H. R. 3743. A bill for the relief of Joseph David Segal, Chaim Szemaja Segal, and Icek Hersz Segal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3744. A bill for the relief of the Shea-Matson Trucking Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3745. A bill for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3746. A bill for the relief of Mario Sebac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3747. A bill for the relief of Kalman and Kato Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3748. A bill for the relief of David Raskin and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3749. A bill for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3750. A bill for the relief of Miss Inge Beckmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3751. A bill for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3752. A bill for the relief of Miss Hatsuko Tsuhamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3753. A bill for the relief of Cynthia Jacob; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3754. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Spennato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3755. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Wimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3756. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 3757. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3758. A bill for the relief of Stavrula Perutsea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 3759. A bill for the relief of Babette Mueller Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3760. A bill for the relief of Walter D. Jenckes and Harriet Jenckes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3761. A bill for the relief of Galicano Padem Achacoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3762. A bill for the relief of Edvardo Romua Arabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1953

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

Father of our life, Fountain of our being: We thank Thee for the light of Thy countenance which illumines our pathway with eternal splendor. Without that light we walk in darkness. Without Thee as guide our boasted progress but leads to the quagmires of futility and oblivion. Without Thee our science but whets the sword to a sharper edge and would destroy us with our own wheels and wings. Without Thee commerce cannot save us, for selfish trade but lifts the hunger of covetousness to a higher pitch. Without Thee even education cannot redeem us, for we know now that the mere sharpening of the intellect, the massing and mastery of facts and figures may but fit men to be tenfold more masterful in the awful art of slaughter. And so, we pray that Thou wilt shatter our delusions, shine through our blindness, shame our pride, that we stray not in folly away from Thee.

As partners in a crusade of decency and honor to make men free, bring us to the common victory for the inalienable rights of all men everywhere. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 4, 1953, 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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is necessary for the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and myself to attend an important meeting on official business, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that we may be excused for such time this afternoon as may be necessary for us to attend the meeting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the leave is granted.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5210 OF REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BY UNITED STATES DISBURSING OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LIFE PRESERVERS FOR RIVER STEAMERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475) relating to life preservers for river steamers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE EKLUTNA PROJECT, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the act of July 31, 1950, relating to appropriations for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Eklutna project, Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF POTENTIAL FORT GIBSON PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Interior on a plan for the construction of the potential Fort Gibson project, Oklahoma (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess personal property disposal, for the period January 1 to December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of January 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in cases of temporary admission of certain aliens into the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

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

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, withdrawing the names of certain aliens from lists of aliens heretofore transmitted to the Senate relating to suspension of deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, for the calendar year 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, 2d session, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF LIST OF POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE (PT. 2 OF S. DOC. NO. 18)

A letter from the Executive Director, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 19, agreed to January 9, 1953, a further list of positions not under civil service rules and regulations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed as part 2 of Senate Document No. 18.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

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

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 Montana; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, United States Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, and Representatives WESLEY A. D'EWART and LEE METCALF, all of Washington, D. C., requesting the enactment of legislation providing for the donation of lands formerly within the Fort Missoula Military Reservation to Missoula County, Mont.

"Whereas the United States of America formerly established a military reservation in Missoula County, Mont., which was legally denominated Fort Missoula; and

"Whereas subsequent to World War II, Fort Missoula was decommissioned as a fort and substantial portions of Fort Missoula were declared to be surplus; and

"Whereas the United States is now making no use of large portions of the area formerly comprising Fort Missoula; and

"Whereas the citizens of Missoula, Mont., through the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, have heretofore donated substantial areas of land to the United States for Fort Missoula; and

"Whereas the county of Missoula is at the present time leasing a portion of the area, but under a lease is unable to adequately preserve and protect the buildings and is unable, under the existing laws of the State of Montana, to purchase the portions of Fort Missoula not now used by the United States and not held for contemplated use by the United States; and

"Whereas the said lands and buildings would be of great value to the public of Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge the enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States providing for the donation of those portions of Fort Missoula which are not being used by the United States for military service to the county of Missoula; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD and Representatives WESLEY A. D'EWART and LEE METCALF.

"DEAN CHAFFIN,
"Speaker of the House.
"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved February 25, 1953."

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 13

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States and the State Department to express their condemnation of Soviet Russia for its brutal and inhumane persecution of Jews living behind the Iron Curtain

"Whereas the Communists to advance their antireligious philosophies have embarked on a determined program of enslavement, torture, and extermination of large segments of the population of Europe; and

"Whereas as a result thereof the lives of 2,500,000 persons of the Jewish faith behind the Iron Curtain hang in the balance; and

"Whereas the democratic forces of all right-thinking people of the world must be marshaled to combat this barbaric course of action in order that the fundamental concepts of morality, religion, and freedom can endure: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully requests the President and Congress of the United States, and the State Department to condemn publicly the persecution and brutal treatment of Jews living behind the Iron Curtain, and to combat such uncivilized action by taking whatever steps are possible to curtail further brutality and persecution; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from this State.

"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing Congress to authorize funds to be made available for construction of several units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects

"Whereas the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, which include the proposed Florida reservoir, Pine River extension, Navaho reservoir, Hammond, South San Juan and the Shiprock projects, has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

"Whereas the construction of reservoirs and utilization of the Colorado River and its tributaries, as contemplated and reported on, aside from direct and lasting benefit to business and to agriculture, will also be of greatly increased benefit to fish culture and better fishing, and that recreational areas for the use of the public will be created of immeasurable value; and

"Whereas in spite of all organized opposition and reports to the contrary, there will be no assessable damage of any kind or nature to any public use area involved in the construction of said projects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to consider a bill which would authorize funds to be made available for the construction of the several units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, as recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

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

"House Joint Memorial No. 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation granting domestic producers of gold to sell their product in the markets of the world—Memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation authorizing the domestic producers of gold to sell the product of their labors in the markets of the world

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 35th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation authorizing the sale of gold from domestic mines by the producers thereof on the open markets of the world at prices which prevail on those markets, without further restriction; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to investigate the reasons for present restrictions upon the buying and selling of gold within and without the United States by citizens of the United States, which privilege is denied citizens of this country although extended to citizens of other countries, with

no apparent harmful effects upon the economics of the respective countries in which gold is allowed to be bought and sold without Government restriction; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States investigate and determine the reasons why the International Monetary Fund has consistently sidetracked the issue involved in raising the price of gold on an international basis to a realistic figure commensurate with the costs of production within gold-producing countries; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to take action now pending: 'Recoinage of the $10 gold pieces'; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and Congressmen representing those States in which gold is produced either as a primary product or as a by-product from the production of other metals, and to the President of the United States, with the additional plea directed to the Chief Executive that immediate steps be taken to bring about the objectives set forth in this joint memorial.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Legislature of the Island of Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution 14

"Resolution relative to memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to provide for appointment of residents of Guam to the United States Military and Naval Academies

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas residents of other Territories of the United States are eligible for appointments as cadets and midshipmen to the Military and Naval Academies; and

"Whereas there are many able and deserving residents of Guam who are not presently eligible under the laws of the United States to receive such appointments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the legislature does hereby memorialize and request the Congress of the United States to amend the statutes of the United States to provide that an equal number of appointments shall be made from among the residents of the Territory of Guam as are made from among the residents of every other Territory of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved That the executive secretary be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, and the Governor of Guam."

A resolution of the Legislature of the Island of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 8

"Resolution relative to memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the election of a Resident Commissioner for the Territory of Guam in Washington, D. C., and to provide for the appointment of a representative to present this matter to the Congress of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas it is customary for Territories of the United States to be represented in the Congress of the United States by nonvoting Resident Commissioners or Delegates to Congress; and

"Whereas the Territory of Guam has not been accorded the right of such representation, although the people of Guam strongly desire the same; and

"Whereas such representation is necessary to a ready understanding by the Congress of the problems of the people of Guam and to their ultimate solution: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the election of a Resident Commissioner to represent the Territory of Guam in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to provide adequate notice to the Guam Legislature prior to considering the matter of providing for a commissioner in order that a qualified representative of the legislature and people of Guam may present necessary information and explain the desirability of such a commissioner to the Members and to the proper committees of the United States Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That the committee on rules be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint one qualified person as representative; and be it further

"Resolved, That the committee on rules be, and is hereby, authorized to pay the necessary travel and other expenses of that representative out of the fund appropriated for contingent expenses of the legislature; and be it further

"Resolved, That the executive secretary be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Governor of Guam."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaksa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Public Lands, United States House of Representatives; the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas statehood in the American Union on a basis of full equality has long been an aspiration of the people of Alaska, believing in government of, by, and for the people; and

"Whereas the people of Alaska have, for a long time past, demonstrated their ability and fitness to assume the full rights, obligations, and duties of citizens of the United States, and now desire to form themselves into a State, as the people of all other Territories have done before them; and

"Whereas the people of our sister Territory of Hawaii enjoy the prospect of being admitted to statehood at the present session of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of the United States, committees of the Congress of the United States, and the national platforms of both our major political parties have called for the early admission of Alaska to statehood.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States, at its present session, adopt adequate enabling legislation providing for the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A resolution of the Senate of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas an appointment to fill the office of Governor of the Territory of Alaska under the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower is imminent; and

"Whereas the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, has repeatedly stated that he would prefer to appoint an Alaskan to the office of Governor of the Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Alaska are desirous of having an Alaskan appointed Governor of Alaska until such time as enabling legislation is enacted so that they may elect an Alaskan to this office; and

"Whereas there are residents of the Territory of Alaska who are able and fully qualified to fill the office of governor.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that a bona fide resident and inhabitant of the Territory of Alaska be forthwith appointed to the office of governor.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, That the text of this memorial be telegraphed to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Honorable Douglas McKay immediately upon its adoption."

The petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, of Paterson, N. J., praying for leave to deposit with the Sergeant at Arms, for the use of the Senate, 96 copies of a brief relating to his claims against Philip Forman and Guy L. Fake, United States district judges for the district of New Jersey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The petition of H. Joseph Mahoney, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to free and independent States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency, and J. D. Small, Chairman Munitions Board:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session, duly and regularly assembled, most respectfully present the following preamble and resolution, to wit:

"Whereas our normal peacetime requirements of primary antimony are about 15,000 tons and in the event of an all-out war these requirements would be increased to about 45,000 tons; and

"Whereas heavy importation of foreign antimony at depressed prices during 1951 and 1952 forced the Yellow Pine mine in Valley County, Idaho, to shut down with the result that our total domestic production, since this shutdown, has been at the rate of less than 100 tons annually, or less than 1 percent of our total domestic requirements; and

"Whereas the said Yellow Pine mine, for years had been supplying over 90 percent of the entire domestic mine output and has a productive capacity equivalent to over 20 percent of our peacetime requirement and about 10 percent of our wartime needs; and

"Whereas formerly our principal source of supply was from China, which source is no longer available to the free world, and another major source has been Bolivia, which source is undependable because of an unstable government and economic disturbance, and all other sources are either far distant, declining or undependable; and

"Whereas our Government stockpile has been estimated to contain only 20,000 tons of primary antimony, or approximately 6 months' supply during a wartime demand period; and

"Whereas our major wartime requirements for antimony cannot be satisfied by scrap or secondary antimony, but only by primary antimony; and

"Whereas since February 1952 the total United States consumption of primary antimony has exceeded the total available supply, including imports; and

"Whereas the United States industrial stocks of primary antimony have declined during 1952 to the lowest point in many years; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge that in the interests of national security the new administration carefully examine our Nation's stockpiling program with respect to primary antimony; and be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge that since we are now in a war emergency and are currently dependent on foreign sources for over 99 percent of our primary antimony supplies, we believe that our national stockpile of primary antimony, estimated to contain only enough antimony to last 6 months during an all-out war, is dangerously inadequate, and we believe that the antimony stockpile objective should be raised to a more realistic figure; and be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge that consideration be given to encouraging or maintaining some productive capacity in this country. We particularly refer to the closed down antimony mine and smelter at Stibnite, Idaho, and believe it regrettable that these excellent facilities have not been made use of in building up an adequate stockpile; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency; J. D. Small, Chairman, Munitions Board; Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, United States Senate; Hon. Herman Welker, United States Senate; Hon. Hamer H. Budge and Hon. Gracie Pfost, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House; Hon. George W. Malone, chairman, Senate Mines Committee, and Hon. A. L. Miller, chairman of House Internal and Insular Affairs Committee."

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

"Joint memorial to the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, relative to certain indemnity lands selected by the State of Idaho in lieu of school sections belonging to the public school endowment

"We, your memorialists, the 32d Legislature of Idaho, respectfully represent and request that:

"Whereas the State of Idaho, acting by and through its duly authorized officers, on April 14, 1913, filed clear lists No. 15, 16, and 21 for indemnity selection of lands in Caribou and Bingham Counties, Idaho, which selection was in lieu of school sections withheld from the lands granted to the State by the Idaho Admission Act; and

"Whereas such clear listed lands amounting to 117,407.07 acres were then subject to a reservation by the United States of the phosphate located thereon which reservation was later withdrawn; and

"Whereas such lands were selected in lieu of lands in which the State of Idaho had title to all mineral rights; and

"Whereas the State of Idaho now has title to said lands and to all other minerals in said land save and except phosphate; and

"Whereas Congress did not include indemnity selections such as those contained in clear lists No. 15, 16, and 21 within the scope of the act of January 25, 1927 (43 U. S. C. A. 870), although it was apparently intended by the Congress that that act should confirm to the State with regard to indemnity lands an interest equivalent to that granted under the act in all school sections known to be mineral on the effective date of that act; and

"Whereas the development of these clear listed lands for phosphate mining has been undertaken under leases issued in good faith by the State of Idaho, and the State has expended money and effort in the development of these areas for phosphate production; and has collected substantial rentals thereon; and

"Whereas the values contained there should, when mined, accrue to the benefit of the public school endowment fund of Idaho as was intended in the grants contained in the admission act; and

"Whereas the United States in 1950 issued leases to mine phosphate in and upon these same lands, and thereby claimed paramount authority to phosphate deposits located in such lands, but lays no other claim to such lands.

"Now, therefore, your memorialists, the 32d Legislature of the State of Idaho, do respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will confirm to the State of Idaho the title to all phosphate found, or to be found, in the lands covered by clear lists 15, 16, and 21, and will restore these rights to the State; and it is hereby directed that the attorney general of Idaho make representation to the Government of the United States to the end that such legislation be enacted; and that he cause copies of this memorial, duly certified, to be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Representatives of Idaho in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

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

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent: that—

"Whereas in Idaho a total of 250 million board feet of Engelmann spruce timber has been infested and killed by a violent outbreak of the Engelmann spruce bark beetle during the summer of 1952; and

"Whereas total spruce stands of 2 billion board feet and having a stumpage value of $15 million and whose manufacture would create labor and lumber values amounting to over $175 million on these five national forests and adjacent lands in other ownerships are immediately threatened by this insect outbreak; and

"Whereas in addition there are 3 billion board feet of spruce in Idaho which may be killed by this insect outbreak unless it is controlled; and

"Whereas a plan to control the epidemic and salvage the spruce has been developed by a joint Forest Service, Bureau of Entomology, the State of Idaho, and Timber Industry Group; and

"Whereas the carrying out of the program will make possible the protection from bark beetle attack of intermingled species of timber and salvage of all infested timber; and

"Whereas this plan has the objective in Idaho of removing 205 million board feet of infested and salvage spruce in 1953 and 475 million board feet of such spruce in 1954 which will require the construction of 368 miles of access roads during the 2-year period; and

"Whereas it is necessary to supplement the road-construction and logging plans with a chemical-treatment program to control the spread of the bark beetles in isolated areas; and

"Whereas time is the essence of the success of this program as timber killed by this insect has little value unless salvaged within 2 years: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 32d Legislative Assembly of Idaho of 1953, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most earnestly request that the Congress of the United States recognize the importance of the spruce timber resource in Idaho and to immediately initiate an adequate emergency program to control the spruce bark beetle epidemic; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

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

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"House Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution memorializing the assumption of governmental authority by a new national administration by the election of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States

"Whereas in accordance with constitutional provisions and procedure a national election was held on November 4, 1952, for the office of President and other National and State offices; and

"Whereas the citizens of this Republic exercising their inalienable right of suffrage have seen fit to entrust the responsibility of Government to a new administration and did elect the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States of America; and

"Whereas this exhibition and bestowal of confidence on the part of the American people is being fulfilled by the expression of these fundamental principles of freedom, justice, and morality upon which this Nation was founded, and from which it derives its great strength and power, as evidenced by the humble prayer to Almighty God, spoken by our new Chief Executive upon his taking the oath of office as President of these United States; and also by his subsequent concise, forthright, and inspiring state of the Union message to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein), That the 117th General Assembly of the State of Delaware hereby expresses its recognition and appreciation of the assumption of the powers of Government by the new national administration and conveys to the President, the Honorable Dwight

D. Eisenhower, the Vice President, the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, and to all others in authority, its hearty felicitations, good wishes, and high hopes that they, with God's help and guidance, will meet the grave problems of the moment, and of the difficult times ahead with foresight, courage, and wisdom; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Delaware congressional delegation."

By Mr. BRICKER:

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senators from Montana; to the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Congressmen from Montana, memorializing the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon a United States Senate joint resolution relative to making treaties and executive agreements

"Whereas the 83d Congress of the United States has introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the 33d Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1953, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we hereby most earnestly request the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon Senate Joint Resolution 1, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"'"SEC. 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

"'"SEC. 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

"'"SEC. 4. All executive or other agreements between the President and any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

"'"SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"'"SEC. 6. 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"; be it further

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

PERSECUTION OF MINORITY GROUPS BY RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITES—RESOLUTION OF DELEGATE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, JEWISH FEDERATION OF NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Delegate Committee on Community Affairs of the Jewish Federation of New Orleans, La., together with a list of member organizations, which was sent to me by Jules J. Paglin, chairman of that committee, relating to the persecution of minority groups by Russia and her satellites.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with a list of member organizations, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY DELEGATE BODY OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF NEW ORLEANS, FEBRUARY 26, 1953

Every right-thinking and justice-loving person in the United States has been shocked and chagrined to learn of the beastly persecution of Jews and other minority groups in Soviet Russia and the satellite countries. Therefore, all of us present at this gathering desire to protest against these atrocities and to condemn these inhuman practices. We furthermore desire to give expression to the hope that the United States representatives at the United Nations General Assembly will make their voices heard in behalf of democracy and humanity and protest vigorously against the abominable crimes that are being perpetrated by Soviet Russia and her satellites.

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF THE DELEGATE COMMITTEE OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF NEW ORLEANS

Anshe Sfard Congregation, Anshe Sfard Sisterhood, Beth Israel Congregation, Beth Israel Sisterhood, B'nai B'rith Lodge, B'nai B'rith Women's Auxiliary, Business and Professional Women of Hadassah, Chevra Thilim Congregation, Chevra Thilim Sisterhood, Gates of Prayer Congregation, Gates of Prayer Sisterhood, Hadassah, Jewish Federation, Mizrachi Organization, Pioneer Women, Temple Sinai Congregation, Temple Sinai Sisterhood, Touro Synagogue Congregation, Touro Synagogue Sisterhood, Workmen's Circle, Zionist Organization.

INCLUSION OF ATTORNEYS IN SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF WEST VIRGINIA STATE BAR

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution unanimously adopted by the board of governors of the West Virginia state bar, in regard to legislation to permit practicing attorneys to become eligible for benefits under the Social Security Act, and in support of a tax-deferment-pension plan.

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

THE WEST VIRGINIA STATE BAR

Whereas practicing attorneys were excluded from the retirement and insurance benefits available to those self-employed under the 1950 amendment to the Social Security Act; and

Whereas the various bar associations and integrated bars of the United States have been considering two types of retirement and insurance benefits for practicing attorneys, the first an amendment to the Social Security Act, and the second a combination tax deferment and pension plan, of which the Keogh-Reed bills are a prototype; and

Whereas the board of governors of the West Virginia State Bar in meeting assembled has considered both of the plans suggested and is of opinion that the amendment to the Social Security Act provides only bare subsistence pensions, and that therefore both suggestions should be enacted into law: Therefore be it

Resolved, as follows:

1. That this board favors the amendment of the present Social Security Act so as to permit practicing attorneys to be eligible for the benefits thereunder as self-employed persons, on a voluntary basis if possible, or, if not, on a compulsory basis similar to others so eligible;

2. That this board favors the enactment into law of a tax-deferment pension plan substantially similar to that proposed in the Keogh-Reed bills in the last session of the Congress;

3. That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the Secretary to the West Virginia Members of the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to such other persons as the president of the West Virginia State Bar shall direct.

IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL—RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BLUEFIELD, W. VA.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the importation of residual fuel oil from foreign countries has very seriously affected the economic health of my State of West Virginia. I feel strongly that we are going to have to face up to the need for legislation to relieve this situation. At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution on the subject which was adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Bluefield, W. Va., on February 10, 1953.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BLUEFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BLUEFIELD, W. VA., FEBRUARY 10, 1953

Whereas during the last several years heavy importations of residual fuel oil from foreign countries has adversely and seriously affected the economy of West Virginia and Virginia, especially the bituminous coal industry of southern West Virginia and southwest Virginia. The situation has steadily grown worse and the bituminous coal industry of southern West Virginia and southwest Virginia is now in a critical condition. Coal mining provides employment for thousands of miners and railroaders living in Bluefield, W. Va., and vicinity, and is the

economic lifeblood of southern West Virginia and southwest Virginia. The importation of foreign residual fuel oil has thrown out of employment thousands of coal miners and railroad employees and has adversely and seriously affected many small enterprises wholly dependent for their prosperity upon the production and sale of coal.

