft result in deferments to only 22 percent of the men of service age, then it follows that within a very few years 78 percent of all our male population would be eligible for governmental insurance. Under the statute the administrative costs of all this insurance would be borne by the taxpayers and quite obviously in the course of time existing commercial insurance would be strangled. The number of people required in the VA to administer such a program is too much for me to comprehend.

There can be no doubt about the fact that H. R. 1 would accomplish considerable savings under the present system. S. 84 would be extremely costly and in my judgment dangerous. I have not given as careful study to S. 84 and its potential effects as I would like. The observations herein are, therefore, of necessity subject to some revision. I am passing these thoughts along to you with the hope that they may be of some assistance and I suggest that you have someone on your staff check this thinking for accuracy.

With my warm personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

PORTER HARDY, Jr.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD a statement prepared by me giving the details of H. R. 1, as amended and reported by the Senate Committee on Finance.

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

H. R. 1 as amended and reported by Senate Finance Committee would provide:

1. On and after June 27, 1950, each person in the Armed Forces would be insured

against death in the amount of $10,000 without cost to the person.

2. Protection would cover the period of active service and periods following call or order to active service or final induction, and in most cases, 120 days after separation from service.

3. If a person were disabled in service to such an extent as to make him uninsurable at standard commercial rates, he may obtain nonparticipating national service life insurance after separation from the service, and where the disability is total waiver premiums could be granted.

4. Generally it would bar future entrants to United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance programs. But any person in the active service having one of these policies could continue it in force.

5. Beneficiaries would be limited to members of the immediate family of the insured person.

6. Maximum indemnity would be paid in monthly installments of $92.90 over a 10-year period.

7. Indemnity would be exempt from the claims of creditors and from taxation.

8. Coverage would be automatic for all persons on active duty with the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and their Reserve components including the National Guard. Also included would be cadets of the military academies, and when on specified types of duty commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and the Coast and Geodetic Survey also would be included.

9. Over the indemnity payment period interest would be paid at the rate of 2¼ percent a year.

10. The total liability of the Government would be $10,000 in any case where an indemnified person also had Government insurance in force.

11. No rights under contracts now in force would be disturbed.

12. Survivors of all men killed in service would be treated identically, and in cases where service-connected disabilities impair insurability, all would be treated alike.

The bill was endorsed by the President and the Bureau of the Budget. In stating his endorsement the Comptroller General estimated that costs to the Government would have been reduced by $587,000,000 if the bill had been in force during the period from 1940 to 1949.

H. R. 1 was endorsed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the AMVETS.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I differ with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance in this matter. I voted for H. R. 1 in the committee, and I intend to vote for it on the floor of the Senate. I have no apologies whatever to make for so doing. I think it is one of the best solutions presented to the Congress regarding the perplexing questions before the Congress. As I have said, the bill has received the active approval of a number of veterans' organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The bill (H. R. 1) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed showing the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER was excused from attendance on the remainder of the session of the Senate today.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1001) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the bill, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gillette	Maybank
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Nixon
Byrd	Holland	O'Conor
Cain	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hunt	Pastore
Carlson	Ives	Russell
Case	Jenner	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Duff	Lehman	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thye
Eastland	Long	Tobey
Ecton	McCarran	Watkins
Ellender	McClellan	Welker
Ferguson	McFarland	Wherry
Flanders	McKellar	Wiley
Frear	Magnuson	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	
George	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1001) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the pending bill was reported by me as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. It provides for the construction of new vessels and the conversion of existing vessels. It provides for the construction of 1 aircraft carrier, 22 mine sweepers, 32 mine-sweeper type vessels, 7 submarines, 2 ocean escorts, 17 fleet tankers, 2 rocket ships, 1 icebreaker, 66 landing ships, and 60 smaller vessels of various types. The bill was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives. It was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and was very carefully considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. I am the chairman of the subcommittee, of which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are members.

The bill was recommended to the full committee without change, and the full committee has approved it. The bill is reported to the Senate without change. I am advised that the program involved is very vital to the war effort, and therefore I ask for prompt action on it by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from Virginia know the approximate total cost of the program?

Mr. BYRD. The total cost of the program, which would extend over a period of years, would be $2,368,092,000. The program would involve the construction of 140 new vessels and the conversion of 292 existing vessels. The construction program would cost $1,070,949,000. The conversion program would cost $1,297,143,000. The amount involved would be spent over a period of years. For example, the aircraft carrier would not be completed for perhaps 2 or 3 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume the Senator from Virginia is satisfied that there is no "fat" in this program; is he?

Mr. BYRD. We could not find any "fat" in it. We thought the program was necessary in order to build up the Navy, which has not had any authorization programs for some time. The committee feels that the Navy is a very important branch of the national defense. We did not find any "fat" in the program. There may be some little "fat" in it, but we did not find any. We believe the program to be one of the most meritorious which has been presented so far as the national defense is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have one further question to ask of the Senator, if he will be good enough to yield.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Can the Senator tell us how many ships of the type provided for in the bill have been given away to other countries, including Russia, since the close of World War II?

Mr. BYRD. I can give the Senator the figures for Russia. I do not have in mind any figures for other countries. We have given to Russia 582 warships, most of them of smaller design than those involved in the pending bill, the largest one being an ice breaker. The Navy Department and the State Department have been trying to get Russia to return the ships, but thus far have not been successful in doing so. Therefore, Russia still has possession of the 582 ships. I do not believe that in recent

years any ships have been given to other nations.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I notice that the program is stated entirely in terms of tonnage. Is there any particular reason for that?

Mr. BYRD. That is customary, I will say to the Senator. However, I have a breakdown, which I have read, as to the number of each type of vessel.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Has the Senator already read that?

Mr. BYRD. I have already read it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. This is a combination construction and conversion program. It is proposed to construct, in all, 140 major new vessels, totaling approximately 500,000 tons, and to convert 292 vessels. The cost of the construction will be something over $1,000,000,000, and the cost of the conversion about $1,300-000,000. As I stated before, however, it will be a number of years before the program is completed. It includes a large carrier, the construction of which was suspended about a year ago. It has now been unanimously approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The size of the carrier is 60,000 tons. That construction will require several years.

In that connection I should like to read a letter from Admiral Sherman. I had requested him to advise me as to whether or not the Joint Chiefs of Staff had approved the construction of the new carrier. He states:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1951.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In compliance with your request, the following additional information is submitted concerning the 60,000-ton aircraft carrier authorized by the bill H. R. 1001.

The inclusion of the carrier in the shipbuilding and conversion program has been specifically concurred in by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The new carrier is needed for naval purposes which are for the most part not connected with atomic warfare.

Nothing has transpired in recent technical research and development to diminish the need for or the prospective tactical value of the ship. Our recent operating experience in the Korean conflict and all technical development to date accentuate the need to add this ship to the fleet at the earliest practicable date.

Cordially yours,
FORREST SHERMAN,
Admiral, United States Navy.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Can the distinguished Senator tell us whether this bill was unanimously approved by the committee?

Mr. BYRD. It was unanimously approved by the House committee, unanimously passed by the House, unanimously approved by the Senate subcommittee, of which the Senator from Virginia was chairman, and which committee included also the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]. It was then unanimously approved by the full committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is to be the cost of the 60,000-ton carrier?

Mr. BYRD. I have not the figure before me, but if my recollection is correct, it will be about $212,000,000.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does that include the planes?

Mr. BYRD. That is only for the carrier itself. It will be the largest carrier in existence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1001) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROPOSED GENERAL FREIGHT RATE INCREASE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission in the important 6-percent freight-rate-increase case have consumed the past week, and oral arguments before the Commission are scheduled to begin tomorrow morning, February 29.

Since this hearing marks the first appearance in the general public interest of the Secretary of Commerce in proceedings of this nature, I think it appropriate and ask leave to insert into the RECORD copy of my letter of January 29, 1951, to Secretary of Commerce Sawyer and his reply which outlines the policy of the Department of Commerce in these matters under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 21.

I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 5, 1951.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: I have your letter of January 29, in which you inquire whether the Department of Commerce will take an active part in the general freight-rate investigation just started by the Interstate Commerce Commission, ex parte No. 175, of the 6-percent increase in freight rates proposed by the railroads. The Department of Commerce will actively participate in the case.

When I set up the Office of Transportation, putting into effect the President's Reorganization Plan No. 21, of 1950, this was one of the principal tasks the President and I had in mind for this Office. On July 24, 1950, in outlining the responsibilities of the Under Secretary for Transportation, I specifically directed that he initiate action before the transportation regulatory agencies when such action appeared to be appropriate in order to effectuate the over-all transportation policies of the Government.

We have been hampered by lack of the funds needed to get this work under way, but the Bureau of the Budget has recently authorized the staffing of this Office, and I look forward with confidence to the performance by General Fleming and his staff of the job you have in mind: To represent the general public interest in transportation matters.

I appreciate the sentiment expressed in the first paragraph of your letter. Your informed interest in legislation designed to establish a national transportation policy has been one of the heartening indications of support in the Congress for the task which has been assigned by the Congress and the President to this Department.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 29, 1951.*

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As one who has long been interested in the transportation problems of the country, especially those of the South, I noted with much satisfaction the setting up in the Department of Commerce last year, under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 21, of a Transportation Section, headed by the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, for development of over-all transportation policy in the executive branch, and to represent the general public interest in transportation matters. I have sponsored legislation in Congress for a number of years to establish a national transportation policy.

May I inquire whether your Department will take an active part in the general freight-rate investigation just started by the Interstate Commerce Commission, ex parte No. 175, of the 6-percent increase in freight rates proposed by the railroads? Such an increase, which would add over $400,000,000 to the country's annual freight bill, would obviously give an added impetus to inflation and might be the start of another series of price and wage increases, followed by additional freight-rate increases, such as we had in 1946–49.

I appreciate, of course, that the railroads must have adequate revenues and that they, like all the other basic industries, have recently experienced certain increased operating costs. However, I am advised that 1950 has been a year of relatively high railroad earnings and that a large increase in traffic may be expected in 1951 which may give them the greatest net revenues since the war peak of 1943–44.

Heretofore there has been no means of presenting to the Interstate Commerce Commission the facts about these matters from the standpoint of businessmen, farmers, and consumers. I am sure that your recently organized Transportation Section would be performing a great service by intervening in the present case, not to oppose any legitimate need of the railroads, but to see to it that the facts, from the standpoint of the users of transportation, are adequately presented and the national interest fully protected.

With all good wishes, I am,
Very sincerely,

Mr. HILL. Senators will recall that among its other provisions the plan provided for the appointment of an Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation to assist the Secretary with respect to transportation problems and the development of over-all transportation policy within the executive branch.

It is pleasing to see that the Secretary of Commerce, for the purpose of representing the interest of businessmen,

farmers, and consumers, is intervening in the present rate case. This is one of the objectives sought in the transportation legislation which I sponsored in Congress for many years.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense by establishing a universal training program, 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 Armed Services with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SECTION 1. That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the 'Universal Military Training and Service Act.'

"(b) The Congress hereby declares that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this Nation.

"(c) The Congress further declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces, including the Reserve components thereof, should be shared generally, in accordance with a system which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy.

"(d) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, both ground and air, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured.

"To this end, it is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, and those in active service under this title, the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the Reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered to active Federal service and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

"(e) The Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible development and utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources.

"(f) To this end, the Congress further declares that it is the duty of all citizens to engage in such training for civilian and military service as will prepare them for the assumption of their responsibilities as citizens of a free and democratic Nation and provide a continuing flow of personnel recently trained in modern techniques and assure a vital, ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.

"(g) The Congress declares it to be in the national interest that personnel serving in the Armed Forces be protected and encouraged in the realization and development of those moral, spiritual, and religious values, consistent with the religious beliefs and convictions of the individuals concerned, which are fundamental in the preservation and strengthening of the fiber of American citizenship. In the pursuit of this end, the Congress further declares that it shall be the duty of every commanding officer in every echelon of command in the respective services of the Armed Forces to maintain to the highest possible degree within his command those conditions and influences calculated to protect the health, morals, and spiritual welfare of the personnel of his command."

(b) Section 2 of such act is repealed.

(c) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen."

(d) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended to read: "The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain adequate Armed Forces."

(e) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects (including his physical and mental fitness for such training and service) has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard)."

(f) The fourth paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Every trainee shall be given full and adequate initial basic training for service in the Armed Force into which he is inducted and no trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be assigned for duty in a combat area, or be permanently assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the continental limits of the United States; and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he has had at least 4 months of basic training. This section shall not prevent residents of Territories and possessions of the United States from being trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted."

(g) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each person inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces for a period of 26 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 or by subsection (d) of section 6 of this title.

(h) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 4 of such act is repealed.

(i) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such act is amended (1) by inserting after the word "hereafter", where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words "and prior to the enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in an armed force of the United States prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be obligated to serve on active training and service and in a Reserve component for a total period of 8 years, unless sooner discharged, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainer of the period which he is obligated to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a Reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from active duty prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other Reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

(j) The first sentence of subsection (e) of section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows: "With respect to the persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title, there shall be paid, allowed, and extended, for training and service, the same pay, allowances, pensions, disability and death compensation, and other benefits as are provided by law in the case of other members of the uniformed services of like grades and length of service of that component of the Armed Forces to which they are assigned, except that whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (k) of this section, each trainee shall, during his initial period of basic training, be compensated at the monthly rate of $30 in lieu of the basic pay that would otherwise be payable to him under this section. During such period in which the pay of trainees is $30 a month, each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E-1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 plus $40 so long as the trainee has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for

the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed."

(k) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such act are repealed.

(l) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty-six".

(m) Section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation by the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for: (A) increasing the periods of initial basic training to not to exceed 6 months, (B) changing or modifying the initial basic training given thereunder, (C) decreasing periods of active service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (D) eliminating periods of active service required under this title. Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of initial basic training for any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be increased to any period in excess of 4 months but not in excess of 6 months which may be designated in such resolution;

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than 26 months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(C) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated,

the period of initial basic training or of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so increased, decreased, or eliminated as the case may be. Whenever the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter registered under section 3 of this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps for initial basic military training for a period of not less than 4 months.

"(2) Effective at such time as the President may deem appropriate in advance of his issuance of an Executive order eliminating periods of active service under this title or effective whenever the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President is authorized to establish a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Effective at such time as periods of active service required under this title are eliminated pursuant to the preceding paragraph of this subsection, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps, whose membership shall be composed of all persons inducted therein for initial basic training. The National Security Training Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training (including the moral, religious, recreational, informational, and educational phases of such training) of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and shall, subject to the direction of the President, designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. All departments and agencies so designated shall carry out such training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission."

(n) Section 5 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) (1) The selection of persons for training and service under section 4 shall be made in an impartial manner, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, from the persons who are liable for such training and service and who at the time of selection are registered and classified, but not deferred or exempted: *Provided*, That in the selection of persons for training and service under this title, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this title, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color: *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.

"(2) Until such time as the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been eliminated in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title—

"(A) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(B) no local board shall order for induction any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as 90 days older, (ii) has not attained the age of 19, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction."

(o) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "the effective date of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1951,".

(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "six months" a comma and the following: "prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its authorized strength, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction,".

(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such act is amended by inserting after "subsection (b)" a comma and the following: "paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

(p) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such act is amended by inserting the words "midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense;" immediately following the words "cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;".

(q) Subsection (d) of section 6 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, (A) until June 30, 1954, to provide for the temporary removal from active training and service upon completion of their initial periods of basic training in the Armed Forces of not to exceed 75,000 persons annually in order to permit such persons to engage in study or research in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, the sciences, engineering, the humanities, and other fields determined by him to be in the national interest, and while so engaged such persons shall not be deemed to be in military service (active or inactive) for any purpose; (B) to suspend for such persons the obligation to complete the period of military service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title until the completion of such study or research, or until any such person ceases satisfactorily to pursue such study or research, whichever is the earlier; and (C) upon termination of such period of suspension, or at any time within not more than 10 years thereafter, to reorder or induct such a person into active service in the same or another armed force for the unserved part of the period of service required under subsection (b) of section 4 of this title, unless such person performs other military or civilian service in the national interest for a period equivalent to such period of service in accordance with regulation prescribed by the President. The persons temporarily removed from active training and service to engage in study or research under the provisions of this paragraph shall be selected by a civilian commission to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than three of the members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party. The persons selected by the Commission to engage in study or research shall be selected upon a competitive basis in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by the Commission. The President is authorized to provide for payment of such portion of the costs of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of any person selected to engage in such study and research as the Commission finds that such person is unable to defray without undue hardship.

"(2) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense any person who (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer-candidate training program established by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057) as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or has been or may hereafter be appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and is undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than 2 years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular

or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction for training and service under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of basic training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such program to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of basic training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed 1 year.

"(3) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer-candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(r) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such act is amended (1) by inserting in clause (1) of the second sentence after the word "persons", which it appears the second time, the following: "(other than wives alone)", and (2) by striking out in the fourth sentence thereof the words "wives or."

(5) Subsection (i) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom or (B) until he attains the nineteenth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of the academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

(t) Subsection (j) of section 6 of such act is amended (1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in lieu of such induction, be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction," and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words "he shall be deferred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "he shall in lieu of such induction be assigned, for a period equal to the period of training and service prescribed by section 4 (b), to work of national importance under civilian direction."

(u) Section 7 of such act is repealed.

(v) Subsection (g) of section 9 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a Reserve component) and who serves for not more than 4 years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of inductees.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of inductees, if he is relieved from active duty not later than 4 years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such 4 years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes prompt application for reinstatement, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

(w) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board."

(x) Section 16 of such act is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(j) the terms 'active training and service' shall be deemed to mean any military service in the active Armed Forces; 'trainee' shall be deemed to mean a person inducted into the Armed Forces under this title prior to attaining the nineteenth anniversary of his birth who is undergoing an initial period of basic training in the active Armed Forces; 'initial period of basic training' or 'initial basic training' shall mean that period of 4 months (or not to exceed 6 months when so increased pursuant to section 4 (k) of this title) immediately following induction; 'inductee' shall mean any person inducted into the active Armed Forces under this title for active training and service."

(y) Section 17 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the expenses of training carried out by departments and agencies designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the designated departments and agencies."

(z) Section 21 of such act is amended (1) by striking out "July 9, 1951, and subject to the limitations imposed by section 2 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953,", and (2) by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-six."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the act of July 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is hereby amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953" and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this act.

(b) Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828); is amended by striking out "July 9, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1953."

SEC. 3. The act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is hereby amended by inserting the words "sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371)," immediately following the word "including."

SEC. 4. Wherever in this amendatory act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory act.

SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 6. This title may be cited as the "1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act."

TITLE II

SEC. 21. (a) The first section of the act entitled "An act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army", approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, 81st Cong.), is amended by striking out the words "until June 30, 1953, to accept original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than 5 years of not to exceed 2,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1955, to accept, during each calendar year, original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than 5 years of not to exceed 25,000."

(b) Section 3 of such act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, is the bill now the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is that Senate bill 1 is now the unfinished business.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say that the bill will not be taken up for consideration until tomorrow. However, I desired to have it made the unfinished business, and that has been done.

COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCES OF CERTAIN GERMAN PRISONERS

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of regret that I feel forced to call to the attention of the Senate the recent action of Gen. Thomas T. Handy in commuting the death sentences of certain German prisoners who were convicted of murdering American prisoners during the Battle of the Bulge. In particular these murders included those at the Malmedy Crossroads.

The subject has been debated on the floor of the United States Senate on several occasions, and I do not intend at this time to raise the question of alleged abuses of these individuals during the investigations and trials which

convicted them. This was answered completely and conclusively by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee which studied the matter thoroughly and found no evidence to support the charges of mistreatment.

However, it is because of the findings of this subcommittee, of which I was a member, that I feel it necessary to point out the seriousness of this decision on the part of General Handy, and its possible effect on the Armed Forces of the United States. Properly to evaluate this problem, a little of the background must be explained which has led to the theory of punishment of war criminals.

Throughout the history of wars between nations many persons have been able to escape punishment for crimes committed under the guise of war necessity by pleading the so-called doctrine of superior orders. However, while World War II gas going on, it was decided that those individuals who committed so-called war crimes would be subject to trial and this doctrine would no longer prevail.

Accordingly the stage was set for the conducting of large numbers of war crimes trials at Nuremberg and at the various lesser courts throughout Germany. The case to which I have particular reference is the so-called Malmedy case, which resulted in the conviction of 73 Germans accused of murdering American prisoners of war at various places during the Battle of the Bulge. The largest mass murder was the shooting of 142 unarmed American soldiers who had surrendered and were grouped in a field at the Malmedy crossroads. Forty-four of these accused were sentenced to death. Through normal review procedures of the Army this number was reduced to 12. Gen. Lucius Clay then made a personal study of these 12 cases and affirmed the death sentences for 6 of them and exercised clemency in the case of the other 6.

Some 18 months after the conviction of these accused a large number of affidavits, many of which were proven by the subcommittee to be false in whole or in part, were disseminated through various media throughout the United States. Organizations such as the National Council for the Prevention of War interested themselves, and the propaganda drums began to beat to save the lives of these six convicted Nazi murderers and to lay the groundwork for the ultimate freedom of all those who were convicted of these crimes. The motivations in back of these efforts were not clear. The subcommittee received certain competent evidence which led it to believe that one motivation was the desire of Communist groups to destroy the prestige of American Military Government in Germany. Whether this was a fact or not it is certain that the effect of these efforts was materially to disturb the German people and to lessen the standing of the American Military Government in Germany.

As a result of its studies the subcommittee was fully convinced that if any injustices had been done to the accused in these cases it had been more than rectified by subsequent reviews and General Clay's action.

When General Handy released his decision on these and other prisoners in Landsberg, he issued a press release, No. 5191, dated January 31, 1951. In this release he repeated the details of the crimes committed by these men and stated, among other things, that the commutation of the death sentences did not mean that there is any doubt whatsoever that they were guilty of the offenses charged.

Mr. President, I do not know what political considerations have influenced General Handy in his decision. This is as much a mystery to me as the great effort made by various individuals to influence this case in the past. I do know, however, that as a result of these efforts there are six guilty Germans who will not pay the death penalty and I suspect will be freed through the same type of pressure within a very short time—I do know that the practice of murdering prisoners of war is being continued by the enemies we are facing today—and certainly we all know that they should feel free to murder prisoners because we have so clearly shown that we will not punish them for doing it.

Mr. President, the other effect is simply this—by our actions we have repudiated the difficult, tedious, conscientious work that was carried out by our various military courts in Germany—we have repudiated the decisions of men like Gen. Lucius Clay, whose opinion in this case was as thorough, as complete, and as convincing as can be found in the history of such cases—and in essence we have laid the ground work for the repudiation of the theory of punishment of war crimes.

Mr. President, there is little else that needs to be said on this matter. I disagree so thoroughly and completely with the action of General Handy that I want the record to show that fact. I can only hope that some divine miracle will open our eyes to the fact that we must punish such criminals when we find them and that by prompt punishment we may cause potential murderers, operating under the guise of war conditions, to check their murdering hands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the news release by General Handy, with reference to his commutation of the sentences in question.

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

Gen. Thomas T. Handy, commander in chief, European command, announced today his final action in the cases of the 13 war criminals under his jurisdiction who are now held in Landsberg Prison under death sentence. He is extending clemency to 11 war criminals by commuting death sentences to life imprisonment and is denying clemency to two others under like sentences.

The death sentences imposed by the trial courts in these cases were originally approved by Gen. Lucius D. Clay in 1948. General Clay ordered further reviews of these cases on the basis of petitions which were filed on behalf of the prisoners.

A War Crimes Board of Review and the then Judge Advocate, European command, concurred in the findings that the 13 were justly convicted, properly sentenced, and that there were no reasons or evidence set forth in the petitions which justified modification of the death sentences imposed. General Clay reaffirmed the death sentences in early 1949.

The cases were also reviewed by the Judge Advocate General of the Army; by a committee headed by Justice Gordon B. Simpson of the Texas Supreme Court, appointed by the then Secretary of the Army Royall and by committees of the United States Congress. Nothing was found by them to disturb the finding of guilty arrived at by the courts which tried these prisoners.

Subsequent to reaffirmation of the sentences, the condemned again addressed petitions to General Clay; additionally, to the President of the United States and other high officials of the executive department, to Members of Congress, and petitions to the United States Supreme Court for writs of habeas corpus, two of which were as late as February 10, 1950. All applications for writs of habeas corpus were denied by the United States Supreme Court.

"Since being in this command," General Handy stated, "I have received numerous petitions to extend clemency to these men. All of these petitions have received thorough consideration. Each has had ample opportunity to refute evidence against him. Additionally, out of an abundance of caution, the trial records have been reviewed many times. Even at this time, I am asked to consider more petitions for clemency. To allow them could only occasion further delay. Previously submitted petitions have contained no new evidence of material value and there is no reason to presume that, if allowed, additional ones would. I have studied each of these cases most carefully and particularly with a view of determining if there were any reasonable doubts in any case as to the guilt of the accused or the severity of the sentence. The sentences of 11 prisoners have been commuted to life. Their guilt as charged is unquestioned and their offenses are of such a nature that each should be required to serve a sentence covering his natural life.

"There are two prisoners to whom I cannot rightfully grant clemency. These prisoners are Schallermair and Schmidt. They were guilty of atrocities in concentration camps. I found that they not only contributed to the infamous record of torture and killing which characterized the worst of the concentration camps but also went beyond what they were expected to do in performance of their duties at their respective camps and, on their own intiative, caused the death of many inmates.

"In the concentration camps established and operated in Germany, hundreds of thousands of victims were beaten, tortured, starved, and exterminated by various procedures. The records found at Mauthausen reflected approximately 72,000 deaths. At Buchenwald, during the later part of the war, approximately 5,000 inmates perished monthly. It was the same in other camps, and in addition to the main camps, many of the hundreds of subcamps carried on the same type of tortures and exterminations. The infamy of these concentration camps is well known and requires no further comment.