A few years ago New England consumed between 17 million and 18 million tons of southern coal annually, mostly low volatile, which is mined in the Bluefield, W. Va., area, but during the last several years the flood of foreign residual fuel oil has replaced nearly two-thirds of the southern coal which was formerly shipped to the New England States, said foreign oil being dumped in New England at prices with which southern coal could not possibly compete. Due to these importations of foreign oil and other economic conditions many mines in southern West Virginia and southwest Virginia have closed down and it is anticipated that during the year 1953 many other mines will close, causing incalculable damage to the coal miners, railroad employees, business enterprises, and the residents of this community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Bluefield Chamber of Commerce—

First. Deplores and condemns the continued importations of foreign residual fuel oil at prices with which the bituminous coal industry of West Virginia and Virginia cannot compete and urges each individual member of this Chamber to exercise his influence in any way possible to relieve this situation.

Second. That a copy of this resolution shall be sent to each member of the West Virginia and Virginia delegations in the United States Congress with the request that proper legislation be enacted to relieve these deplorable conditions; that copies of said resolution shall also be sent to the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Interior, and the Tariff Commission of the United States, with the request that steps be taken immediately to remedy the situation and bring an end to the unfair competition brought about by the importation of cheap foreign residual fuel oil.

Third. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the State chamber of commerce and to the various local chambers and boards of trade throughout West Virginia.

INCLUSION OF FARMERS AND CERTAIN SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS IN SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF ELKHORN GRANGE 908, NORTH POWDER, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Elkhorn Grange, No. 908, North Powder, Oreg., be printed in the RECORD. The resolution asks that social security be extended to cover farmers and other self-employed persons.

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

Whereas social security has been broadened to include self-employed farm labor, etc.; and

Whereas most young farmers have some social security rights before starting to farm which they will lose, and statistics show that the average American farmer or his dependents do not have ample old-age security: Therefore let it be

Resolved, That Elkhorn Grange, No. 908 goes on record favoring the extension of the Social Security Act to include the farmer, as well as the self-employed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Pomona Grange, State Grange, and our Congressman.

LOWELL CHANDLER,
Master.
LOIS SMITH,
Secretary.

CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Ojibway Tomahawk Band, St. Paul, Minn., and a resolution from that band be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. The matters are of vital concern to the Indians of my State and relate to certain tribal funds.

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

OJIBWAY TOMAHAWK BAND,
St. Paul, Minn., February 18, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

OUR DEAR SENATOR: From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, 1953, attached, we noticed you presented a resolution for appropriation of $100,000 for the Tribal Executive Council of the Chippewas of Minnesota, Edward Wilson, president.

For your information, at a special called meeting of the tribal council, July 9, 1953, which Commissioner Myers attended, a resolution—which asked for a general accounting to be completed within 6 months—signed by 200 Indians or more was presented to the council and adopted unanimously.

Enclosed please find a copy of the resolution.

There has been no action as yet. In fact, as you will see by our resolution, there has been no accounting of tribal estate since the adoption of the Wheeler-Howard Act by the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, July 24, 1936.

In view of the request made by the signers, active members of the tribe, and its adoption by the tribal council, we believe your resolution should be withheld until such accounting is completed to the satisfaction of majority of the members of the tribe.

Submitted.

WILLIAM MADISON,
Legislative Chairman.
GERTRUDE LERCH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The following resolution was presented to the tribal council:

"Whereas, the Wheeler-Howard Act, or Reorganization Act, self-government, was enacted into law June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984); and

"Whereas under said law the Chippewas of Minnesota adopted the same under the name of 'The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe' and their constitution and bylaws were approved by the Secretary of the Interior in Washington, D. C., July 24, 1936; and

"Whereas the said organization has not to this date,—July 1, 1952—given a full and complete statement of accounting of the tribal business to the Chippewas as a whole, or as individuals:

"Now, therefore, we, the undersigned enrolled members of various bands which make up the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, do hereby petition its tribal executive committee to give each enrolled member a report of all business matters, such as money borrowed and moneys accrued from all sources, such as from loans in various projects, both tribal and individual; acres of land bought and sold, and complete mapped areas where tribal lands are located; timber resources, including the mapped areas where the wild rice purchased land are located, including moneys spent for wild rice; its income from said project; it is further

"*Resolved*, That a reasonable time of 6 months be allowed for the completion of said complete general accounting in printed form for the availability of all enrolled members of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

"The petitioners of this resolution have a right, according to law, to know everything concerning the business transactions of the tribe.

"The Wheeler-Howard Act does state in section 10: 'A report shall be made annually to Congress of transactions under this authorization.'

"It is evident, since Congress makes such appropriations out of the General Treasury, it is proper to give an accounting of such transaction. On the other hand, individuals who are enrolled members of the tribe and who do not hold any office in the organization are justified to secure an accounting under the law which is found in the American Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States, which should mean more to the Indian race because of their aboriginal rights.

"The petitioners refer specifically to amendment 5—protection of person and property—American Bill of Rights, last part which states, 'nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.'

"Therefore, the petitioners are shareholders in all Chippewa estate by treaty rights as well as enactments of laws pertaining to their tribal business. Therefore, we submit the foregoing resolution for its passage."

INCLUSION OF CERTAIN NURSES IN SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION, EAU CLAIRE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution which I have received from Mrs. Ann Wilcox, chairman of the committee on legislation from the Eau Claire District of the Wisconsin State Nurses' Association.

The resolution urges the inclusion of nurses working for State and municipal governments under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. I heartily endorse the resolution.

It is, of course, consistent with the so-called Wiley amendment which I offered to the omnibus social-security law in the last Congress. Under my amendment, the third-odd-thousand individuals covered under the Wisconsin retirement fund would be blanketed in under the Federal social-security system. Thus, State and municipal workers could receive supplementary Federal coverage in addition to their modest State and local coverage, just as millions of industrial workers throughout the Nation receive Federal pensions in addition to the private pensions provided by their respective companies.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAU CLAIRE DISTRICT,
WISCONSIN STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
February 12, 1953.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the last meeting of the Eau Claire District of the Wisconsin State Nurses' Association, which was held at Luther Hospital, January 14, 1953, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the Eau Claire District of the Wisconsin State Nurses' Association do hereby publicly express a desire to have the laws regarding Federal old-age and survivors insurance changed to include and cover nurses in government employment, such as city or county school nurses, city or county health departments, public institutions, and similar organizations."

Resolution formally moved, seconded, and approved by the group.

Any interest that you can lend to this cause would be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) ANN CAVES WILCOX,
Chairman, Committee on Legislation.

ORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 80)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I am releasing today a chart and accompanying report setting forth in detail the organization of Federal executive departments and agencies, with the number of paid civilian employees assigned to each major operating unit. This is one of a series of such charts that have been released by the committee covering a period of 6 years, beginning January 1, 1947.

With the chart is included a committee report to the Senate which includes a summary of present Federal employment by departments and agencies, with details regarding reorganization changes that have taken place during the past calendar year. The report and chart reflect a total of 2,564,111 paid civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government, as of January 1, 1953. This exceeds by 301,486 the highest previous postwar total of 2,262,625 on January 1, 1947. Increases of 79,699 were reported during 1952, as compared to an increase of 319,050 reported on the last chart issued covering calendar year 1951.

The report reflects a total of 205,210 employees assigned to overseas posts as of January 1, 1953—181,035 in the departments, and 24,175 in the independent agencies—of whom 89,112 are American citizens and 116,098 are nationals of other countries.

The executive departments reported a total of 2,208,296 civilian employees as of January 1, 1953, of which 181,035 were employed overseas—82,336 citizens and 98,699 foreign nationals. The total represents an increase of 84,138 during 1952, and an overall increase of 418,030 since January 1, 1947. Defense activities account for most of the increases in the departments, with 67,360 additional employees reported in the Department of Defense during 1952, and 337,809 for the 6-year period. The Post Office Department reports increases of 13,608 for the year, and 66,229 since 1947; and the Department of State, 9,691 and 17,181 for the same periods. The Department of Commerce, although reporting a reduction of 4,857 employees in 1952, reflected an overall increase of 13,490 for the 6-year period. The Departments of State and Commerce indicated that the increases were largely due to oversea activities, and to the operations of the National Production Authority, respectively. The Department of the Interior reported increases of 812 during the past year, and 6,083 since 1947. The Department of Justice has 827 less employees than it reported a year ago, but still reported 6,199 more than in 1947, due to expansion of FBI field service in 1950 and 1951. Decreases in employees were reported by the Treasury Department, totaling 1,608 for 1952, and 14,646 since January 1, 1947. The Department of Agriculture, although reflecting an increase of 1,244 in 1952, reported an overall decrease of 12,919 during the 6-year period. The Department of Labor reported a reduction of 1,285 during the past year, and 1,396 since 1947.

The independent agencies reported a total of 354,658 employees as of January 1, 1953, representing a decrease of 4,344 employees during 1952, and 16,674 less employees assigned to these agencies than were employed on January 1, 1947. Of the present total, 24,175 were overseas employees—6,776 citizens, and 17,399 foreign nationals.

The largest decrease among independent agencies during the 6-year period was reported by the Veterans' Administration—50,830, of which 2,251 occurred in 1952. Other agencies reporting decreases were the Panama Canal Company, 8,485, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 7,258. The Economic Stabilization Agency decreased its employees by 6,343 during the past calendar year, due to its liquidation program. Increases during the past year were reported by the Civil Service Commission, 1,148; the Mutual Security Agency, 1,033; the Atomic Energy Commission, 966; and General Services Administration, 787.

The chart and accompanying report released by the committee have been generally accepted as the official report on organization of the Federal Government. It is the only chart issued which accurately reflects the number of employees assigned to each agency's activity by major operating components. The information on which the chart and report are compiled is certified to the committee by the Secretary or agency head, of each of the departments and agencies. The committee has received many letters of commendation and expressions from officials and others interested in the operations of the Federal Government as to the value of these charts and reports, and has been informed that they are used extensively by educational institutions in their courses in American Government. I believe that Members of Congress will find that the information will be equally beneficial to them in connection with committee studies of Federal operations, proposed reorganizations, appropriations, and expenditures as applied to the various components of the executive branch.