"George Schallermair, denominated a roll call leader, was directly in charge of prisoners at Muehldorf, a subcamp of Dachau. Large numbers of inmates died as a result of beatings which he personally administered. Of 300 people brought to the camp in the fall of 1944, only 72 survived some 4 months later. He visited the morgue daily with an inmate dentist to extract the gold teeth from the dead bodies from the camp. There are no factors or arguments which can possibly justify clemency in this case.

"Hans Schmidt was the acknowledged adjutant of the Buchenwald concentration

camp for approximately 3 years. It was estimated that at one period while Schmidt was assigned to this camp, approximately 5,000 prisoners, including substantial numbers of French, Russian, Polish, and Czech nationals, died each month as a result of the conditions under which they were forced to live and the cruelties inflicted upon them by the SS. As the SS adjutant, Schmidt was in a very responsible position in the administration of the camp, frequently acting as the temporary commander during the absence of Colonel Pister, the camp commandant. According to the statement of Pister, Schmidt participated very actively in the activities of the camp, and had to be restrained because he frequently assumed greater authority than was actually delegated to him. He was in charge of all executions of inmates, including the execution of several hundred prisoners of war by a special unit called "Commando 99." These executions were carried out in a former horse stable converted into what appeared to be a dispensary. As the unsuspecting victims were purportedly being measured for height, they were shot in the back of the head with a powerful air pistol concealed behind the wall. Sometimes as many as 30 victims were thus disposed of on a single occasion. Some of the executions supervised by Schmidt took place in the camp crematory where the victims were hung from hooks on the wall and slowly strangled to death. I can find no basis for clemency in this case.

"I have decided to commute the death sentence imposed on six war criminals convicted in the Malmedy case to terms of life imprisonment. The commutation of the death sentences does not mean that there is any doubt whatsoever that each was guilty of the offenses charged. The crimes for which these men were convicted occurred in the area of operations of one specific combat unit that spearheaded the Ardennes offensive. No one who has actually read the record of the trials can question the fact that 142 unarmed American soldiers who had surrendered were grouped in a field at the Malmedy crossroads and were then machine gunned from armored vehicles which were deployed partially around the group. Many were later individually shot and killed as they lay wounded on the ground. One hundred thirty-six frozen bodies in four close rows were found where they had fallen in ranks in the snow when the 'Bulge' was reduced. All were without firearms and many had their hands above their heads as they were held prisoners. Likewise, specific killings of unarmed, surrendered prisoners of war or civilians at other definite places to wit: Bullingen, Cheneux, La Gleize, Stoumont, Wanne, and Petit Thier, were each conclusively shown to have been committed by certain specified ones of these six prisoners.

"The leader of the combat group which perpetrated these crimes was Joachim Peiper. His protagonists represent him as a most forceful, inspiring leader who was the active moving spirit in the actions of his organization. Many petitions submitted in his behalf have been based solely on the statement that as fine an officer and soldier as he could not have been guilty of the crimes charged. I am convinced that Peiper was a remarkable leader; that he was the moving spirit of the armored unit which spearheaded the desperate attempt of the Battle of the Bulge. General Clay said in his final affirmation of Peiper's death sentence, 'there is no question in my mind that Peiper was, in fact, the principal in the Malmedy case.' I am likewise convinced that Peiper was the motivating spirit of the terror-spreading, killing-prisoners-of-war procedure of this spearhead. The very arguments presented in Peiper's behalf as to his ability as a leader will convince any unprejudiced observer that the killings of prisoners of war which took place in so many different localities covered by the operations of his unit could not have taken place without his knowledge and consent, and, in fact, without the force of his driving personality behind them. No fair-minded man who knows the facts would give a more severe penalty to any other participant in the Malmedy massacre than is given to Peiper.

"The record of trial is detailed and voluminous. The evidence is compelling and has convinced everyone who has read it objectively that these criminals committed the acts as found by the court which tried them. For four and a half years the execution of the sentences has been delayed by a continuous and organized flood of accusations and statements made to discredit the trial and the repeated reviews and studies requested by and on behalf of the prisoners themselves. However, the record is convincing that these men are guilty. Investigations carried on by congressional committees and the reviews by trained judges have failed to unearth any facts which support a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of these prisoners.

"The commutation has been based upon other facts, which are deemed to mitigate in favor of less severe punishment than death. First, the offenses are associated with a confused fluid and desperate combat action, a last attempt to turn the tide of Allied successes and to reestablish a more favorable tactical position for the Germany Army. The crimes are definitely distinguishable from the more deliberate killings in concentration camps. Moreover, these prisoners were of comparatively lower rank and, other than Peiper, they were neither shown to be the ones who initiated nor as far as we know advocated the idea of creating a wave of frightfulness to precede the advance which we usually refer to as the Battle of the Bulge. I cannot overlook the fact that the army commander, his chief of staff, and the corps commander are each serving only terms of imprisonment. Four of the six condemned in this case were sergeants, one was a major, and the highest ranking, Peiper, was a lieutenant colonel.

"Lastly, the Board, headed by Judge Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, which reviewed this case, though not questioning the guilt of these accused, recommended that these sentences be commuted to life imprisonment. The Secretary of the Army upon the recommendation of the Judge Advocate General recommended that the sentences to death be reconsidered.

"The sentences of Gustav Heigel, and Max Seidl, both SS sergeants, have been commuted to life imprisonment. Although these individuals participated actively in the brutalities of the concentration camps to which they were assigned for duty, their positions were relatively subordinate. Though nothing can justify the brutality of their personal conduct, still the records do not show that they went out of their way to add to the brutalities. I have decided in these cases to commute each of their sentences to imprisonment for life.

"Hermann Dammann, Richard Schulze and Kurt Hans were sentenced for participating in the murder of American and Allied airmen who parachuted from disabled planes. There is no question as to their responsibility of these murders. However, certain mitigating circumstances, such as the excitement resulting from the aerial activity, the offenses being committed after heavy bombing, and the fact that their crimes did not show a pattern of their character have been advanced along with many other reasons which I deem less important. I feel that I can commute the death sentence of each to imprisonment for life.

"In addition to the review of the cases of prisoners under death sentence, the European Command War Crimes Modification Board is in the process of reviewing the cases of all war criminals confined in Landsberg Prison under the jurisdiction of the European Command. Reviews of some 120 cases have been completed. There remain over 300 noncapital additional cases to be reviewed. The review of this Board has resulted in recommendations for substantial modification of sentences. A system of giving credit to prisoners for good conduct time in line with the best prison practices in the United States has also been instituted. This credit for good conduct time has resulted in the release of 91 war criminals prior to the expiration of sentences imposed by the Court."

WANTED: A PLAN FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, it is apparent to all patriots that our energies must be dedicated to building a completely adequate defense for our country. Any preparedness program is futile if it results in runaway inflation. It makes little difference to future generations whether our cherished freedoms are lost through failure to stop Communist infiltration at home or through failure to avoid economic disaster at home. Our two major problems, therefore, concern manpower and money. Both are limited.

All our foreign and domestic policies must be framed in the light of limited manpower and limited financial resources. We have hundreds of plans for various foreign and domestic programs, but taken together they exceed the money and manpower available. For example, the Acheson containment plan involves policing the 20,000-mile Soviet perimeter with American ground forces. It would bleed us white both physically and financially. The Ewing plan for socialized medicine, the Foley plan for socialized defense housing, and the Brannan plan for socialized agriculture are but a few of the plans based on the assumption that the Federal Treasury is a bottomless well. We have many material shortages, Mr. President, but there is no shortage of administration plans or Government coordinators. In fact, we probably have more coordinators than there are functions to coordinate. We have a plan on almost every conceivable subject except one—a plan to save America.

The latest plans to spring into being are those of the Economic Stabilization Agency for the control of prices and wages. As yet, no one, including the stabilizers themselves, has the faintest idea about how prices and wages will be controlled. However, the statement which accompanied the first general price regulation contains some very important observations on the place of price and wage controls in the fight against inflation. This statement contains some half-truths and omits some significant facts, but it also expresses a great deal of good common sense.

INFLATIONARY FORCES IN THE NATION'S ECONOMY

It is encouraging to see that the Economic Stabilization Agency recognizes the enemy it is supposed to fight. Its statement says in part:

The fact that prices have been frozen by this regulation should not be interpreted as ending the danger of inflation. This would be to confuse controlling the symptoms of a

disease with its cure. The effect of price control is not to eliminate inflation, but to suppress it. Inflation comes about as a result of a gap between the available supply of goods and the amounts which consumers, business firms, and governments would like to buy and can pay for. Price control does not eliminate this gap.

According to the ESA statement, "since June 1950 the country has been in the throes of a mounting inflation." That is a half-truth. We have been the victims of creeping inflation ever since the conclusion of World War II and of galloping inflation since January 1950. The inflation of the past 4 years cannot be blamed on shortages. From 1947 through 1950 we had the greatest production of civilian goods in our history. Nevertheless, we have had inflation because the Government's fiscal and credit policies produced new money and credit faster than American farms and factories could produce goods.

The Economic Stabilization Agency says that inflationary pressures began to develop after the invasion of Korea. Recognizing that defense spending in 1950 had only a negligible impact on the economy, the ESA says:

Scare buying and profiteering were major factors in the sharp price advances which occurred in the last half of 1950.

Unquestionably, the outbreak of war in Korea inspired some speculative and panic buying beginning in July 1950. However, the major cause of inflation throughout 1950 was the administration policy of deficit spending. We were told by the Fair Deal medicine men that a little inflation was a good thing and that a $43,000,000,000 budget did not have to be balanced. The myth that the Federal Government does not have to live within its income has finally been exploded. Mr. Truman, who warned against trying to balance a peacetime budget of $43,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1950, now insists that the 1952 budget of over $71,000,000,000 must be balanced. However, if we accept all of the defense mobilization plans offered by Mr. Truman and his lieutenants, we will fall many billions of dollars short of paying as we go.

PAST EFFORTS TO PREVENT INFLATION

In discussing prior efforts to stabilize prices, the Economic Stabilization Agency refers to increased taxes, selective credit controls, and the use of priorities and allocations powers. The statement of the ESA continues:

Moreover, the President, prior to the passage of the Defense Production Act and since, has repeatedly urged business, labor, farmers, and consumers to exercise restraint in their buying and selling.

The ESA maintains a discreet silence about the necessity of having the President exercise a similar restraint. It is futile for Mr. Truman to denounce business as usual and spending as usual as long as his administration continues to be the worst example of these attitudes. We have already passed legislation which seems adequate to protect us against profiteering on Government contracts and on war-created shortages. Our most dangerous type of profiteer, however, is the political profiteer. In the 1952 budget we see how the political profiteer has dressed up all of his discredited proposals in the uniform of national defense. Congress not only must cut out all nonessential spending, but also must learn to distinguish between the less essential and more essential forms of Government spending.

In speaking of its general ceiling-price regulation, ESA says:

Because of the comprehensive character of this action and the need for speed, it has not been practicable to establish committees of representatives of the persons substantially affected by this general ceiling-price regulation and to consult with them.

The truth of the statement just quoted is questionable. The Defense Production Act was signed by the President on September 8, 1950. The Economic Stabilization Agency was created less than 2 weeks later. It has had ample time to consult with representatives of business and labor in the formulation of its regulations. In that bill Congress made such consultation mandatory. If officials of the ESA had followed the procedure prescribed by law, a great deal of confusion and countless inequities made inevitable by the present regulations might have been avoided, and thus we might have been able to avoid the very critical situation which exists at this very hour; for if the ceiling on wages, as fixed by the Board, is broken, there likely will be no stability to the economic stabilization program at any time in the future.

The fact that some of the Members of Congress do not agree, and then bring political pressure to bear upon the heads of the agency, is no reason why the American people should not be protected by a sound wage-scale regulation fixed by the majority.

Even though price and wage controls merely suppress inflation temporarily, there is no question but that the American people are entitled to this temporary relief against rising prices. It is certainly not the fault of the American housewife that the effective weapons against inflation have not yet been fully and effectively utilized. The Congress was persuaded on the ground that such authority was needed immediately, to pass price- and wage-control legislation without even holding hearings. Now, after almost 5 months, the price-control agency is reported to have only about 600 employees with which to control billions of daily sales transactions. With such a limited staff, any general price-control order can be nothing more than an empty gesture.

DANGERS INHERENT IN PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

It is encouraging to note that Mr. Johnston and Mr. DiSalle seem to be aware of the dangers which general price and wage control involve. One very great danger is described by them in this language:

It must be clearly understood that, even if price control does a perject job in holding the prices of individual commodities, it is powerless to insure that the essential commodities will be produced in the right quantities.

In a free economy, prices reflect the combined judgment of millions of producers, distributors, and consumers. When the votes of millions of consumers in the market-place register an increased demand through a higher price, increased production of the article comes quickly and automatically. Even if the most able men in America were assigned to the job of price control, they would be unable to satisfy the demands of the public one-tenth as effectively as a free economy can. It is inevitable that price and wage controls will curtail production of many things which are vitally needed. Instead of blaming the price administrators for mistakes which are inevitable, we should hold them accountable for first, providing machinery for the prompt correction of mistakes and inequities; second, acting in accordance with the price- and wage-control statute—and I dare say they have not done so; and, third, adopting policies which will facilitate the removal of price and wage controls at the earliest possible date.

Another danger inherent in price and wage controls is that they breed disunity and social conflict. Many employers who suffer as a result of price ceilings put the blame on excessively high wages. Many workers trace their hardships in a controlled economy to profiteering by business. Furthermore, many consumers charge that farmers have been favored for political reasons, and many farmers try to shift the blame to that familiar devil the middleman. People who live on static incomes blame the price-control agency for sacrificing them in favor of business, labor, and farm pressure groups. Price and wage controls are politically attractive because they sugar-coat, at least temporarily, the sacrifices which an emergency requires. In the past, price and wage controls have been proposed as a painless remedy for inflation. It is hardly surprising that every group in our society seeks to avoid that pain by transferring it to some other group. The fact, of course, is that our present mobilization effort will require a lower standard of living for everyone who is not already at the subsistence level. In the long run, it is much better to face these sacrifices by resorting to measures which prevent inflation instead of concealing it temporarily. No matter how hard the sacrifices may seem, we could at least accept them as a united—not divided—people.

WEAPONS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. Eric Johnston has stated on several occasions that price and wage controls should be viewed only as stop-gap measures in the fight against inflation. In issuing its general price-control order, the ESA observed that in preventing inflation "major reliance must be placed upon vigorous taxation and credit policy." I agree wholeheartedly with that statement except that I would add as equally important a drastic reduction in proposed Government spending and the encouragement of individual saving.

Taxation is one of our best weapons in the fight against inflation. To prevent inflation without reducing the

President's budget, it would be necessary to raise an additional $16,500,000,000 in taxes and probably more. It is unlikely that we can raise this much in additional taxes without impairing the productivity of our economy. Corporate, individual, and excise tax rates are already close to the record levels which prevailed during World War II. Increasing existing tax rates would be a simple matter if we were not already close to the point of diminishing returns. Higher taxes are inflationary when they become so confiscatory as to stifle production, kill incentives for profits and efficiency, and keep workers from entering the labor force.

To the extent that taxes can be increased without adding to inflationary pressures, higher taxes are much better than a price-and-wage-control straitjacket. The great advantage in fighting inflation with taxation is that consumer rationing can be avoided. Taxes are, in effect, a rationing of money. Higher taxes would give almost all of us less to spend, but no bureaucrat would tell us how many shoes or how much meat we could buy. By rationing money and credit instead of goods we would not have the black-market problem, which is bound to confront us under wage and price controls in peacetime.

It is now clear that we did not tax ourselves enough during World War II. Taxes and sales of bonds to nonbank investors fell about 25 percent short of paying for the cost of the last war. This deficit was financed inside the commercial banking structure, with the result that the 1939 dollar is today worth only 55 cents in purchasing power.

It would be absurd, of course, to reduce individual income through taxation and allow the reduced income to be supplemented by easy credit. For that reason the Defense Production Act provides for consumer-credit controls and control of credit for real-estate construction. Nothing has been done, however, to restrain general credit expansion by making it more expensive for business to borrow money. The Federal Reserve Board has ample power to fight inflation by reducing the over-all supply of money and credit. However, the Board cannot make the cost of borrowing money more expensive for banks and their customers without also making the cost higher for the Federal Government. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder recently announced that the cheap-money policy made possible by Federal Reserve Board support of the Government securities market would be continued. It is this policy which, in the words of Marriner S. Eccles, "makes the entire banking system, through the action of the Federal Reserve System, an engine of inflation." Congress, and not Secretary Snyder, should decide whether it is more important to have cheap money in the interest of debt management or to preserve the value of the dollar by making the cost of money more expensive.

If we fail to reduce Government spending, restrict credit, or increase taxes enough to avoid a deficit, our only chance of preventing inflation is to borrow from nonbank sources. Almost everyone agrees with the statement of the Economic Stabilization Agency that inflation "destroys the value of savings and, therefore, the motive to save," and that "it creates a panic flight from liquid assets to goods." There is no question that that situation exists at this very moment. Any banker or savings and loan official, if asked, will give the record of the past few months to show that money is being withdrawn from savings and put into materials and goods. There is grave danger that the economic and fiscal policies hitherto pursued by this administration have already destroyed for millions of Americans the incentive to save. We must take our heads out of the sand and face this question: Do the American people have enough confidence in the stability of the dollar to defer current spending by investing in Government bonds?

During the last war bonds were sold to the public in huge quantities. At that time, however, the Treasury could point to the fact that the purchasing power of the dollar had remained fairly constant for more than 70 years. A man who bought a $75 bond in 1941 was promised $100 in 1951. The Federal Government will fulfill the letter of its obligation, but the bondholder knows that he will receive only $55 worth of purchasing power. There are signs that existing bondholders and the general public are weighing the possibility of cheaper dollars in the future. In several recent months bond redemptions have exceeded sales. The boom in farm land is attributed in part to attempts to hedge against inflation. The greatest mistake we can make is to assume that no matter what Congress does, the American people will extend their E bonds and buy additional bonds in sufficient quantities to prevent inflation. In my opinion, the American people will make a substantial investment in Government bonds only if they have reasonable assurance that the value of the dollar will not be further depreciated. Sales talk is not enough. Only by the following deeds can we assure the American people that the integrity of the dollar will be maintained: First, elimination of all nonessential Government spending; second, adherence to a mobilization plan which makes efficient use of our limited manpower and money; and third, a determined effort to finance the mobilization program on a pay-as-you-go basis.

THE EFFECT OF INFLATION

For the past 18 years we have been told by economists of the New Deal and the Fair Deal that the size of the national debt is a matter of no importance. Their favorite bromide was "we owe it to ourselves." The great majority of our people are just beginning to appreciate the significance of the fact they not only owe but also own the national debt. The savings of almost every American citizen would be wiped out if our debt were repudiated either directly or indirectly by wild inflation. So long as confidence in the dollar can be maintained we can handle a national debt even in excess of what we now have. But if confidence in the dollar is lost through the prospect of runaway inflation, it is immaterial whether the national debt is $100,000,000,000 or $300,000,000,000. No system of a price control and rationing can stop a panic-stricken flight from the dollar to obtain real wealth in the form of materials and property.

The present financial condition of the Federal Government makes it not only immoral but probably impossible to finance our mobilization effort by inflation. While inflation can be regarded as an indirect form of taxation, it preys upon the most helpless and most deserving groups in our society. Anyone who advocates another dose of inflation for the economy is, in effect, proposing a capital levy on the value of all annuities, pensions, bonds, life-insurance policies, and savings accounts. Only by adopting courageous monetary, fiscal, and credit policies can we hope to avoid economic disaster in the years ahead.

PLANNING FOR AN INDEFINITE PERIOD OF MOBILIZATION

Our present national emergency is unique in one vital respect. The present emergency may last for 5, 10, 20 years, or even longer. We remember that when General Eisenhower was here he emphasized the fact that it might continue for a period of 20 years. We cannot blindly follow the methods which were employed in response to emergencies of limited duration and hope to escape disaster.

The need for skillful leadership and careful planning is far more important today than it ever was during World War II. After Pearl Harbor there was never much doubt that victory over the Axis Powers would come within a relatively short period. It was possible to adopt economic policies which were suitable for a temporary war period, but which would have been disastrous as long-range policies. The last war proved that our economy can be completely regimented for a short period, that the American people will accept all-out controls on a temporary basis, and that the patriotism kindled by war makes it possible to have inflation without loss of confidence in the currency. In a long-range preparedness program, however, we cannot ignore economic principles. We must keep the cost of a more or less permanent mobilization program within our ability to pay for it. If we fail to do so, we will lose our freedom through overwhelming debt and massive inflation without Russia firing a single shot.

Where is the over-all plan for a long-range program of defense mobilization? Mr. Truman has failed to produce it. In the coming months we will hear much about shortages of tin, zinc, nickel, skilled labor, housing, and many others. All these shortages can be overcome by the ingenuity of the American people and their ability to substitute and to improvise. Our most critical shortage today is executive leadership. Unfortunately, there is no available substitute for such leadership except at 4-year intervals.

A blueprint for national defense mobilization would tell us the maximum number of men we could, in the absence of all-out war, place in the Armed Forces

without hampering production or exceeding our ability to pay. With this figure definite, everyone would be able to form an intelligent conclusion as to how many American soldiers, if any, should be provided for international land armies. Our educational institutions and our young people would be able to make plans for the future. But we have no such blueprint. The recommended size of the Armed Forces increases almost from day to day. Are we to drift by degrees into an army of 4,000,000, then 6,000,000, and eventually 10,000,000?

A blueprint for national defense mobilization would specify the peacetime spending which must be curtailed and the peacetime proposals which must be shelved for the duration. We not only have no such blueprint, but practically every Government department and agency is clamoring for more money and more employees to perform work in the magic name of national defense.

A blueprint for national mobilization, short of all-out war, would indicate exactly how much material would be required for our own Armed Forces and for military aid to foreign countries. However, no one, in or out of the executive branch, has any clear idea of what military spending will amount to or how it will be spent. As a result business and labor do not know to what extent they must shift to defense production.

A blueprint for national mobilization would coordinate monetary, fiscal and credit policies with a view to eliminating price and wage controls at an early date. In the absence of such a blueprint, and in spite of Mr. Johnston's announced intentions, we can never get rid of price and wage controls.

I have no doubt that Congress will do its part if it is given an over-all plan with which to work. With our specialized committee system, and the absence of information which the executive departments have, it is practically impossible for us to devise a long-range mobilization plan. Only Mr. Truman can provide such a plan. It is time for him to cast aside all other plans and concentrate on a plan which is concerned exclusively with the preservation of the American way of life in the critical years which lie ahead. Now is the time for the President to forget narrow, sordid political motives and plans such as those which seem at this time to be actuating very much of what he does.

RECESS

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 27, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 26 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Ben Hibbs, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term expiring January 27, 1954, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified, vice Mark Foster Ethridge, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James R. Wright, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 24, 1951.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

James E. Colliflower, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1951.

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 section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be lieutenant colonel

John F. Kellogg, Jr., MC, O230050.

To be majors

Arren C. Buchanan, Jr., MC, O1689921.
Joseph W. Cooch, MC, O476993.
James R. Drake, MC, O371656.
Charles F. Kramer, MC, O461082.
Francisco T. Roque, MC, O1897087.
Peter S. Scoles, MC, O977064.
Charles E. Tegtmeyer, MC, O335197.

To be captains

James P. Albrite, MC, O983789.
Cora L. Allebach, ANC, N767038.
Margaret F. Alt, WMSC, M458.
Louise S. Andersland, WMSC, J100042.
Robena C. Anderson, ANC, N760086.
Louise P. Appel, ANC, N776730.
Dorothy M. Atwood, ANC, N800115.
Hazel Belsit, ANC, N736065.
Bernice D. Brandt, ANC, N730555.
Mary Breazeale, WMSC, R84.
Rachel V. Briggs, ANC, N731483.
Treva B. Brookens, ANC, N724687.
Mary L. Burrows, ANC, N762512.
Marjorie J. K. Burts, ANC, N788828.
Samuel W. Caldwell, MC, O447880.
Helen L. Callentine, ANC, N728324.
Irving H. Canfield, MC, O474732.
Margaret R. Cannon, ANC, N771862.
Gracie L. Chapman, ANC, N734009.
Louise M. Clifford, ANC, N700956.
Ruth L. Craig, ANC, N800006.
Bess Crim, ANC, N727499.
Geneva H. Culpepper, ANC, N755251.
Mabel E. Dayton, ANC, N743221.
Pamela E. Duer, WMSC, M2375.
Anita M. Dumas, ANC, N790099.
Anna D'Zurko, ANC, N725880.
Bernice E. Epps, ANC, N763854.
Hazel E. Evans, ANC, N722276.
Adele F. Foreman, ANC, AN703172.
Margaret A. Fournelle, ANC, N703800.
Bruna G. Fusi, ANC, N721750.
John F. Geer, DC, O960673.
Julia T. Graves, ANC, N754449.
Alice Gunlogson, ANC, N733003.
Pauline A. C. Gustafson, ANC, N735552.
Thomas A. Haedicke, MC, O1756156.
Laura R. Hagen, ANC, N771467.
Helen Harnett, ANC, N744157.
Dorothy B. Harper, ANC, N745335.
Helen G. Hayworth, ANC, N744285.
Sylvia E. Hendrickson, ANC, N755225.
Mary I. Hogan, ANC, N730307.
Rose E. Houck, ANC, N743988.
Ernest E. House, DC.
Ruth Ivey, ANC, N731604.
Catherine T. Jennings, ANC, N755396.
Wanda Jensen, ANC, N737408.
Gladys E. Johnson, ANC, N733328.
Pauline V. Johnston, ANC, N784246.
Dorothy M. Kaiser, WMSC, R907.
Kathren L. Kauffman, ANC, N725824.
Eva T. Kotowski, ANC, N762970.
Elsie Krchnavi, ANC, N742726.
Joyce J. Kruse, ANC, N772826.
Hazel L. Langdon, ANC, N741585.
Marjorie J. Lindau, ANC, N730385.
Eileen L. McCarthy, ANC, N797367.
John B. McClellan, MC, O534233.
Annie M. McCraw, ANC, N724047.
B. Virginia McGlamery, ANC, N745376.
Venona M. McGuire, ANC, N732114.
Mona M. McMahon, ANC, N771938.
Betty E. Messersmith, ANC, N722649.
Alberta J. Miller, ANC, N797153.
Freda L. Monske, ANC, N762133.
Lenore L. Murphy, ANC, N759555.
Margaret M. Murphy, ANC, N799552.
Mary E. Murphy, ANC, N730892.
Florence R. Nelson, ANC, N756742.
Mary Nepsha, ANC, N796114.
Irene Newman, ANC, N720443.
Margaret A. Nice, ANC, N725708.
Hazel S. Nicholas, ANC, N767313.
Esther C. O'Neill, ANC, N759814.
Victoria R. Pavlowski, ANC, N732916.
Martha S. Pearce, ANC, N755492.
Lillie C. W. Penn, ANC, N703803.
Constance M. Perfett, ANC, N767251.
Rose L. Ponticello, ANC, N742074.
Anna M. Potochnik, ANC, N774123.
Nancy A. Probasco, ANC, N788282.
Ruth M. Roberts, ANC, N756012.
Ernestine Robertson, ANC, N721751.
Cecelia D. Romeyn, ANC, N728167.
Anne Rose, ANC, N704084.
Margaret C. Ross, ANC, N734396.
Andrew C. Ruoff III, MC, O511154.
Jean G. Russo, ANC, N723207.
Ruth P. Satterfield, ANC, N703364.
Amanda E. Schuchmann, ANC, N784265.
Estelle Smith, ANC, N726997.
Florence R. Smithers, ANC, N725985.
Margaret C. Stafford, ANC, N771471.
Donald J. Styer, DC, O1766327.
Ruth M. Swanson, ANC, N732568.
Ethel M. Sylvester, ANC, N775626.
Helen C. Tannehill, ANC, N733138.
Anna L. Taylor, ANC, N753241.
Inez A. Taylor, ANC, N785532.
Agatha B. Teasley, ANC, N780403.
Nellie R. Tubelis, ANC, N743363.
Alice E. VanWart, ANC, N723121.
Stefano Vivona, MC, O1766178.
Catherine U. Voetsch, ANC, N725067.
Eleanor F. Waite, ANC, N722712.
Margaret D. Wallner, ANC, N774788.
Rebecca Webber, ANC, N721107.
Zada V. Whiteman, ANC, N768385.
Jane A. Wilkinson, ANC, N757611.
Sudie A. Wilkinson, ANC, N726536.
Anna R. Worthington, ANC, N770083.
Martha J. Yancey, ANC, N775821.