At this time I submit the report of the committee, together with the chart to which I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report and chart will be received, and the report will be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1190. A bill to amend section 205 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to make the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor ex officio members of the National Labor-Management Panel established by such section; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1191. A bill to authorize the payment of transportation expenses in the case of civilian employees of the American Battle Monuments Commission serving outside the United States when granted leave of absence to visit in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1192. A bill to provide for the establishment of an addition to the Gettysburg National Cemetery on lands presently located within the Gettysburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WELKER):

S. 1193. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and Public Law 471, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1194. A bill for the relief of Thomas Henry Harrison; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1195. A bill to amend subsection 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, relating to compensation for unused leave of enlisted persons; and

S. 1196. A bill to amend section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to eliminate discrimination against certain personnel of the uniformed services incapacitated prior to physical examination for promotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and Mr. CASE):

S. 1197. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota of certain compacts with respect to the use of waters common to two or more of said States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1198. A bill for the relief of Vera Helene Hamer (Vera Helga Mueller) and Sonja Margret Hamer (Sonja Margot Mueller); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) (by request):

S. 1199. A bill for the relief of the families of certain merchant seamen who lost their lives in an airplane crash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1200. A bill to direct the closing of the United States naval installation at Naples,

Italy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1201. A bill for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1202. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1203. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Rollins S. Emmerich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1204. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yen-Yu Huang and his minor daughters, Lillian and Jean Huang; and

S. 1205. A bill for the relief of Wally Krausnick Paeschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Josephine Lisitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1207. A bill to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1208. A bill for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1209. A bill for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1210. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Lecue; and

S. 1211. A bill for the relief of Martin Madarieta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1212. A bill for the relief of Alice Masaryk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 1213. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1214. A bill to provide for uniform relative rank for the persons occupying the positions of leaders or directors of the various Service bands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1215. A bill to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Public Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1216. A bill for the relief of Karl L. von Schlieder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1217. A bill for the relief of the alien Col. Panagiotis Christopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1218. A bill for the relief of Winifred Margaret Short; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1219. A bill for the relief of Gertrude M. Baumberger;

S. 1220. A bill for the relief of Heidi H. Baumberger;

S. 1221. A bill for the relief of Fritz Baumberger, Jr.;

S. 1222. A bill for the relief of Emma Baumberger;

S. 1223. A bill for the relief of Fritz Baumberger;

S. 1224. A bill for the relief of Erika Baumberger;

S. 1225. A bill for the relief of Brunhilde Walburga Golomb, Ralph Robert Golomb, and Patricia Ann Golomb; and

S. 1226. A bill for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1227. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to complete the survey of the Pecatonica flood area, and to appropriate $25,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1228. A bill for the relief of Patric Dorian Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1229. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

UNEQUAL TREATMENT OF ENLISTED MEN IN PAYMENT OF ACCUMULATED LEAVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the Committee on Armed Services, a bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, relating to treatment of enlisted men in the payment of accumulated leave.

Simply stated the bill would remedy the unequal treatment accorded enlisted men in the computation of unused leave pay. At the present time such payments to officers include the actual rates of allowances, which have been increased since 1946. But, in the case of enlisted men, payments are based upon the lower 1946 allowances.

There seems to be no valid reason for this discrimination and this bill would accord equal treatment for enlisted men.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

There being no objection, bill (S. 1195) to amend subsection 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, relating to compensation for unused leave of enlisted persons, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any member of the Armed Forces discharged after August 31, 1946, having unused accrued leave standing to his credit at the time of discharge shall be compensated for such unused leave in cash on the basis of—

"(1) the base and longevity pay, and allowances, applicable to such member on the date of discharge including for enlisted persons the allowances as provided for such enlisted persons in subsection (a) of this section, if his discharge occurred before the effective date of paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

"(2) the basic pay and the basic allowances for quarters and subsistence applicable to such member on the date of discharge, including for enlisted persons discharged during the continuance of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 applicable basic allowances for quarters and subsistence at the rates prescribed by amendments made by that act, as amended, if his discharge occurred on or after the effective date of this paragraph.

No cash settlement shall be made to any member (A) discharged for the purpose of accepting a commission or warrant or entering into an enlistment in his respective branch of the Armed Forces, or (B) electing to carry over such unused leave to a new enlistment in his respective branch of the Armed Forces on the day following date of discharge."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be effective on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

INEQUITIES IN RETIREMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL WOUNDED IN KOREA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the Committee on Armed Services, a bill to amend section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Under existing law military personnel are barred from promotion and retirement at a higher rank when wounds interfere with passing the physical examination required for promotion. This works a special hardship on servicemen wounded in Korea. They are forced into retirement by wounds suffered in combat. And the very same disability prevents retirement at a higher rank to which they otherwise would be entitled.

This was not the law prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Apparently this result was not intended. I urge speedy rectification of this inequity.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1196) to amend section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to eliminate discrimination against certain personnel of the uniformed services incapacitated prior to physical examination for promotion, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fifth proviso contained in section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U. S. C. 272 (d)), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That if the physical disability entitling such member to disability pay is found to exist at any time prior to promotion or advancement in pay grade in the case of a member (1) who is on a recommended list or a promotion list for permanent or temporary promotion, or (2) who is eligible for promotion to higher permanent or temporary commissioned officer, warrant officer, or enlisted rank, grade, or rating, or for assignment to a higher warrant officer pay grade, and whose eligibility for such promotion or assignment is based upon cumulative length of service or length of service in rank, grade, pay grade, or rating, the disability retirement pay of such member shall be based upon the basic pay of the rank, grade, pay grade, or rating to which such member would have been promoted or assigned, but for such disability, if such rank,

grade, pay grade, or rating is higher than any other rank, grade, pay grade, or rating upon which such pay is herein authorized to be computed and which such member would have been entitled to receive if serving on active duty in such rank, grade, pay grade, or rating."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be effective as of October 1, 1949.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF NAVAL INSTALLATION AT NAPLES, ITALY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to require the Secretary of the Navy to close the naval installation at Naples, Italy.

It was my privilege to visit, together with the junior Senator from Oregon, this naval activity during the month of September 1952. After a thorough briefing on the activities of the Navy at Naples, the Senator from Oregon and I were completely convinced that the amount of money the Government of the United States is spending on the Navy's activity at Naples is almost 100 percent wasted. I would not quibble if perhaps our Government might be deriving even two or three thousand dollars of benefit for the $10 million it is spending at Naples, but from point of qualitative consideration, I am convinced that this activity takes the prize for sheer waste without beneficial results.

The naval activity at Naples, with its thousands of naval personnel, is not in anywise used to support our 6th Fleet operating in the Mediterranean. When we visited that activity in September 1952 it was no longer the headquarters of any Mediterranean command activities under our NATO organization. The Italian Government would not permit it to be called even a defense activity. Upon returning to the United States, we severely criticized the naval activity at Naples, and General Bradley told the Armed Services Committee that the Navy had its CINCNELM, meaning Commander in Chief Northeastern Atlantic and Mediterranean, at Naples. He explained to the committee that the activities of CINCNELM no longer included the responsibility for the United States or Allied operations anywhere in the Atlantic or the Mediterranean. Such activities had been taken over under our North Atlantic Treaty Organization activities. CINCNELM, according to General Bradley, had had his activities reduced to the Red Sea and part of the Indian Ocean, where the United States does not pretend to maintain any considerable number of ships or shore activities. Subsequently, the Navy testified that Admiral Wright occupies the position of CINCNELM, and Admiral Wright was still in London and that CINCNELM headquarters had never been established in Naples.

As a former member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a Navy veteran myself, Mr. President, permit me to suggest the nature of the naval activity at Naples. Every indication points to the fact that this wasteful expenditure of more than $10 million a year at Naples is a part of naval officer thinking to the effect that once in a good port, the Navy should never leave, until it is actually forced to depart by its own Government or actually thrown into the sea by the people occupying the land.

I am reminded of one of my experiences in the service during World War II when some of us were so fortunate as to be assigned to operating amphibious craft to unload cargo in Palermo Harbor. One of the officers became so fondly attached to the city of Palermo and its citizens that he found every conceivable excuse to stay at Palermo. On two occasions his ship was ordered to leave, along with other ships. However, in each instance, his ship broke down after leaving the breakwater, and limped back into the harbor under limited operational capabilities. Finally, a third time he was ordered to Bizerte, and the local commander of the Palermo base sent an oceangoing tug behind to tow the amphibious craft to Bizerte in the event that another breakdown should occur.

In this instance, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, hoping that by act of Congress we may be able to tow the Navy out of Naples harbor, where it has no useful purpose to serve. The measure, I believe, will save the taxpayers well in excess of $10 million a year.

The bill (S. 1200) to direct the closing of the United States naval installation at Naples, Italy, introduced by Mr. LONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ALICE MASARYK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a private bill granting the right of permanent residence and asylum in this country to Dr. Alice Masaryk, an accomplished lady in her own right, who is the daughter of that great world statesman and fighter for democracy, the late President Thomas Masaryk, og Czechoslovakia.

It is particularly appropriate that I introduce this bill today because tomorrow is the anniversary of the birth of this lady's great father. The birthday of this man, father and founder of the Czechoslovakian Republic, is celebrated by all Czechoslovaks who love freedom. In Czechoslovakia, before it was ruthlessly seized by the Communists, it was celebrated as a national holiday. Here in America we have regularly taken note of this day. It has been the occasion for a rededication to the cause of freedom for which Masaryk worked during all of his life.

He was a great scholar and writer. His contributions to the writings of our times on the subject of democracy are of lasting significance. His death in 1937, at the age of 87, brought to an end one of the most fruitful lives of our times.

I am happy to be able to introduce the bill in behalf of his daughter who for some time now has been in this country, engaged in social work, and also broadcasting to Czechoslovakia over the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. This accomplished lady was at one time president of the International Conference on Social Work. During the time that her father was in this country fighting for Czechoslovakian independence, Dr. Masaryk was working with Jane Addams in famous Hull House in Chicago.

Her entire life has been a splendid example of what we consider the most noble of human traits. Not only her own life but the lives of her illustrious parent and her brother, the late Jan Masaryk, have been filled with acts of friendship and cooperation with the United States.

She has lately been served with an order of deportation. It seems incredible that it should require a piece of special legislation for this country to offer permanent haven and asylum to a woman of Dr. Masaryk's stature, not to speak of the contributions of her family to the cause of freedom. I hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will speedily report this bill and that it will be quickly passed in special tribute, not only to this lady and to the name of Masaryk but to the freedom-loving people of Czechoslovakia.

The bill (S. 1212) for the relief of Alice Masaryk, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JUDGMENT UPON CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR BASIC AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation. I had intended to speak in support of the bill, but I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement by the Senator from West Virginia will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1213) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation, introduced by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

I have just introduced a bill to waive the 6-year statute of limitations with respect to certain claims of Government employees for overtime compensation. Practically all of these claims arise under section 23 of the Act of March 28, 1934, which provided a 40-hour week for wage-board employees of the Federal Government, and overtime at the rate of time and one-half for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours a week.

The wage-board employees of the Federal Government are those engaged in the manual trades and occupations, such as carpenters, painters, electricians, and the like, whose pay is fixed by wage boards on the basis of rates prevailing in private industry. They do not include any employees who are under civil service, who are engaged in administrative or policy-making positions, or whose pay is otherwise fixed by statute. To obtain wage-board employees, the Government must compete with private industry, must therefore pay wages which are comparable with those paid in private industry, and must provide similar working conditions.

Throughout private industry, a 40-hour week and time and one-half for overtime have prevailed for many years. Section 23 of the act of March 28, 1934, provided a 40-hour week and time and one-half for comparable wage-board employees of the Federal Government. The great majority of these employees have been paid on that basis ever since.

Unfortunately, a few isolated groups were mistakenly excluded from the benefits of section 23 by rulings of the Comptroller General. Among these were floating equipment employees of the Panama Canal, and employees of the Alaska Railroad. In the *Townsley* case (101 C. Cls. 237; 323 U. S. 557), and the *Hearne* case (107 C. Cls. 335) the Panama workers established their right to the benefits of section 23.

The rights of employees of the Alaska Railroad were presented to the Court of Claims in a test case, *Poggas* v. *U. S.* (118 C. Cls. 385). This case was filed in 1947. The jurisdiction of the Court of Claims is limited to 6 years prior to the date a claim is filed in the court. Therefore the Poggas claim was limited to the period from 1941 to the date it was filed. That meant that, even if they won their cases in the Court of Claims, the employees of the Alaska Railroad would have been deprived of most of the compensation to which they were entitled, that is, compensation for the period from 1934 to 1941. To overcome this injustice, the 81st Congress enacted and the President approved Public Law 440, which waived the statute of limitations with respect to employees of the Alaska Railroad, and authorized the court to render judgment for the entire period back to 1934. On December 5, 1950, the Court of Claims decided that Poggas was entitled to recover, and that therefore all nonoperating employees of the Alaska Railroad were entitled to judgment.

The only other large group of wage-board employees who were deprived of the benefits of section 23 regarding whom we have definite knowledge were the employees of the Alaska Road Commission. These employees are typical wage-board employees, and there was no justification whatever for depriving them of the benefits of section 23 by administrative action. About 4 years ago one of these road commission employees made demand on the Department of the Interior for overtime compensation under section 23, and the Solicitor of the Interior Department ruled that he was entitled to such compensation. Thereafter, several claimants filed claims with the Comptroller General who likewise ruled that they were entitled to the benefits of section 23. These claims were certified to Congress for appropriation. Funds to pay the claims were not appropriated, however, presumably because the House committee misunderstood the situation (see H. Rept. No. 1797, 81st Cong., 2d sess., p. 80). In October 1950, the Alaska Road Commission informed some of these claimants of the action of the Appropriations Committee, and advised them that their only recourse was a suit in the Court of Claims. Several suits were filed by the claimants in January 1951.

These road commission employees, and most other wage-board employees, commenced to receive time and one-half for overtime after 40 hours a week on July 1, 1945. The entire period for which the claims run, therefore, is from March 28, 1934, until July 1, 1945. The individual claims, of course, begin with the first date of employment or March 28, 1934, whichever is later; and terminate on the last date of employment or July 1, 1945, whichever is earlier. The test claimant had last worked for the road commission on March 5, 1945, so that at the time the claim was filed in the Court of Claims on January 24, 1951, all of plaintiff's services had been performed more than 6 years prior to the date of filing, except for the last 40 days before March 5, 1945. The Government therefore made a motion for summary judgment against the plaintiff for the period prior to January 24, 1945. On July 15, 1952, the Court of Claims denied this motion (*Marr* v. *U. S.* (123 C. Cls. 474)). The basis of the court's decision was that the Comptroller General, by certifying the claim, in effect reached an accord which renewed the Government's obligation to pay the compensation.

Manifestly, this decision raises a nice legal question, and it is reported that the Government will seek certiorari. If the Supreme Court should overrule the Court of Claims, the claimant would be entitled to receive overtime compensation for a period of 40 days, but would be deprived of compensation to which he was entitled for a period of many years. If the Supreme Court should affirm the decision of the Court of Claims, the claimant could then recover the full amount found due.

Regardless, however, of the ruling of the Supreme Court, unless action is taken by Congress, most of these faithful Government employees will have been deprived of overtime compensation which Congress had provided for them by law. This will be so because only a small number of claims have been certified by the Comptroller General, and because very few of them have been filed in the Court of Claims.

In 1934 Congress enacted an overtime compensation law for this entire group of Federal employees. From 1934 to 1945 they were wrongfully deprived of this compensation because of erroneous administrative action. If any of them are to recover what should have been paid to them, all of them ought to be permitted to recover. It will be injustice if one or a dozen of them recover all or part of what is due, and the great majority of them are left without remedy. I do not believe that Congress wants to withhold from these people what Congress previously ordained they were entitled to receive and for which they rendered service. Nor do I think that the Government can equitably exploit the statute of limitations to enforce a wrongful act against a group of its own employees. To avoid that the bill I have introduced ought to be enacted promptly.

My bill would not determine the rights of these claimants. It would simply enable them to have their day in court, and have their rights adjudicated by the tribunal Congress has established for that purpose. The court has already held in the Townsley case, the Hearne case, the Poggas case, and the Marr case that these wage-board employees were not culpably dilatory in the assertion of their claims.

Since Congress has already waived the statute with respect to employees of the Alaska Railroad, there is certainly no sound reason why Congress should, by inaction, discriminate against the employees of the Alaska Road Commission. Except for the period within which claims may be filed, my bill, it should be noted, is identical with one introduced by Senator MAGNUSON (S. 751), which was reported out unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee in the last Congress.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FREAR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be Solicitor General of the United States, and William J. Bray, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Postmaster General, which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army, retired), for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list.

Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general and effective March 1, 1953, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general and date of rank from January 19, 1948; and

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, and several other lieutenant generals (major generals, Regular Air Force) to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general.

NOMINATION OF ALBERT M. COLE TO BE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably the nomination of Albert M. Cole, of Kansas, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator. I hope that on Monday the Senate will consider the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President of the United States sent to the Senate today the nominations of Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn, of Nebraska, to be the Representative of the United States on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1955, Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin, a Foreign Service Officer of the Class of Career Minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, and John M. Allison, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service Officer of Class One, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan. The nominations were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Notice is hereby given that the nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, in accordance with the rule.

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

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

By Mr. GREEN:

Address entitled "Security and the United Nations," delivered by him at the University of Rhode Island on March 5, 1953.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by him on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor, March 3, 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Address delivered by Senator HENNINGS before a statewide Democratic rally at Topeka, Kans., on February 21, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him before the American Association for the United Nations, at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., on March 3, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Disrupting Morale," published in the Washington Post, March 3, 1953, discussing a certain memorandum circulated among employees of the Budget Bureau.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Statement prepared by him in commemoration of anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

Statement by Charles S. Rhyne, on behalf of the United States Chamber of Commerce, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committe on the Judiciary, on March 4, 1953, relating to the so-called Bricker amendment dealing with treaties.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Article entitled "Stevenson and the Big Oil Grab," written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 18, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article by Dr. Charles M. Steese, regarding part played by Gen. Simon Cameron, Ambassador to Russia in the Lincoln administration, on the acquisition of Alaska.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address entitled "The War Against Poverty," delivered by Edward J. Bell, administrator, Oregon Wheat Commission, at Sixth Annual Conference of Oregon High School International Relations League, Eugene, Oreg., February 27, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Offshore Oil," published in the New York Times of March 2, 1953.

By Mr. JENNER:

Statement entitled "Agriculture Is the Nation's Basic Economic Problem," written by Robert M. Harriss.

Statement of policy for inquiry by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee into communism in the educational process.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., regarding the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Statement by Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, before subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on Senate Joint Resolution 1, regarding treaties and domestic law.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial from Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch with reference to treaties and the basic law.

Editorial from San Francisco Chronicle on the same subject matter.

Editorial from the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind., on the same subject matter.

Editorial from San Francisco Examiner of February 25, 1953, on the same subject matter.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Letter addressed to him by the Lions Club of Brillion, Wis., regarding number of persons in that town who voted in the recent election.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, tomorrow, March 7, will mark the 103d anniversary of the birth of the great Czechoslovak patriot and world leader, Thomas G. Masaryk. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, the text of a message to the people of Czechoslovakia which I have prepared for this occasion.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON THE 103D ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK, MARCH 7, 1953

Each year, only a few days after the tragic anniversary of Communist control in Czechoslovakia, the people of that European stronghold of freedom may lift their hearts to celebrate the anniversary of the birth of one of the most courageous men the world has ever known.

Thomas G. Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's great statesman and patriot, was born on March 7, 1850. By his study and ardent labors, a true democracy was realized and established in his homeland. His ideals created one of the first free nations in all of Europe.

On the occasion of his anniversary it is appropriate that we pay homage again to Thomas Masaryk. His leadership, his scholarship, his innate greatness are still an inspiration not only to the people of his native land, but to all people who love freedom. His memory cannot be erased by present tyranny in his homeland. His tremendous strength is a beacon for those who follow him, guiding them forward to the day when freedom is once again established in his beloved nation.

I join my supplications with all others who fervently desire the liberation of Czechoslovakia. On this anniversary, our prayer is brightened and hope kindled by the memory of Thomas Masaryk.

MILITARY POLICY IN KOREA

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we are fortunately free, so far as the present administration is concerned, of supporting and enjoying the contemptible policy of allowing our soldiers and our allies to be shot at on the stationary battlefront in Korea for an indefinite time. What many of us have called a stalemate has been better termed by General Van Fleet as a sitdown. A stalemate is a situation in which the forces are so evenly balanced that neither can get ahead of the other. A sitdown is a situation where one side by deliberate policy refuses to take military advantage when it is plain, clear, and undeniable. Our sitdown has continuously weakened us and continuously strengthened the Communist position.

The question is, what are we to do next now that our minds are clear and we are open to consider a change in policy?

There is one change in policy, Mr. President, which lies on the side of political action, and may be added to our military policy whatever that may turn out to be. The political action will not work against constructive military policy. Both will work to strengthen each other and strengthen the free nations of the world.

What our political action might be, I have set forth in a talk which I gave at a luncheon for the American Association for the United Nations at the Shoreham Hotel on Tuesday, March 3.

The death of Joseph Stalin may well have world-shaking results, but it should have no effect on such diplomatic policies as I am proposing, since these are based on eternal truths and the spiritual laws of the universe. They are not supervened by current events, no matter how portentous these may be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by me on the occasion referred to be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

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

NEXT STEPS FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

There has been a tendency in public thinking to write off the United Nations as a failure. The fact that so many constructive proposals have been vetoed by the Soviet Government has led to proposals for a complete reorganization of the whole institution. There is a large body of opinion which feels that our common action, particularly in search of a common defense against aggression, has been stopped by an insurmountable roadblock.

This roadblock indeed does exist so far as certain types of action are concerned. It does not, however, prevent all useful action nor does it place a bar across the road to what may be the most useful and effective types of action open to the United Nations. Our opportunities are ahead of us, not behind us.

The new courses of action will be directed particularly toward measures which have in them a large moral content and which will draw to their support the spiritual forces of the globe and of the universe. Let us look at a few examples of undertakings of this sort.

First it would seem entirely feasible to take our part in the Korean war out of the classification of a contest for power and seek to resolve it on the basis of well-being of people. It would seem that this could easily be done by announcing, unilaterally, terms on which the United Nations would be willing to end the conflict, not by a truce, but by a peace.

A first provision of such terms would be to offer to Communist China a neutral zone along the Yalu whose neutrality would be inspected and administered by a commission composed solely of Asiatic nationals. This would take care of the only interest in the Korean war which Communist China has expressed; viz that she wants assurance that Manchuria will not be invaded from the southeast. That government would, therefore, be furnished with a face-saving proposal and the United States and other western nations would be freed from the accusation that this war is a part of a contest for power between Washington and Moscow. These terms would renounce political power on the part of the so-called "capitalist nations and colonizing powers."