To be first lieutenants

Cecil R. Albright, DC, O1100411.
Marshall E. Bailey, JAGC, O985336.
Joseph J. Barone, DC, O981508.
Jeanne R. Bowdish, WMSC, R2226.
Mildred E. Breimyer, WMSC, R2058.
Jeanette V. Caldwell, ANC, N762366.
Richard E. Dierking, DC, O980749.
Mary C. Driscoll, WMSC, M2784.
Mary E. Frazee, WMSC, M2450.
Guy A. Hamlin, JAGC, O2019459.
Robert E. Holzgrafe, MC, O9[illegible]52.
John F. Johnson, DC, O375615.
John C. Lanham, JAGC, O985507.
Donald V. Leddy, MC, O959039.
John A. Lighthall, JAGC, O388762.
Robert R. Mallory, JAGC, O1329142.
Edmund J. Morgan, Jr., MC.
John L. Naler, JAGC, O985278.
Marie L. Pearce, ANC, N793634.
Edwin R. Priest, MC, O980931.
Elizabeth F. Purcell, ANC, N794209.
Gracie V. Roberts, ANC, N765717.
Catherine M. Ruane, WMSC, R2027.
Leon C. Rudy, DC, O983322.
Arthur R. Slade, Jr., JAGC, O456136.
Wiliam S. Spicer, Jr., MC.
Ralph H. Sundeman, DC, O980064.
William A. Watt, JAGC, O1324688.

Anita Weber, ANC, N754491.
Virgil Woods, DC, O986925.
Charles K. Wright, Jr., JAGC, O460026.

To be second lieutenant

Charlotte V. R. McLain, WAC, L1010200.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants

Ollie L. Tracy, O467251.
Raymond C. Wilson, O546005.

To be second lieutenants

William A. Alfonte, Jr.
Robert J. Andrews, O1595349.
Harold T. Babb.
Samuel J. Bateman, Jr., O971258.
John B. Bristow, O2209925.
Alvin W. Granade, O2204790.
Kenneth R. Ingold.
Richard L. Jones, O1060832.
Harry L. Kellinger, O970538.
Ernest N. King, O1183333.
James E. Kingman, O2204575.
Henry K. Mattern, O554030.
Roy E. Platt, Jr., O2206797.
James L. Reavis.
Kenneth G. Stauffer, O2014693.
Cyril N. Volk, O2210306.
Charles F. West, O2204584.
Allen W. Wiegand, O499123.

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 section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Joseph A. Carvajal, O2206582.
Harry Feinstein.
Barney L. Garrett III.
Harlan E. Kamm, O2209401.
Albert F. Kee.
Raymond F. Korber.
Elvin F. Kromer, Jr.
Paul G. Martin.
Will H. Perry, Jr., O968717.
Robert D. Porter, O2205475.
George C. Rybak, O2202567.
Kenneth A. Sawyer, O2201353.
James C. Sindt, O2206989.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1951, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Raymond E. Arnold, O2211138.
Edward B. Baffico, Jr.
Harold L. Baker, O2204991.
Emmett W. Bowers.
Robert A. Burns.
Donald B. Carmichael.
John F. Conlee.
Bernard W. Dibbert, O2211094.
George M. Donovan, O2208682.
Howard D. Edwards, Jr.
George V. Ellis.
Byron J. Epstein.
Emory M. Folmar.
John O. Girardeau.
Frederick J. Gormley.
Raymond D. Hall.
Wallace Hooper, Jr.
Clifford G. Houchin.
Graham H. Howison.
Miles T. Jones.
Billy D. Lee.
Daniel D. Lee.
Harry E. Lewis, Jr.
Robert W. McDaniel.
Lawrence G. Means.
Ray R. Miller.
William H. Olson, Jr.
Robert M. Penor.
James E. Ramsey, O975327.
Wright S. Skinner, Jr.
Ivan L. Slavich, Jr., O2210248.
Harry F. Stewart, Jr., O2202578.
John J. Stipetic.
Donald C. Thorn.
Joseph D. Walding.
John C. Webber.
Paul A. Whetstone.
Thomas B. Wynegar.
Richard E. Zumsteg.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service:

Capt. Melbourne Caldwell Chandler, O37486, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Clyde Milton Turner, O43233, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj. Stanley John Cherubin, O20700, United States Army.

Maj. Frederick Charles Lough, O21118, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Paul Johnson, O23926, United States Army.

First Lt. James Clyde Waller, Jr., O50167, United States Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined for physical fitness and found physically qualified for promotion. All others are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Donald Ivan Abbott, O60517.
Alan Breiner Abt, O60323.
×Sidney William Achee, O60583.
Ivan Benton Acker, O60474.
Earl Clyde Acuff, O60178.
Robert Lionel Adcock, O60565.
Aaron Cummings Adkins, O60512.
Eugene Leon Adoue, O58805.
David Westerdahl Affleck, O58806.
×James Joseph Albertson, O62197.
×Thomas Chappell Aldridge, O58807.
Henry George Allard, O58808.
×Herbert Bland Allen, O60349.
Philip Joe Allen, Jr., O60585.
Warren Parrott Allen, O62825.
William Andrew Allison, O60176.
Curtis Harry Alloway, O59772.
William Marion Allred, O58809.
Theodore Ponce Alvarez, O60787.
Don Carlos Ambrose, O62179.
Richard Frank Amity, O60407.
Allen Ramano Anderson, O62116.
Melvin Charles Anderson, O60805.
Richard Claire Anderson, O58810.
Richard Lee Anderson, O60567.
Edward Comstock Anderton, O61094.
Charles Andres 3d, O58811.
×James Lawrence Andrews, O58812.
×Thomas James Anthony, O58813.
Robert Apt, O58814.
×Vern Ray Arnett, O60369.
×Richard Dinwiddie Arnold, O58815.
×Richard Jett Arnold, O58816.
×Frank Edward Atchison, O58817.
Frank Arthur Athanason, O58818.
×William Homer Avery, Jr., O58819.
×Rudolph Alfred Axelson, O59838.
×Jack Stephens Bailey, O62209.
Paul Owen Bailey, O60515.
×Dallas Olen Baker, O58820.
James Oliver Baker, O60316.
Paul Anthony Baldy, O59773.
×John James Balitis, O60414.
Donald Spencer Ballard, O58821.
Eldon Lee Ballinger, O61202.
John Donovan Bang, O63056.
×Stanley Baran, Jr., O60519.
Eugene Charles Barbero, O61994.
×Edmund Jackson Barker, O60330.
Harry Clements Barnes, O58822.
Howard Jay Barnett, O60496.
×Robert Boyd Barnett, O58823.
William Howard Barr, O59470.
×Ross Paige Barrett, O58824.
Thomas McClellan Barrick, O60493.
×Albert Lee Barringer, O58825.
William Robert Barwick, Jr., O61089.
Marshall Brent Bass, O62204.
Carl Franklin Baswell, O58826.
John Olaf Batiste, O58827.
John Thomas Batts, O59774.
James Oakley Baxter, O60478.
×Daryl Adelbert Beard, O60506.
Kenneth Raymond Beard, O61095.
×William Arnold Bearden, O60491.
Leonard Becicka, O58828.
William Julian Beck, O58829.
James Edward Beckett, O59839.
Robert Karl Bein, O60379.
Nicholas Anthony Beninate, O59464.
×Lucien Caldwell Benton, O60549.
×Robert Joseph Bernard, O58830.
×Charles Berry, O60490.
Milton Morgan Berry, O59886.
×Charles Edmund Best, O58831.
John James Betz, Jr., O58832.
Charles Prentis Bickerdike, O58833.
Emerson Theodore Biere, O58834.
×Bernard Big, O58835.
Edward Patrick Billinghurst, O63069.
James Calvin Blackford, O58836.
×Robert Coleman Blair, O59840.
Leslie Merle Blake, O62183.
Frank James Blankenship, O60389.
×Stanley Robert Blunck, O58837.
×William Charles Boehm, O63051.
George Marion Boone, Jr., O60335.
Charles Clifford Bourquardez, O60337.
Maurice Hugh Boutelle, O62126.
×William Clinton Bowen, Jr., O61201.
×Edmund George Boy, O63073.
Donn Thorp Boyd, O62181.
Peter Joseph Boyle, Jr., O58839.
William Lamar Boylston, O59775.
×Robert Kendall Bradford, O62173.
×Robert Anthony Brandewie, O60373.
×Charles Edward Brannon, O61207.
William DuBose Bratton, O60190.
×Walter Reis Braun, O60509.
Patrick Joseph Breen, O62129.
Eugene Harold Breitenberg, O62819.
×John Logan Briggs, O58840.
×Fred Mack Bristol, O63000.
×Charles Albert Brizius, Sr., O58841.
×Charles Kenneth Brockett, O60199.
×Roland St. John Brooks, Jr., O60336.
×Albert Joseph Brown, O60321.
×George Kepler Brown, Jr., O58842.
Haldon Duane Brown, O62136.
Hugh Mack Brown, Jr., O58843.
Richard Francis Brown, O59841.
William Andrew Brown, O60815.
×William Douglas Brown, O60426.
×Mark Lucius Browne, Jr., O58844.
Edward Joseph Bruger, O60516.
Jackson Mahone Bryant, O62151.
×John Thomas Bryant, Jr., O58845.
×Everts Reed Buchanan, O59842.
John Osborne Buchanan, O58846.
Clifford John Budney, Jr., O59776.
×David Monroe Buie, O59777.
×William Parker Bullard, O58847.
×Frank Edward Bullock, O60319.
×Frank Ralph Burget, O62120.
Robert Theodore Burns, O62820.
John Denton Burrer, O61208.
Harry Leonard Bush, O59843.
Billy Wayne Byrd, O58848.
Daniel Kevin Byrne, O58849.
Walvin Milton Cadman, O60554.
×Winfred Dubignon Cagle, O60579.
Lloyd Rondall Cain, O58850.
Thomas Andrew Callagy, O61093.
×Robert Francis Callahan, O58851.