These terms should be broadcast to the soldiers of the Communist armies, over the air and from the air. It is important that they should know that there is nothing for them to fight for except Russian imperialism. Everything else is theirs if they will cease fighting.

If we then made definite the offer to rebuild in usable form the housing, transportation, and industries of northern Korea as

well as southern Korea, the war-torn populations of the north should be anxious for a settlement on this basis.

After rebuilding, the United Nations would offer to carry out its original purpose of holding free elections by means of which the reunited country could select its own form of government.

Every group except professional Communist politicians would derive advantages from the proposed settlement. This would include the Communist government, the Communist soldiers and the harassed citizens of North and South Korea. It could be stopped by a veto from Moscow whose support of the war has been so clearly recorded by Ambassador Lodge. But such a veto would open itself to the clear demonstration that the purposes of Moscow are the accumulation of power and not the well-being of people.

Another line of thought and action that must be pursued is the project for eliminating curtains whether of iron, bamboo, or other materials. These curtains prohibiting intercourse between the peoples of the world is an offense in the sight of God and man. He who has made of one blood all the nations of the earth does not desire that His sons should be separated from each other in groups which have no communication or personal relationships.

The curtains must be attacked. We can draw support for such an attack from nations which are now trying to remain neutral in what appears to them to be a contest for power between Moscow and Washington. These nations can join our side gladly and strongly since this proposal is not one for power but for the dignity, freedom and intercommunication of peoples.

One of the points which should be brought out is that no nation which hides behind the curtain can honorably seek admission to the United Nations. We have seen that the countries behind the curtain which already have been admitted are unable and unwilling to act as members of the family of nations. They have cut themselves off from that role. It is unfortunate that they have gained entrance to the United Nations when they cannot fulfill their responsibilities therein. We must make every effort and offer every proper inducement for them to raise the curtain, but our experience is such that we must oppose the entrance of those countries who thus prevent themselves from carrying out the obligations of membership.

This is a much stronger bar to recognition than is the fact that we detest certain forms of government. Diplomatic history, practice, and precedent do not prohibit the recognition of a detestable de facto administration. But when it comes to granting the privileges of recognition to a nation which hides behind a curtain and so is unwilling to carry out the responsibilities of recognition and membership in the family of nations, that is a new condition, and it must be met with new determination and new precedents. But with this determination goes the responsibility of welcoming and assisting any genuine moves by Communist China to draw the curtain aside.

Of the many opportunities to move into the field of moral issues and spiritual power, there is one which we must continue to present and support. That is universal guaranteed disarmament.

There is no substitute for such thoroughgoing disarmament. There is no substitute for having it guaranteed in the terms of international inspection and administration. When the other nations of the world open themselves to international inventory, inspection, and control of arms and munitions, the nations which refuse obviously refuse for unworthy purposes. This situation must be continuously presented and continuously pressed.

Here again we have a project which is based on the well-being of peoples rather than the aggrandizement of power. To refuse to accept terms of complete inspection is to give plain indication that the nation which refuses to accept such a program is not concerned with the well-being of the peoples of the earth. It is not concerned with the well-being of its own people. It sets power above people. This position is one which should draw condemnation from nations which have tried to stay neutral because they feared being drawn into a power contest. There is no power-seeking left here. There is nothing but concern for the material and spiritual well-being of the citizens of all nations.

While continuously presented in the agenda of the Council and in the forum of the Assembly, continued rejection must lead to other means of presenting the popular cause. It will then become the duty of those responsible for the information programs, beamed to the citizens of the countries behind the curtains, to raise questions in the minds of those citizens as to why they should continue to bear this heavy load of armies, arms, and armament. Questions should be implanted in their minds as to whether their governments really care anything about them as persons or are only concerned with their usefulness in supporting power politics. By continuing such an information campaign simply, strongly, and continuously, forces can be set in motion which will weaken the foundations of totalitarian imperialism and help to bring the world back to peace, prosperity, and spiritual progress.

"People, not power," must be the watchword of the United Nations. Moving in this spirit and with this purpose, a brighter future lies open ahead of us.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIP IN RUMANIA

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, 8 years ago the Rumanian nation was placed under the slavery of Communist conspiracy. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks, a statement I have prepared on the subject.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF RUMANIA

Today marks the eighth anniversary of the installation of a Soviet Communist dictatorship of Rumania.

The Communist domination of Rumania on March 6, 1945, was in violation of the Yalta agreements and took place almost before the ink was dry on the decisions. Mr. Vishinsky went to Bucharest and ordered the disarming of the Rumanian garrison, took over complete control of the city by means of the Red army, and demanded instant dismissal of the national-union government of General Radescu and the installment of a Communist government.

This date, March 6, is therefore the anniversary of the enslavement of the Rumanian people and the anniversary of one of the early enslavement of peoples.

It is this kind of enslavement that we condemn. We must offer hope and courage to the citizens of Rumania and other imprisoned peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

TREATMENT ACCORDED SICK OR INJURED SEAMEN UNDER IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under date of February 6, 1953, Mr. Kosmas Fournarakis, president of the International Society for the Aid of Greek Seamen, Inc., addressed an inquiry to me concerning the treatment being accorded sick or injured seamen under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Following that, I addressed a letter of inquiry to Mr. Argyle R. Mackey, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, asking for clarification of the points raised in the letter from Mr. Fournarakis.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 2, 1953, from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in which he responds to the aforementioned inquiry.

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

MARCH 2, 1953.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: This acknowledges the receipt of your letter of February 16, 1953, with which you enclosed the attached letter dated February 6, 1953, from Mr. Kosmas Fournarakis, president of the International Society for the Aid of Greek Seamen, concerning specific problems which have arisen in the case of Greek seamen.

As you know, section 252 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that alien crewmen may be issued conditional permits to land temporarily in the United States for (1) the period of time (not exceeding 29 days) during which the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived remains in port, if the immigration officer is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart on the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived; or (2) 29 days, if the immigration officer is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart, within the period for which he is permitted to land, on a vessel or aircraft other than the one on which he arrived.

Mr. Fournarakis seems particularly concerned about the treatment accorded to sick or injured seamen. All district directors of the Service have been authorized, in cases where a crewman failed to leave the United States within 29 days, if such failure is due to illness or other reasons beyond his control, to allow him additional and reasonable time to regain his health and depart the United States.

In order further to clarify the procedures, special telegraphic instructions were sent to all District Directors under date of February 18, 1953, covering the following points: The cases of alien crewmen who have been issued conditional landing permits under section 252 (a) (1) of the act (for the time their vessel remains in port), who later request permits under section 252 (a) (2) of the act (29-day permit with permission to pay off and discharge) for the purpose of securing hospital or medical treatment, are to be granted such permits valid for 29 days from their original landing, if their applications are found to be bona fide in every respect. If the physical condition of such seamen prevents their departure within 29 days, they are to be granted a further period of time within which to depart voluntarily from the United States without the institution of deportation proceedings inasmuch as the act has been so construed as to preclude granting formal extensions of temporary stay. A period of voluntary departure without the institution of deportation proceedings is also to be granted to crewmen who were originally issued 29-day landing permits before the need for hospital or medical treatment became known and whose physical condition prevents their departure within 29 days. All landing permits issued under section 252 (a) (2) of the act are to be issued for the full 29 days permitted under the act. Bona fide crewmen who are unable to depart within the period of their admission because of other

reasons beyond their control, such as their vessel's going into drydock, unavailability of shipping, etc., are also to be given a period within which to depart voluntarily without the institution of deportation proceedings.

It is believed that the instructions above referred to will satisfactorily take care of the problems pointed out in the specific cases referred to by Mr. Fournarakis.

Sincerely,

———— ————, *Commissioner.*

FIRST VISA TO JAPANESE NATIONAL UNDER LIBERALIZED UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a letter dated February 14, 1953, addressed to me from Sozaburo Kujira Oka, of Tokyo, Japan, who was the recipient of the first visa to be handed a Japanese national under the liberalized United States immigration law of 1952.

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

TOKYO, JAPAN, *February 14, 1953.*

The Honorable PAT A. McCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: It is with a great deal of delight and honor to inform you that I have been chosen as the first Japanese citizen in postwar Japan to receive an immigration visa to enter the United States.

This was made possible by the passage of the new American immigration law, which eliminates racial barriers as a basis of exclusion from the United States, and which removes all racial barriers to naturalization as an American citizen.

This event is without a doubt the greatest and happiest moment of my life. Words alone cannot express the thrill which I experienced when His Excellency the United States Ambassador to Japan, Robert D. Murphy, handed me the visa on January 21, 1953, at 11 a. m., at the United States Embassy in Tokyo, Japan.

In closing, I would like to express my sincere gratitude for giving me this great right to enter the United States of America, and I shall endeavor to make myself worthy of the great honor which has been bestowed upon me.

Please give my best regards and gratitude to all personnel who made efforts for the passage of this new immigration law.

Very truly yours,

SOZABURO KUJIRAOKA.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week I joined in the offering of many well-earned tributes to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] on the occasion of the anniversary of their 20 years of service as Senators of the United States.

At that time I did not realize, or, if I did, I forgot, that there was another among us to whom tribute should also be paid for the same long and faithful period of service as a distinguished Member of the Senate.

I take this opportunity to pay my respects to the very able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], whose long and faithful record in the Congress of the United States is one of brilliance and rich accomplishment. I believe it was in 1912 that Senator HAYDEN first came to the Congress of the United States as a Member of the House of Representatives. For the past 2 years it has been my pleasure and privilege to serve on the Committee on Rules and Administration under the able leadership of the Senator from Arizona. From that experience, I am convinced that I shall ever feel the inspiration of the Senator's competence, integrity, and sincere friendship.

I hope and pray that the fine and able mind of the Senator from Arizona, together with his happy and charming personality, will remain with the Members of the Senate for a long time to come.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey. It has been my good fortune to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with the Senator from Arizona, and there is no finer or more able man serving on that committee than Senator HAYDEN.

SHORTAGE OF AMMUNITION IN KOREA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have written to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. C. E. Wilson, with respect to the testimony given yesterday by General Van Fleet regarding the shortage of ammunition in Korea. I had taken up this matter with the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, on August 13, 1952, and called his attention to complaints that had been made to me alleging this shortage.

In view of the fact that $100 billion has been expended for military purposes since the beginning of the Korean war on June 25, 1950, it is nearly unbelievable that there has been a continuous shortage of ammunition in Korea in the 22 months General Van Fleet has served as commander in the field. It is particularly amazing that there has been a shortage of hand grenades and a necessity for rationing ammunition and other implements of war. When you ration hand grenades and other ammunition to a soldier on the frontline, it is often equivalent to a verdict of death.

I was surprised, too, that General Van Fleet stated the Communists have greater artillery power than we have and did not seem to suffer from any lack of ammunition.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a copy of the letter I wrote on yesterday to Secretary Wilson asking for a full report in the matter.

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

MARCH 5, 1953.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: In my 20 years in the Senate I have never been more shocked than I was today when General Van Fleet testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that there has been a shortage of ammunition and hand grenades in Korea for at least 22 months.