Vincent Jerome Callahan, O60325.
×Miguel Antonio Candal, O61096.
J. Parry Cannon, O58852.
Leland Robert Cantlebary, O60350.
David Leon Cantor, O60539.
Michael Anthony Caponegro, O60206.
×Joseph Capuano, O58853.
×Charles Vernon Carney, O60783.
Dalton Odell Carpenter, Jr., O62188.
×William Currence Carper 3d, O58854.
William David Carr, O60420.
×William Robert Carraway, O59844.
Stephen John Carrig, O60378.
×Kevin Francis Carrigan, O62159.
×Edward Alexander Carrigo, Jr., O58856.
Cloud Graham Carter, O58857.
×James Taylor Carter, O60358.
×Sherman Floyd Carter, O60550.
Roscoe Conklin Cartwright, O63039.
Eugene Marshall Castellow, O58858.
Rupert William Catlin, O58859.
Edward Valentine Cerny, O59845.
×Norman Palmer Chandler, O60817.
Lorin Paul Chapman, O58860.
Floyd Arnold Chase, Jr., O60360.
×Sigmund Richard Chester, O58861.
James Hayden Chisholm, O60343.
Charles Britton Christian, O59779.
×George Howard Christianson, O60500.
Alphus Richard Clark, O63059.
Harlow Gary Clark, Jr., O60339.
Harry Edgar Clark, O60357.
×James Leonard Clark, O58743.
×William Ross Clark, O60521.
Richard Livingston Clarkson, O60792.
John Henry Cleveland, O59468.
Henry Leroy Cody, O60443.
William David Coffey, Jr., O60341.
×Jack Hart Cole, O60456.
×Bruce Sutton Coleman, O58862.
James Farnsworth Coleman, O58863.
John D. Coleman, Jr., O60785.
×Clarence James Coles, O60432.
William Hurle Collier, O58864.
Donald Richard Condrill, O63309.
Donald Allen Conner, O58866.
George Clifford Connor, O60557.
Charles Ermer Conrad, O58867.
×Clifton Harding Conrad, O63071.
×DeWitt Cook, O60510.
John Ellis Coon, O59847.
Virgil Norbert Cordero, Jr., O60181.
David Ray Correll, O60440.
Robert Francis Coveny, O62167.
John Smith Craig, O58868.
Walter Midkiff Crandall, Jr., O58869.
Leon Crenshaw, O59457.
Creston Winterfred Crockett, O60462.
×John Jordan Crockett, O59848.
Morgan Joseph Cronin, O58870.
×Robert Alger Cronk, O58871.
James Albert Crough, O58872.
×Thomas Howell Crowder, Jr., O62178.
Ralph Heller Cruikshank, O60803.
Paul Vernon Culbertson, O59849.
Kenneth Milton Cummings, O60526.
Robert Francis Cunningham, O58873.
Thomas Wesley Dale, O58874.
Robert Clinton Dalzell, O60183.
George McCarty Daniel, O60551.
William Boyd Daum, O58875.
David Leonard Davis, O60365.
×Gordon Reed Davis, Jr., O58876.
Harry Parker Davis, Jr., O60364.
Albert Fred Dawson, O59850.
William Joseph Dawson, Jr., O60801.
George Robert Deakin, O58877.
×Charles de Forest Decker, Jr., O58878.
Theodore Joseph DeFranço, O60417.
×John Brock De Marcus, O59851.
Raymond Clifford Denchfield, O58879.
Paul Stanton Denison, Jr., O58880.
×Darel Douglas Denney, O60408.
Joseph Anthony De Santis, O60362.
×Vernon Curtis Devan, O62194.
Oliver William Dillard, O60564.
Robert James Dillard, O58881.
Richard Turner Dille, O58882.
×William Harold Dillon, O58883.
Donald Peter Doerflein, O60547.
×John Domenech, O60487.
James David Donnelly, O60205.
×Paul Edward Donnelly, O59852.
×Thomas William Donovan, O58884.
John Edward Dougherty, O60314.
Leslie Milton Douglas, O58885.
William Thomas Drake, O60429.
×Elbert Elliott Drane, O60449.
George Roland Dufresne, O62812.
×George Joe Duggins, O58886.
James Otis Duke, O60502.
×Lonzie Jefferson Dukes, O58887.
Samuel Kenneth Duncan, O60393.
William Henry Dunham 3d, O60419.
×Richard Henry Durr, O58888.
Paul Bernard Duruz, O58889.
Joseph Angell Dyer, O60376.
×Carl Templeton Earles, O58890.
Joseph Albert Edmunds, O60390.
Ralph Edwards, O62827.
×Robert Buster Edwards, O60562.
×Frank Joseph Egan, O58891.
×George Dewey Eggers, Jr., O60555.
×Albert Prince Eickhoff, O59853.
Uell Wesley Ellard, Jr., O58892.
August Victor Ellis, O58893.
William Ralph Ellis, O62814.
×Bryce Linton Elmer, O58894.
William Harville Embley, O58895.
×Jean Roland Emery, O60544.
×Harris Emmons, O59854.
Edward Philip Endres, O60571.
×Jones Newton Epps, Sr., O60328.
×Herman Ertischweiger, O58896.
×Albert Ronald Escola, O60569.
William Walling Etchemendy, O62152.
Max Etkin, O60793.
×Bryan Evans, Jr., O58897.
Harry Everett Evans, O62150.
Arvine J. Eyer, O62824.
Ronald James Fairfield, Jr., O62135.
William Kenneth Farmer, O60486.
×Thomas Hinchman Farrington, O60796.
Richard Gregory Fazakerley, O58898.
×Russell Engle Felix, O60475.
Bruce Courtney Fisher, O60329.
×Joseph Edward Fix 3d, O60527.
×Paul Mitchell Fletcher, O60189.
William Hayes Fogel, O58899.
Joseph Anthony Fontana, O60439.
×William Albert Forbes, O58900.
×Alvin Ernest Fort, O62163.
James Edenfield Foster, O58901.
Robert Francis, O62122.
Cleo Samuel Freed, O59463.
×George Lawrence Freeman, O59781.
Ejner Jens Fulsang, Jr., O60452.
Robert Lincoln Gabardy, O58902.
Bernard Walter Galing, O60574.
George Albert Galion, O58903.
×James Vance Galloway, O59782.
×Robert Maxton Galloway, O62166.
×John Clarence Gambrell, O58904.
Orlando Garcia, O62138.
Edward Jennings Garrett, O58905.
Felix Roby Garrett, O60436.
Franklin Trent Garrett, O59783.
Daniel Joseph Garvey, O58906.
×Charles Ephriam Garwood, O60552.
Robert Alan Geiger, O58907.
Donald Leonard Gellnicht, O58908.
×Peter Paul Genero, O63063.
Henry Herman Gerecke, O62160.
×Shirl Leroy Gerlach, O63049.
Richard Earl Gerrish, Jr., O58909.
John Franklin Gerrity, O58910.
Benjamin Franklin Gibbons, Jr., O60816.
Frederick William Giggey, O60532.
×John Paul Gillis, O60313.
Ralph Harold Girton, O57588.
Richard James Glikes, O60197.
Lewis Henry Goad, O60450.
×Carl Edward Goldbranson, O60451.
×Roscoe Harris Goodell, O60377.
James Henry Gordon, O60784.
Will Hughes Gordon, Jr., O60529.
William Eugene Gore, O58911.
Freddie Warren Gramling, O62115.
Robert Thomas Grant, Jr., O60346.
Harold Kazmaier Graves, O59855.
Robert Preston Graves, O58912.
Columbus Eagle Gray, Jr., O59460.
×Harvey Wilson Gray, Jr., O60582.
Maurice Cameron Greene, O60435.
×Arthur Peter Gregory, O60788.
William Arthur Gresham, O59471.
Leonard Francis Griffin, O61092.
Benjamin Louis Gunter, Jr., O62202.
×Louis Jacob Gutting, O62822.
John Benjamin Haberer, O60194.
Charles Early Hall, O60578.
Harry Harold Hall, O58913.
×James Frank Hamlet, O60412.
×George Michael Hamscher, O62174.
×William Robert Hanks, O58914.
William Oscar Hanle, O60348.
Laurence Kenneth Hannon, O58915.
×George Keith Hansen, O58916.
×Adam Wesley Harper, O60399.
×Douglas Patrick Harper, O58918.
×Joseph Wheeler Harper, Jr., O58919.
Joseph Shelton Harrelson, Jr., O62119.
Carl William Harris, O58920.
×Harry Benjamin Harris, O62165.
×Dennis James Harrison, O58921.
LeRoy Oliver Harstad, O60453.
Edsel Fay Hart, O60186.
Carl Wayne Hartman, O62171.
×Sidney Stewart Haszard, O60457.
William Savage Hathaway, O60588.
William Sherman Hawkins, O60808.
Oakes Mildren Hayden, O60327.
Herbert Wade Hayes, Jr., O58922.
Rodney Gould Hayler, Jr., O60528.
×David Philip Heekin, O60888.
Daniel Patrick Heilman, O60563.
×Glenn Bernard Helmick, O59856.
John Leonard Helms, O60513.
Desmond Harris Hardie Hempton, O58923.
Allen Theodore Hendren, O60406.
×Herbert Thomas Herrin, O62810.
×Howard Marvin Herron, O59465.
Walter Hettlinger, O59857.
×Walter Hibbard, Jr., O59858.
Elzie Hickerson, O62141.
Alfred George Hill, O58924.
Lucius Gordon Hill, Jr., O58925.
Ernest Alfonso Hinojosa, Jr., O57585.
James Munhall Hitchcock, O60198.
Raymond Fallon Hodgdon, O60187.
×Genous Sanders Hodges, Jr., O58926.
Fremont Byron Hodson, Jr., O60543.
×John Henry Hoffman, O62140.
Crenshaw Allen Holt, O58927.
Charles Fuller Hood, O59494.
×Maurice Rossiter Horn, O59472.
×Willard Victor Horne, O60800.
Robert Powers Hotaling, O62177.
James Wayne Houtz, O62821.
×John William Houtz, O63326.
×Charles Walter Howard, O59785.
Harmon Howard, O62180.
Frederick Richard Huck, O60421.
×John Joseph Huetter, O63316.
John Sheldon Huff, O59859.
Richard Allen Huff, O58928.
Tom Huff, O58929.
John Anderson Hughes, Jr., O61995.
John Cecil Hughes, O58930.
Walter Phillips Hughes, Jr., O62816.
Albert George Hume, O58931.
William Lloyd Humphrey, O59786.
George Richard Hurd, Jr., O60437.
James Herbert Hutchison, O60282.
Albert Lockett Hutson, Jr., O58932.
Robert Burgoyne Hutton, O58933.
×Chester Pratt Irby, Jr., O60366.
Edward Francis Irick, Jr., O60791.
I. J. Irvin, Jr., O62131.
Thomas Ralph Isaacs, O58934.
Carl Watson Ivie, Jr., O59787.
Robert Walter Jamison, O60355.
×Henry Alston Jeffers, Jr., O60795.
John Michael Jennings, O60587.
×Carol Norman Johns, O63061.
×Carl Amesly Johnson, O58936.
×Jasper Royce Johnson, O62170.
×Marshall Dean Johnson, O58937.
James DeCatur Johnstone 3d, O58938.
Robert Virgil Jones, O58939.
Russell Burton Jones, Jr., O59860.
Werner Clayton Jones, O60553.
×Horst Karl Joost, O60353.
×William John Joosten, O61206.
Charles John Kachavos, O59491.
Jerome Harry Kaczmarowski, O60454.

Raymond Kalgren, O60338.
×Raymond Levis Kampe, O60430.
Tom Kanelis, O58940.
×Edward Neal Kaplan, O60180.
×Hervey Earl Keator, O58941.
Bernard Stephen Kern, O62201.
Richard LaRue Kerr, O59458.
Charles Gideon Kershaw 2d, O58942.
Edward Francis Kerwin, O58943.
Paul Edward Killpack, O58944.
×Leonard Kimmick, Jr., O60558.
Monroe Dee King, O60322.
William Porter King, O58945.
×William Wilson Kirchman, O62185.
×Henry Clay Kirk, O60422.
Flavious William Kirksey, O60363.
John Frederick Kiser, O58946.
Henry Lawrence Klim, O60458.
Charles James Kling, O60344.
×Jerry Adolph Kneisl, O60499.
Bruce Rudolph Knowlton, Jr., O59861.
Eric Kobbe, O62175.
Kenneth William Koch, O62190.
James Robert Koenig, O59475.
John Stanley Komp, O58947.
×Joseph Kormylo, O58948.
×Constantine David Kryzanowsky, O62162.
Charles Edgar Kunkel, O58949.
Leonard Harry Kushner, O60818.
George Vance Labadie, Jr., O62118.
×Wilfred George La Londe, O62195.
Henry Carson Lamar, Jr., O58950.
Kenneth Richard Lamison, O58951.
Stephen Edwin Lance, O60561.
Jack Cecil Langston, O60392.
Donald Heywood Lanier, O60559.
×James Reed Lawrence, O58952.
William Franklin Lawson, Jr., O62176.
×William Stevens Lawton, Jr., O60505.
Victor Jerome Layton, O59862.
×William Emmet Leahey, O58953.
Roy Jean Lechner, O60503.
John Harold Le Clair, O58954.
×James Monroe Leer, Jr., O61204.
Robert Harvard Lehman, O62168.
Bernard John Leu, Jr., O62205.
×Roy Lenton Liles, O58955.
William Bruce Lindsay, O61203.
Gordon Joseph Lippman, O60536.
Albert William Litschgi 3d, O59863.
Theodore Llana, Jr., O59864.
Leon Harrison Lockhart, O62117.
Otto Anthony Lockwood, O58956.
Joseph Randolph Loftin, O60312.
×Arthur Eugene Lomax, O60488.
Wesley Tierce Long, O59887.
Robert Carlton Lorch, O58957.
Robert Meyer Lorenz, O63036.
Harry Franklin Lowman, Jr., O59459.
Theodore Roosevelt Lowman, O58958.
Edward Guthrie Luce, O60356.
Lorenzo Foster Luckie, Jr., O58959.
×Roy William Clause Lundquist, O63042.
Roman Joseph Lutz, O58961.
John Lycas, O62137.
Joseph William Lyons, O59466.
Paul Dixon MacGarvey, O62132.
×Robert Charles MacLane, O59865.
×Angus Boyd MacLean, O60530.
×William Allister MacLeod, O60287.
Arthur Edward Mahoney, O60523.
John Eugene Maier, O63058.
×Robert Thomas Mailheau, A62172.
George William Mainer, O60811.
Alexander George Makarounis, A58962.
Michael Joseph Malone, O58963.
Max Dutton Manifold, O60345.
×Kenneth Theodore Manning, O60320.
William Edward Manning, O60466.
×John George Mantalas, O63064.
Herbert Edwin Marlatt, O58964.
Robert Davies Marsh, O60387.
James Edward Marshall, Jr., O60794.
James Calbraithe Martin, O58965.
Jason Howard Martin, O58966.
George Henry Marx, O58967.
×Harry Thomas Mathews, O60428.
Stanley Lawrence Matthews, O60315.
Leroy Baity Mattingly, O58968.
Charles Russell May, O60448.
Henry James McAllister, O60332.
×Harvey Olan McAlpin, O60581.
×James Clay McAmis, Jr., O60372.
John Francis McAuliffe, O60354.
Thomas Raymond McCandless, O60395.
Samuel Eugene McCann, O61200.
×Leo Clark McCarthy, O62123.
Nevin Lee McCartney, O60508.
Stan Leon McClellan, O58969.
Walter Stark McCrackern, O58970.
×Francis Max McCullar, O60174.
Henry Hawkins McCurley, O60802.
Charles Arthur McFadden, O60175.
Kenneth Thomas McFall, O60586.
Richard DeLause McFarland, O58971.
×Robert Reed McFarland, O60479.
John Rutherford McGiffert 2d, O58972.
James Bernard McIlwee, O58973.
×James McKee, O60427.
×Joseph Vincent McKeever, O58974.
×Ray Archie McKinsey, O60797.
Frank James McNeese, O60577.
×Sam Meadow, O62142.
Walter Sherman Medding, O58975.
Jack Marshall Meiss, O62146.
Ralph Theodore Mello, O58976.
×George Dewey Merrell, Jr., O60812.
Elmer Jesse Messer, O58977.
Jack Robert Metzdorf, O62139.
×Warren Hugo Metzner, O62191.
David Wilson Meyer, O59867.
×Sanders Davis Middleton, Jr., O60203.
Alfred John Millard, O60489.
Darwin Caye Miller, O60538.
Charles Walter Moffett, Jr., O60807.
John Post Moffitt, O58979.
Eugene Eric Monk, O59467.
Keith La Verne Monroe, O62182.
John Joseph Montgomery, O59868.
Raymond J. Montgomery, O60391.
Eugene Edward Morath, Jr., O58980.
Berkeley Davis More, O58981.
Thomas Garnett Morehead, O59869.
Carroll Moreton, O60333.
John Thomas Morgan, Jr., O60814.
William John Morrisroe, O62186.
Herbert Edwin Morse, O60498.
Paul Ammon Morton, O62127.
×Robert Eugene Morton, O60483.
Nard Long Moseley, O60545.
James Robert Mulligan, O60191.
×Floyd Russell Mulvany, O60459.
Richard Adams Munn, Jr., O59461.
×James Joseph Murnane, O62144.
James Alva Murphey, Jr., O60501.
×Francis Joseph Murphy, O62156.
George Masayuki Nagata, O60799.
×Marvin Lee Nance, O62161.
Orrin Drexel Neff, O62189.
Raymond Nicholas Nelson, Jr., O59802.
×Stephen Alexander Nemeth, O59870.
Roscius Clinton Newell, O58985.
Gilbert Hughes Newman, O59790.
Glenn Lee Nicholas, O58986.
William Lee Nichols, O58987.
Andrew Nisbet, Jr., O58988.
×Thomas Patrick Noble, O60334.
Hubert Edward Nolde, O60542.
×Robert Joseph Noll, O58989.
Albert Theodore Noreen, Jr., O60438.
×Louis Joseph North, O62199.
×Leonard Levert Norwood, Jr., O58990.
Jehiel Novick, O61993.
Clifford Clyde Nunn, Jr., O60465.
Richard Charles O'Connor, O62187.
×William Charles O'Kelley, O59871.
Leonard Kenneth Olvis, O60434.
Joseph John Ondishko, Jr., O60576.
George Alan Orfalea, O60455.
John Roy Osborne, O60537.
Frank Stanley Osiecki, O60425.
Wade Hampton Padgett, Jr., O62145.
Alexander Chenoweth Page, O60556.
John Morgan Parker, O58992.
Robert Lang Parker, O58993.
×Robert Hill Parks, O59872.
Robert Whitmore Patterson, O58994.
×Robert Burland Payne, O58996.
Eugene Laird Peale, O60520.
Anthony Pecoraro, O59873.
×William George Penrod, O60441.
John Petrelli, O60413.
×Milton Bailey Phillips, O62210.
Robert Leroy Phillips, Jr., O58997.
Edwin William Piburn, Jr., O60380.
×Albert Adrian Piccirilli, O60342.
Lloyd Joseph Picou, O58998.
John William Pierce, O59874.
Leon Alfred Pierce, O58999.
James Edmond Piercy, O59000.
Howard Wheeler Pierson, O60494.
Harry Bernard Plowman, O60324.
John Franklin Plumb, O59001.
Donald Kenneth Polifka, O60522.
James Rupert Porta, O60431.
Alton Gustav Post, O60317.
Charles Maxwell Post, O59002.
Joseph Lavern Power, O62818.
×George McLeod Powers, O59003.
David Roscoe Presson, O60195.
Charles Eugene Pritchard, O60041.
Gilbert Procter, Jr., O62155.
Nicholas George Psaki, Jr., O62121.
×George William Pulliam, Jr., O62208.
×William Truman Putnam, O59004.
James Leslie Quinnelly, O60177.
Edward Calvin Radcliff, O60533.
John Herbert Rafferty, Jr., O60804.
Rene Ramos, O59005.
Thompson Lamar Raney, O63054.
Mark Raum, O59006.
William Arthur Rawn, O60461.
×William Bennett Ray, O60568.
×Robert Alexander Reade, O60514.
Paul Francis Reagan, O59008.
Albert Redman, Jr., O62157.
×Kenneth Ralph Rees, O59875.
×Wallace Gene Reid, O60361.
Francis Whitlock Reilly, O59009.
×Daniel Joseph Renneisen, O62133.
×Homer Ellis Rhoads, O59010.
Richard Goin Rhodes, O59876.
Samuel Tinsley Rhodes, Jr., O56992.
×Marvin Earl Rice, O59011.
Barton Fraley Richards, O60471.
Walton Karl Richardson, Jr., O59013.
×Melvin Elton Richmond, O60388.
Francis Marion Riddlemoser, Jr., O59014.
Vance Devor Rider, O60518.
Noble Lee Riggs, O59791.
×Evan Francis Riley, O60370.
Eugene Rinaldi, O59015.
Kenneth George Ring, O59016.
Eugene Joseph Ringel, O59017.
×Andrew Jackson Roach, O56994.
Carl Franklin Roark, O61996.
Oliver LeRoy Robbins, O62153.
Robert Samuel Robbins, O62192.
William Godfrey Roberts, O59018.
Neil Robinson, O59019.
Eric Otto Rodenbeck, O60375.
John Francis Rogan, O62203.
×Benton Milton Rogers, O59020.
Donald Edward Rogers, O60573.
Ernest Rollen Rogers, Jr., O60374.
Fred Tecumseh Rogers, O59021.
George Mann Roper, Jr., O60359.
×Charles Wilbur Rose, O60400.
Warren John Rosengren, O62158.
John Philip Ross, O60404.
Francis Curry Rosser, O61130.
William Joseph Rousseau, Jr., O59022.
×Henry Cordes Row, Jr., O60443.
Newton Chester Royce, O60415.
Harold Wayne Runft, O63046.
×Alexander Paul Rusanowsky, O62823.
Donald Keith Russell, O62817.
George Cameron Russell, Jr., O59877.
×George Hector Russell, O59499.
×James Wilson Russell, O60424.
×Robert Clinton Russell, O62125.
Hans Gunther Ruthe, O62164.
×Eugene George Sabota, O63066.
×William Harvey Sachs, O60464.
×Benjamin Ball Safar, O60331.
Samuel Francis Sampson, O59023.
Bernard Brown Sapp, O62143.
John Joseph Sarazen, Jr., O57582.
×Robert Allen Satterfield, O60482.
×James Baines Saum, O59878.
William Schabacker, O59792.
×Louis Theodore Schaner, O62200.
Thomas Sewell Schreiber, O57918.
Carl Thomas Schuler, Jr., O59024.
Ferdinand Loray Schwartz, O59793.