General Van Fleet testified this shortage has been continuous since he took command and that almost daily he had reported it officially and through channels. Failure to supply these munitions, according to General Van Fleet, seriously handicapped not only the prosecution of the war against Communist Chinese and North Koreans but also the protection of our own troops.

Shortage of munitions inevitably leads to greater loss of life and prolonged conflict. To me, such a situation as this, extending over 22 months, represents criminal inefficiency, because since the Korean war started, on June 25, 1950, the following appropriations have been made to the armed services: $51 billion in fiscal year 1951, $61 billion in fiscal year 1952, $48 billion in fiscal year 1953; total, $160 billion.

From these appropriations, the following expenditures have been made for military purposes: $20 billion in fiscal year 1951, $39 billion in fiscal year 1952, $44 billion in fiscal year 1953. Included in fiscal 1953 are expenditures to July 1, 1953. Total, $103 billion.

Today the armed services have on hand unexpended balances in appropriations which have been made to them totaling approximately $80 billion, and they estimate that as of next June 30 they will still have some $60 billion of unexpended appropriations, exclusive of whatever may be appropriated in the current session of Congress.

In the face of these facts it is outrageous that we have allowed unnecessary loss of life and the improper prosecution of the Korean war for 22 months by failure to supply necessary munitions.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am asking that you—

1. Make a full investigation as to what officials at the Pentagon received information, so often transmitted by General Van Fleet, that there was a shortage of munitions.

2. What officers at the Pentagon are responsible for the failure of General Van Fleet to receive adequate munitions.

3. What action you will take to punish those officers who have been guilty of such negligence of their official duties.

4. What steps are being taken by the Pentagon to supply adequate munitions in the future.

5. That this and all other information incident to a shortage of munitions in Korea be presented as promptly as possible so that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate can undertake further investigations, should such be desirable.

In closing, let me say that when a charge such as this comes from the commanding general in the field, it is of such importance as to warrant the most exhaustive investigation so as to determine who is at fault, and to punish those who have been derelict in their duties.

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TODAY AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Executive Calendar be called.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to make inquiry of the distinguished majority leader as to his plans for next week.

Mr. TAFT. Beyond calling the calendar on Monday, I do not believe there will be any substantial legislation considered next week. I do not know of any important measures except those which are actually on the calendar. I may move to take up any of those measures if they are objected to upon the call of the calendar, though I do not know of any measures on the calendar which are really controversial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the majority leader plan to have the Senate meet on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of next week?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of next week. A number of nominations are expected to be received, and I think the Senate should meet to dispose of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the majority leader indicate whether or not it would be agreeable to him to take up today Senate Resolution 16, Calendar No. 46?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. We intend to take it up today. In addition to Calendar Nos. 46 and 47, being Senate Resolution 16 and Senate Resolution 49, respectively, I believe there is another resolution which has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Executive Calendar be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry N. Routzohn to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if this nomination was reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. TAFT. This nomination was reported unanimously by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I may say, since Mr. Routzohn is a constituent of mine, that he is one of the leading attorneys in the city of Dayton, Ohio. I think he might well have been recommended to be a Federal judge if he had not been beyond the age limit prescribed by the Attorney General's ruling. He has had service on all sides of the labor question. He has represented labor unions and many other clients. For some time he has been the attorney for the International Brotherhood of Carpenters, in the position of general counsel. I do not know of anyone who I think would be more impartial in his action as Solicitor of the Department of Labor. He was a Representative in Congress during the years 1939 and 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harry N. Routzohn to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor?

The nomination was confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard R. Atkinson to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

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

LOYALTY CHECKS ON SENATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 16, Calendar No. 46.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The resolution (S. Res. 16) to provide for loyalty checks on Senate employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "to the", to strike out "Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, to the"; in line 7, after the word "Investigation", to strike out "and to the Central Intelligence Agency,"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, to the", and in line 7, after the word "Investigation", to strike out the comma and "and to the Central Intelligence Agency", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That hereafter when any person is appointed as an employee of any committee of the Senate, of any Senator, or of any office of the Senate the committee, Senator, or officer having authority to make such appointment shall transmit the name of such person to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of such agency concerning the loyalty of such person, and in any case in which such derogatory information is revealed such committee, Senator, or officer shall make or cause to be made such further investigation as shall have been considered necessary to determine the loyalty of such person.

Every such committee, Senator, and officer shall promptly transmit to the Federal Bureau of Investigation a list of the names of the incumbent employees of such committee, Senator, or officer together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed of any derogatory information contained in the files of such agency concerning the loyalty of such employee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Chair know of any reason why an amendment to Senate Resolution 16 which would require that the resolution cover Senators as well as Senate employees would not be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is subject to amendment in the usual manner. Of course, in the Senate germaneness is not required in the case of amendments.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to announce that at a later hour this afternoon I shall offer the amendment which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit the names of each Senator of the United States, incumbent on the date of the adoption of this resolution and hereafter entering upon the office of Senator of the United States, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of each agency (and if such is on file, any rebutting information) concerning the loyalty and the reliability of such Senator for security purposes. In any case in which such derogatory and rebutting information is submitted, the Committee on Rules and Administration shall make or cause to be made such further investigation necessary to resolve the issues raised by such report and to take such further action as it or the Senate shall deem necessary."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my amendment to Senate Resolution 16 would include an investigation of Members of the Senate as well as Senate employees.

As I announced last week, I have already notified the Attorney General that, so far as my office is concerned, this resolution is not needed. We are perfectly willing to have the Department of Justice proceed, on a voluntary basis or a waiver basis, with the investigation of members of my office staff, including the Senator from Oregon himself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am having an amendment to the resolution drafted. As soon as it has been drafted I shall offer it to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY ON SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the amendment is being drafted I shall discuss another subject matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration a proposed amendment to Senate Resolution 32, which I submitted on January 13.

The subject of the assignment of Senators was debated at some length on that day. At that time I submitted Senate Resolution 32, to enlarge the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by two members, a member of the majority party and the junior Senator from Oregon.

PURPOSE OF SENATE RESOLUTION 32

That proposal has a twofold purpose: to maintain numerical control of those committees by the majority party and to continue the junior Senator from Oregon on those committees in recognition of his Senate seniority and in conformity with the almost unbroken rule of the Senate that once a Member is assigned to a committee he is not removed from it in violation of his Senate seniority.

INACTION OF RULES COMMITTEE

That resolution has been pending before the Rules Committee since January 13 and so far as I know—and there has been no public announcement to the contrary—absolutely no action has been taken upon it. No hearings have been held, no committee discussion or vote has taken place, no report has been made to the Senate.

I point out that the distinguished minority leader blocked consideration of Senate Resolution 32 on the day that I submitted it—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 337, January 13, 1953. He indicated that he believed the proposal should receive the consideration of the Rules Committee. At that time I was of the opinion that the issues were sufficiently clear to enable any Senator to vote immediately upon my proposal. That was not done.

MANY SENATORS DESIRE OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE

Many Senators stated on that occasion and later that they desired to have the opportunity to vote on Senate Resolution 32. It appears to me that a sufficient amount of time has elapsed since January 13—7½ weeks, to be precise—to enable the Rules Committee to consider Senate Resolution 32 and report it so that the Senate may consider it and vote upon it.

The Senate will recall that on January 13, the membership of standing committees was voted upon. At that time many Senators complained that they were embarrassed by the parliamentary situation in which they found themselves. They were not permitted to vote on Senate Resolution 32.

The distinguished majority leader, with his customary fairness, agreed to a postponement of the assignment of the junior Senator from Oregon to the two committee posts which were left over after the Republican and Democratic caucus slates were drawn.

As I stated at the time, Mr. President, the assignment of the junior Senator from Oregon, if he had been assigned to the two committees to which it was suggested he should be assigned, would have been somewhat in the nature of a garbage-can assignment. Those two assignments being all that were left, the junior Senator from Oregon would have been required to take the leavings. I did not think they would have been even edible crumbs.

The sole reasonable purpose of delay was to permit committee consideration of Senate Resolution 32.

ONLY ONCE HAS A SENATOR BEEN REMOVED FROM A COMMITTEE FOR POLITICAL DIFFERENCE

When the Senate discussed committee assignments on January 13, I presented the complete history of committee assignment in the Senate. It shows that on only one occasion—I repeat, on only one occasion—has the Senate removed a member from a committee because of differences between him and the administration or majority party. One has to go back to 1871, during General Grant's "illustrious" administration, to find that occasion.

Charles Sumner, who at that time had been chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations since the Republicans gained control of the Senate and who had served with distinction, opposed Grant's plan for the annexation of Santo Domingo. The Republican caucus in reporting its committee list on March 10, 1871, omitted Sumner as chairman, and in addition, did not include him as a member of the committee.

A vociferous debate ensued and the disciplinary action was denounced by such eminent Senators as Wilson, Schurz, and Trumbull, and described as unjustifiable, impolitic, and unnecessary.

James G. Blaine later observed:

> Never was the power of the caucus more wrongfully applied.[1]

There were several other Senators who opposed their party's nominee or policy. Some were among the most renowned Members of this body: Stephen Douglas, Ladd, and Norris. In not one case did anyone lose a committee post formerly held by him. In some cases, though not all, a Senator has not been continued as a committee chairman, but in none of those instances was he removed from a committee on which he had served.

[1] Haynes, The Senate of the United States, vol. I, pp. 302–303.

Let me describe some of the demotions from chairmanships which took place, not one of which was accompanied by loss of membership on the committees involved.

1859: Stephen A. Douglas, the only Democratic chairman from a non-slaveholding State, was, while absent from the Senate, dropped from the chairmanship of the Committee on Territories, which he had held since his election to the Senate. Senator Pugh laid this punishment to vindictiveness for Douglas' antislavery views.

1867:

> Contrary to precedent, at the beginning of the short session a new election of all the standing committees took place. The list submitted by the majority leader was approved without debate. Apparently the sole object of this election was to discipline the Republican chairmen who had not supported the radicals in the vote to override the President's veto of the civil rights bill.[2]

Three chairmen were demoted.

1923: In my remarks on January 13, I described the removal of Senator Cummins from the chairmanship of a committee he had held for 4 years. Cummins was then 73 years old and held another chairmanship. Two chairmanships were deemed too great a burden for a man of his age. A contributing factor was his unpopularity with certain Senators who opposed the Esch-Cummins Transportation Act of 1920.

1925: On this occasion the dominant Republicans disciplined the supporters of old Bob La Follette's presidential candidacy in the campaign of 1924. Ladd lost a committee chairmanship and the others were reduced in committee seniority. None was removed from a committee on which he had served.

1929: Senator Norris supported Alfred E. Smith and Heflin supported Hoover in the 1928 campaign—each crossing party lines. They both continued in the same committee posts they had held before the election.

This matter has been researched and re-researched—and no example of removal from a committee other than Sumner in 1871 has been unearthed.