Adrian Scott, O60786.
×Beverly Summers Scott, O60580.
×Ebbin Pina Scott, Jr., O60467.
Robert Eugene Sears, O60311.
Wallace Roy Sears, O60447.
Frank Donald Secan, O60201.
×John Allen Seddon, O63057.
Chesley Kent Seely, O59025.
August George Seibert, O59026.
Jack Bradford Shanahan, O60809.
Claude Oscar Shell, Jr., O60798.
×Jerome Sheppard, O60468.
Frank William Sheppe, O59803.
×Selvin Edward Shields, O60382.
Kenneth Shipman, O60411.
×Courtney Reid Shirley, O59027.
×James William Shockley, O59028.
Rowland Berger Shriver, Jr., O60495.
George Macon Shuffer, Jr., O59029.
Arthur Eugene Sikes, O60531.
Arthur Robert Simpson, O59030.
×Edgar Merrill Sinclair, O59031.
Homer Henry Sittner, O60492.
×Victor Lee Sitton, O60394.
Paul Lester Skogsberg, O62134.
Earl Stanley Sleeper, O63045.
×Ira Taylor Sliger, Jr., O59032.
×Bartholomew Peter Smith, O60790.
Charles Austin Smith, O60566.
×Harold Timbs Smith, O59795.
Jack Edwin Smith, O60347.
Joseph Henry Slack Smith, O59033.
Kingsley John Smith, O59034.
Martin Robert Smith, Jr., O59035.
Richard Calvin Smith, O60477.
Samuel Clendenin Smith, O59036.
Wilfrid King Grover Smith, O60548.
William Alexander Smith, Jr., O60546.
×Felix Stephen Smolenski, O63037.
Frank George Snow, O59879.
James Arthur Snow, O60385.
×Basil Joseph Sollitto, O59796.
×Lowell Kalb Solt, O60200.
Delbert Dean Spahr, O60789.
Sam Spector, O59037.
Frank Joseph Spettel, Jr., O59038.
×Bob Frederick Spitzmiller, O60188.
×Jack Wilburn Stallings, Jr., O62193.
James Thomas Staples, O60444.
×Robert Nathan Starr, O60351.
×Harold Stein, O60540.
×Richard Riley Stevens, O59039.
Cleveland Rex Steward, Jr., O59040.
×Loren Francis Stewart, O59462.
Gerald Clayton Stinson, O61997.
Frank James Stone, Jr., O60442.
William Mills Stone, Jr., O60485.
Louis Francis Strawn, O59041.
Robert Warren Street, O59042.
×James Kenneth Stringer, O62184.
Emil Joseph Stryker, Jr., O59043.
Norman Edward Sudnick, O57587.
James Joseph Sullivan, O59044.
×Gordon Lincoln Swangren, O59045.
Ralph Junior Swann, O59046.
Paul Andrew Swanson, O59047.
Harvey Edward Sweeney, O59048.
×Lewis Stanley Swinehart, Jr., O59880.
Neely Milton Swomley, O59881.
×Thomas Howard Tackaberry, Jr., O60504.
Raymond Vincent Taibbi, O63044.
John Franklin Taylor, O59049.
Paul Russell Thacker, O59050.
David Cummings Thatcher, O59051.
×Halbert Colclough Thaxton, O59052.
Lawrence Milton Thomas, O60318.
×Wray Richardson Thomas, O60535.
×John Wesley Thompson, O59053.
Paul Edward Thornton, O62815.
William Harris Timberman, O62811.
John Andrew Todd, O60511.
Pershing Tousley, O60204.
×Harry Wheatland Townsend, O60481.
×Harry Edward Trigg, O60470.
Lawrence Vito Troiano, O59797.
Douglas Byron Tucker, O62169.
Elwin Bailey Tudder, O60541.
Jack Maynard Tumlinson, O60572.
×Charles Matthew Tyson, O63047.
Milton Frank Uffmann, O60383.
×William Daniel VanBuskirk, O62147.
Richard Vanderploeg, O60416.
John Harper Van Eaton, O60497.
×Robert Osborn VanHorn, O60173.
×Charles Enid VanZant, O61131.
×James Benjamin Vaught, O60570.
Caleb Randolph Vincent, O60813.
Ernest John Vogelgesang, O60507.
×Robert Louis Vranish, O60386.
George Ivan Wagner, O60185.
Benjamin Metcalf Walker, O59054.
Jerry Green Wallace, O59812.
John Joseph Walsh, Jr., O59055.
Allie Lee Walters, O59056.
Norman Hutton Wampler, O60398.
David Edward Ward, O60403.
Richard Henton Ward, Jr., O62130.
William Benjamin Ware, O62114.
Dayton Leonard Warren, O59798.
Edwin Alexander Watson, O59469.
Duane LeRoy Wayman, O60472.
×James Mitchell Webb, O60182.
Lloyd Edwin Webb, O60575.
Milton Dell Weeks, O62128.
Henry Norman Weggeland, Jr., O59882.
Sherman Weisinger, O59057.
Seymour Theodore Weisser, O62148.
Raymond Lamount Welide, O60423.
×Donald Booth Wentzel, O59800.
Craig Thomas Wesley, O60193.
×Ernest Edward Wheeler, O60418.
Charles Irwin White, Jr., O59059.
Joseph Franklin White, O63048.
Wolfred Kenneth White, O59883.
David Denson Whiteside, O62149.
×Charles Hamilton Whitledge, O62198.
Harry Randall Whitman, O59060.
×Kenneth Stoddard Whittemore, Jr., O62999.
×Charles Willard Whittington, O59884.
×Charles Clair Wigner, O59061.
×Richard Franklin Wilkinson, O59062.
×LeRoy Lyle Willard, O63313.
Dudley Ames Williams, O60445.
Harry Edgar Williams, O61091.
×John David Williams, O60446.
Tinker Williams, O59063.
Vernon Charles Williams, O63062.
×Virgil Hughes Williams, O59064.
Leo Charles Williamson, O59065.
James Forster Wilson, O60405.
Kermit Jewell Wilson, O60172.
Robert Duane Wilson, O59067.
Kingston Montgomery Winget, O62206.
Sanford Harold Winston, O62154.
Jerome Thomas Winter, O59068.
Frederick Joseph Wittlinger, O59069.
Richard Delmont Wolf, Jr., O59070.
Hiram Michael Wolfe 3d, O61090.
Gus August Wolman, Jr., O57583.
×Edwin Wood, O60525.
×Roy Lee Wood, O59071.
×William Schuyler Wood, O59072.
Altus Lamar Woods, Jr., O59885.
×Samuel Miller Woodward, O59801.
Reginald Wallace Woolard, O59073.
Robert Deane Worthen, O62207.
×DeVerne Richard Yost, O60381.
James William Young, O60410.
×Raymond Earl Young, O60484.
Evert Charles Youngs, O59074.
Gordon Francis Zeitz, O60352.
×Frank Joseph Zigmund, O59075.
×Paul Sumpter Zobrist, O59076.
×Charles William Zuppann, O60534.
Edward Francis Astarita, O60821.
George Bertrand Barrett, Jr., O60601.
Robert Parmly Blackmore, O59473.
Robert Edwin Burt, O63053.
John Thomas Coughlin 2d, O58013.
Wallace Homer Currey, O62212.
×Jack Marshall Darden, O60595.
Edgar Robert Fenstemacher, O59780.
Leroy Humphries Glunt, O60599.
Girvan Henry Griffith, O60591.
Owen Ross Grogan, Jr., O63052.
Donald Joseph Hennes, O63297.
Forest Eugene Hoff, O63310.
×Albert Romaine Hoffman, O63234.
×Stanley John Hussey, O63323.
Raymond Edrid Johnson, O63281.
Merle Elpheus Johnstonbaugh, O60590.
Eugene Kelley, Jr., O63320.
×Harold Hikiau Lee, O63324.
Robert John Maier, Jr., O63075.
William Leo Maloney, O60600.
David Stockman Marshall, O63288.
William Francis McCormick, Jr., O63076.
Robert Palmer McMath, O60603.
×Wallace Norman McNicol, O60820.
×Paul Hubert Miller, O63325.
Winfred Elden Mitchem, O60596.
Euless Buniott Moore, Jr., O63300.
×William Fdederick Nickel, O63293.
James Cantrell Olson, O60207.
×John Paul O'Shaughnessy, Jr., O63317.
David William Passell, O62211.
William Joseph Pfeffer, O60593.
William Amos Ponder, O60589.
Frank Dana Proctor, O61097.
Claude Holt Rawlins, O60594.
×Tom Reid, O63040.
×Clifford Charles Reynolds, Jr., O63279.
Edwin Tietjen Rios, O63038.
Jarvis Kenneth Shaffer, O59888.
William Stendeback, Jr., O63327.
William Earl Taylor, O63308.
Joseph Vincent Tittone, O60592.
×Edward Samuel Waddell, O63068.
Vernon John Walters, O63074.
×Wilburn Clarence Weaver, O63407.
Samuel Crayton Wood, O60598.
Theodore Wyckoff, O63312.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

William Leon Bost, O58787.
Maxwell Alexander Cook, O59846.
John Arthur Deakins, O58788.
×Adrian David Mandel, O60889.
Ralph Willard Morgan, O60887.
Carlos Edward Newton, O61082.
×Earle Alexander Paxson, O58790.
×Arin Forest Robinson, Jr., O58793.
Frederick Bertram St. John, O58791.
Hanssen Schenker, O63181.
Claude Earl Young, O58792.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 26 (legislative day of January 29), 1951:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Wallace A. Burgess
Eugene B. Conrad
Valleau E. Curtis
Gresham G. Downs
Walter A. Ellinghausen, Jr.
Clarence Erkelens
John R. Gunderson
Arthur D. Jessen
John M. Key
Edward D. Kuball
Thomas D. Lewis
Ralph A. McCroskey
John DaC. Meyer
Donald A. Miller
John M. Neel
Charles P. Pressly III
Gilbert D. Saul
Thomas B. Smiley, Jr.
Stephen D. Stevning
Jerry "D" Wolfe

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Charles L. Cotter
Roland S. Dick, Jr.
Paul C. Gaertner, Jr.
Frank U. Garrard III
Jack T. Hamilton
Robert E. Hodgson, Jr.
Joseph A. Juhlin, Jr.
Arthur G. O. Roe
Robert L. Sheppard, Jr.
James L. Thwing

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy (special-duty officers):

Joseph R. Geraud
Harold Hoag
Paul R. Kramer
Charles E. McDowell
David W. Miller
Robert H. Nicholson
Franklin E. Porter
Edwin P. Preston
James M. Wallace, Jr.
James D. Wilder

The following named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commanders

James K. Cunningham
Halvdan G. K. Faaland
Charles P. Root

Lieutenant

James A. McLaughlin

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Luther W. Brady, Jr.	James B. Lynch
William R. Daniel	Thomas G. Lyons
Robert L. Davis	Kenneth W. Meinert
Seldon C. Dunn	George W. St. C. Moore
John E. Gill	Robert G. Reaves, Jr.
David Gillette	George W. Thoma, Jr.
Theodore C. Hooker	Edgar E. Thomas, Jr.
Gilbert M. Kinzer	Earl A. Thompson

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

John P. Byrnes	John L. Moran, Jr.
Samuel R. Hardman	Harlin E. Tillberg
Lucian C. Mattiello	James H. Veary
Don M. Michael	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

Thomas H. Mayo

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Earl R. Williams

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Addie E. Baker	Henrietta A. Mulholland
Elizabeth A. Bispham	Rose A. Pachiano
Helen J. Black	Jane M. Parrick
Betty A. Gibson	Edia M. Plosila
Lola M. Green	Angelina T. Pommier
Doris E. Marsch	Anna C. Read
Lucille A. Matchus	Ellen G. Warren
Millicent E. Merrick	
Thedia A. Michael	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenants

Doris F. Bentley	Josephine E. McCarthy
Arline W. Harding	Clara T. Szczypin
Edythe A. Head	

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Frances J. Jacobson

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenant commanders

Albert L. Ballard	LeRoy Loewer
Edward H. Bayers	James R. McKenzie, Jr.
Louis E. Biechlin	Robert E. Mansard
Joe M. Danielski	Kenneth A. Mundy
Edward M. Doran	Rollin M. Reed
Harold C. Gabriel	Victor A. Schmalfeldt
Carll T. Gleason	Horace D. Schultz
Eldon L. Guhl	William E. Taylor
Harry A. Guthrie	George S. Watson
Clarence C. Hawk	Ephraim R. Weaver
Marion H. Hawkins	Juston W. West
Stanley J. Lewandowski	

Lieutenants

Thomas E. Acton	Harold M. Dubree
William F. Adams	Jesse W. Dunwoody
John C. Arthur	Robert J. Erickson
Dwight F. Asmus	Leon S. Ertle
Thomas E. Bager	Marion S. Evans
John W. Barden	Eudore A. Forcier
George R. Becker	Laron S. Franklin
Henry F. Berck	William E. Fuller
Alvin C. Bergquist	Ned A. Gardner
Joseph Buehlman	John G. Gillissie
Silas M. Blakely	John Greksouk
Harold B. Boaz	Lyle T. Griffis
Alfred V. Boutin	Truman F. Grubl
Jim W. Bryson	Harry D. Hall
Donald F. Byers	Russel L. Hendrickson
Don M. Cameron	Frederick J. Hicken
Allan R. Carlson	Glenn W. Holmes
Evan M. Chanik	Leo T. Howard
Homer W. Chellew	Paul E. Huffman
Jack G. Churchill	Clayton F. Johnson
William T. Coulson	Harvey B. Jones
James D'A. Dodge	Gaddis G. McKee
Gordon B. Dosskey	Richard R. Matthews
Ivan H. Douglas	Johnnie E. Mattis
Bernard A. Middleton	Ray W. Seiwert
Edward C. Miller	John R. Shannon
Joseph F. Miller	Paul A. Smith
LaVern C. Moore	Russel D. Smith
LeRoy Perkins	Will L. Stalnaker
George W. Perrin	Robert B. Stickles
James E. Plowden	Ralph C. Thomas
Aquilino L. Ponciroli	James L. Thompson
Robert R. Ragsdale	Joseph B. Tiara
Elsworth C. Reynolds	John S. Walden
Chesley W. Richey	Frank W. Warrick
Meredith C. Riddle	Walter R. Watkins
William H. Robb	Boyce St. C. Webb
Donald E. Runyon	Robert E. Wheeler
Walter Schauer	Paul H. Williams

Lieutenants (junior grade)

George A. Ales	Charles E. Johnson, Jr.
William G. Bigony	Gordon W. Jones
Rudolph M. Buselmeier	Charles E. Landahl
Howard W. Carr	Allan E. McArthur
Albert F. Christener	Charles H. McMakin, Jr.
Craig McD. Coley	William R. Morgan
Fred W. Davenport	Lawrence O. Nasset
Claude L. Dickerson	Eugene A. O'Brien
Telofil Dmoch	Ross Peters
Donald D. Dunton	Lewis J. Polansky
Eugene R. Forsht	Charles W. Postlethwaite
Herbert A. Franck	Wilbur E. Reed
Donald Gaither	Linus H. Schuh
Claude E. Hale	Harold J. Shapard
William F. Harris	Robert A. Stahl
Claude J. Hinds, Jr.	
Paul A. Hunt	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenants

Andrew F. Bevill	Edmund J. Prosch
Kenneth P. Dehart	William R. Whitney
Eddie M. Johnson	Clarence R. Wright

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert L. Jones	Raymond H. Stutheit
Don C. Mandeville	Joseph H. Tetrault

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenant

Harlan L. Bowman

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Justin D. Denman

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we have again entered upon a new day with its many tasks and responsibilities which challenge the best that is within us of fidelity and devotion, of courage and spiritual capacity.

We rejoice that Thou art continually seeking to stir and inspire us with a vision of that glorious future when righteousness and justice shall be triumphant and the spirit of man shall be too strong to be chained and too large to be imprisoned by anything that degrades and defiles.

Grant that our vision of that blessed future may never become eclipsed or extinguished by feelings of doubt and despair. We pray that in the assurance of Thy wisdom and power and in the splendor and radiancy of that vision we may find our cheer and hope for even the darkest day and the most difficult problem.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 22, 1951, 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. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Tuesday next and for 10 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

GOVERNOR DEWEY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the press tells us that on Saturday Governor Dewey was down here and told the Republicans what they should do to win world war III—more accurately, keep us out of that war. He is a great man, there is no question about that, but if no better as a war expert than as a political one, well, we all know about what happened to us in two presidential campaigns. He maintains himself in office in New York in some way with some sort of a deal with the Democrats in that State. That is fine for the easterners, and for Dewey, but it does not help Republicans nor the people in the Middle West, nor anywhere outside of New York. Perhaps Dewey is just fronting for Dulles.

Having led us in two campaigns to what might be termed a glorious defeat as a party, of course, it would be presumptuous of me to say that he ought to go back and sit down and let some other Republicans run the Republican Party for a little while. While he is waiting I wish he would think over this Hanley letter business and come up with an explanation as to what he did and whether or not it is lawful. He was a great prosecutor and sent a lot of crooks to jail. I am sure his opinion on that deal would be valuable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

RE-CREATION OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.