Therefore, I wish again to make crystal clear for the RECORD that on January 13, 1953, the Senate followed a course of action which it had not followed since 1871. My colleagues in the Senate can tell their constituents all they want to tell them, as they have in many letters, copies of which I have received from their constituents, to the effect that no disciplinary action was taken against the junior Senator from Oregon, but their constituents are too smart to swallow that alibi or rationalization. Their constituents know full well what happened to the junior Senator from Oregon on January 13, 1953, at the hands of a Senate which apparently felt that the time had come to set an example for all the future which would teach a lesson to insurgents and rebels in the Senate of the United States. It was aimed at reminding insurgents what would happen to them if they refused to accept the dictates of a party caucus. However, the

[2] Haynes, p. 302, footnote 2.

action will not deter true liberals. It will boomerang against the Senators who voted as they did on January 13. I was fair enough to advise both party caucuses, some days prior to the meeting on January 13, that I did not desire to be assigned by a party caucus to a Senate committee, but that I desired to be assigned to committees in accordance with my rights under the Reorganization Act of 1946.

But apparently my colleagues in the Senate either have not read or did not wish to read with the correct interpretation the Reorganization Act of 1946, because after reading it they could not reach any other conclusion than that under that act every Member of this body has a right to be assigned to committees by vote of the Senate, not by action of a political caucus. The junior Senator from Oregon asked to be assigned in accordance with his rights under the Reorganization Act. The Members of this body went back to 1871 for a precedent which was established at the beginning of another military administration, for the action which was taken against the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, my colleagues can continue to tell their constituents that they took no disciplinary action, but I intend to meet them on the platform in their States in 1954, and we will discuss with their constituents the real meaning of their action on January 13, 1953.

Mr. President, I was appalled by the glaring fact that on January 13, the Senate proceeded, in effect, to remove a Senator from committee posts long held without the slightest research of the precedents of the Senate. No Senator of the majority party made any statement which would indicate that he or his party or caucus had considered the history of the Senate before taking the action the caucus had decided upon. The majority leader gave no inkling of having any such information.

With only two exceptions, the Democratic speakers demonstrated the same lack of information, and worse. Both parties appeared indifferent, apathetic, to the possibility that 164 years of precedent might be overturned. To me, that was a shocking course of action.

THE PRINCIPLE OF MINORITY REPRESENTATION IS ROOTED IN DEMOCRATIC TRADITION

Nor was there a shred of evidence that either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party had given the slightest prior thought to the principle of minority representation.

As I stated in my remarks on January 13, the rights of minority parties in the Senate to committee assignments is not a matter of sufferance: It does not depend upon the indulgence of the majority of the moment. It is—or at least it has been—firmly rooted in a tradition of the Senate which has but mirrored a basic premise of our democratic form of government; namely, that the majority shall prevail but with due regard for the preservation of minority representation and the recognition of minority rights. The Constitution is designed to insure and preserve that balance, and it is for that reason that amendments to the Constitution require more than a simple majority.

At any moment a majority of sufficient numbers could override the basic rights of minority groups—whether a political party, a religious group, or dissenters of many persuasions. In such a case the strength of democracy is its accumulated tradition of liberty and the protection of minority rights which has defeated and will defeat attempts at totalitarian control.

The history of progress is the history of minorities fighting for their rights, not humbly petitioning for the indulgence of their betters.

The distinguished minority leader stated on January 13—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 343—that he had no intention of interfering with the selection of the majority caucus because the majority "soon would be picking every member of every committee in the Senate. I can see no more dangerous day that could ever face a minority," said he.

Mr. President, I say that is a counsel of fear. Certainly the minority party should be the first to stand on its hind legs and fight any infringement of the rights of another minority party. I would recall to the Senate that the motto of the Hapsburgs was "divide and conquer." I call the attention of my liberal friends on both sides of the aisle in the Senate to the fact that that is also the old shell game which for decades has been played against liberals in American politics—in short, divide and conquer. The liberals should have known that there was nothing better that the reactionaries would like to do than divide the liberals. Turn the liberals against each other and then pick them off one by one has been reactionary policy for decades. It is a bad thing that my liberal friends in the Senate fell for the tactics.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 32

Let me turn to the arithmetic of the situation and outline what I submit today.

The minority leader, in blocking consideration of Senate Resolution 32, stated that the caucus slates were designed to insure the same percentage of minority party representation in this Congress as obtained in the 82d Congress, 1st session. He pointed out that in 1950 the Republican Party had 47 Members in the Senate and that in this Congress the Democratic Party has 47 Members in the Senate. He is not completely correct in his statement that the percentages are the same, Mr. President; they are only roughly the same.

In the first session of the 82d Congress there were a total of 203 committee posts, of which the then minority party had 94. Under the reorganized committee plan adopted on January 9, 1953, there are now a total of 209 committee posts, of which the Democratic Party presently has 77.

What I propose in my amendment to Senate Resolution 32 is to increase the number of committee posts by two. That would be accomplished by adding 2 members to the Committee on Armed Services and 2 members to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and by reducing the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works by 1 member each. The total change in overall committee posts would be from 209 seats to 211 seats. At present the Committee on the District of Columbia is supposed to have 9 members, and the Committee on Public Works is supposed to have 11 members. Until now, each has operated with one vacancy. It will be recalled that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] explained that it was not found possible to agree upon a plan which would insure a numerical majority of majority party members on all committees. It was decided that the Republican and Democratic strength on those 2 committees should be equal, and that the junior Senator from Oregon should be the ninth member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the eleventh member of the Committee on Public Works.

They implied that I could conceivably hold the balance of power on these committees. They were not happy about the prospect but apparently felt that this was the best that they could do.

Of course, at no time have they ever contemplated what the RECORD will show, namely, that my votes on the Armed Services Committee and my votes on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for years and years, have never been based upon any partisan theory of who holds the balance of power, but only on the theory of the merits of the issues before the committee, and on what, in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, was best for the country. The assumption concerning the balance of power on committees which has run through this debate on committee assignments is, of course, clearly based upon what I think is a very undesirable admission that in committee at least some Senators act from a partisanship standpoint rather than from the standpoint of the merits of the issues before the committee. But I said on January 13 that I was perfectly willing to agree with the distinguished majority leader, as I did, that the majority party was entitled to have a majority of one on the committees of the Senate. I did not quarrel with that, but I quarreled with the false assumption of the minority that it had no responsibilities in the fight to protect the interests of a minority or independent party in the Senate. Again today I charge the minority with having, on January 13, walked out on its clear obligations to protect minority rights as a minority party in the Senate of the United States. The minority is going to learn from constituents of theirs across the country that thousands of them agree that there was a failure on the part of the minority party, on January 13, to live up to the professed liberal beliefs of certain Members of the minority, in connection with this committee fight, because they substituted political expediency for political principle, as they well know. In fact, some of them have tended to half confess it in letters to constituents, copies of which have been sent to me.

But what have Members of the minority done since January 13 to correct a wrong, not to the junior Senator from Oregon, but a wrong to the traditions of the United States Senate, a wrong for

which they can find no precedent since 1871. They have done absolutely nothing. They stand convicted before the bar of American public opinion today, in my judgment, as a group of men who walked out on their responsibilities to minority rights in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon, I think, knows that I am a cosponsor of Resolution No. 32. I was very glad indeed to be a cosponsor, because I felt that the proposal which was made took into account the existence of an independent party, and also recognized that a party that had been voted the majority party in the election was entitled to organize the House and the Senate, and to control the committees by majority membership on the committees.

I supported Resolution No. 32 with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, because I felt that the solution offered by the resolution was a reasonable and a fair one; and I still do, because on two committees, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services, on which the distinguished Senator from Oregon has served with such great distinction for many years, it would have given him continued membership and at the same time would have permitted the majority party to assert its role as a majority party.

While I think that resolution was an entirely fair one, I do not subscribe to the thesis enunciated by my friend from Oregon that the minority party did not recognize its responsibility. Quite the opposite, Mr. President. Many of us in the minority party spoke in favor of Senate Resolution 32 and stated that we would support it, as we would support it today if it should come before the Senate, because we consider it to be a thoroughly fair and equitable resolution which gives recognition both to the right of seniority of the Senator from Oregon and to the right of the majority party to assert its function as the majority party in the Senate.

When that resolution was proffered, as the Senator from Oregon will recall, some of us asked that it be reported promptly by the committee. The answer was that no assurance could be given as to a specific date on which it would be reported. It has certainly been my understanding that it would be brought before the Senate, not necessarily with a favorable report from the committee, but brought to the floor of the Senate so that Members could fight for it.

I can assure the Senator from Oregon that when that happens he will have the support of many members of the minority party, as well as, I believe, the support of many members of the majority party, because it provides a sound way to handle the situation. It would accord recognition of the right of the member or members of an independent party to have proper committee assignments and of the right of a Member who has served on committees for many years to maintain his seniority, and at the same time it would recognize the right and the authority of the majority party to organize and to control, so far as it is able to do so through its own efforts, the proceedings within the committees and within the Senate.

I want the Senator to know that I stand shoulder to shoulder with him in a desire to have the resolution brought before the Senate, and I can assure him that when that happens he will certainly have my support, as he has in the past, and also the support of many other Members of the Senate in both parties.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the remarks of the Senator from New York. I assure him that in my reply I mean no personal reflection upon him. I am talking to the principle which is involved; and I wish to say that the remarks of the Senator from New York are completely unsatisfactory, so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, as to the correct explanation of what happened prior to January 13 and on January 13 as affecting the minority side of the Senate. I do not think the Senator from New York can erase from the RECORD the plain facts. He talks about a group of Senators on the minority side, when the junior Senator from Oregon offered Senate Resolution 32, rising and asking to join in the resolution. That was sort of an afterthought on their part. But the fact should be borne in mind, that the junior Senator from Oregon should never have been placed in such a position that he himself had to offer Senate Resolution 32 in order to do justice on the floor of the Senate to a minority interest. That should have been done by the minority party itself; the resolution should have been offered by the minority party itself. But it was the minority party which blocked the proposal when the majority leader himself made very clear, as the RECORD of January 13 will show, that it would have been acceptable to the majority leader.

The minority party cannot by any stretch of the imagination place upon the majority party the responsibility for what has happened in regard to this committee problem. They say, Mr. President, out of one corner of their mouths, that they recognize that the majority is entitled to a majority on the committee, but out of the other corner of their mouths they say in a letter which I am going to read presently that it was the responsibility of the majority to take care of the junior Senator from Oregon by way of committee assignments. They cannot have their cake and eat it, too; they cannot have the argument both ways; they cannot take the position that the majority is entitled to a majority of one and then take the position that the majority should have destroyed that majority of one on the two committees that I am entitled to serve on. The fact is that the minority party did not want to recognize the fact that there are three parties in the Senate of the United States. They do not want to face the fact that there is an Independent Party in the Senate of the United States. So nothing was done by them on January 13 to protect the rights of the Senator from Oregon. They did not offer any resolution to protect his rights.

The Senator from New York says they rallied to the support of the Senator from Oregon after he offered the resolution. Do Senators think it was pleasant for the junior Senator from Oregon to take the action he did? Do they think it is easy to do that on the floor of the Senate, considering the kind of press we have in America today, which is ever-ready to distort the position taken by nonconformists? I have my feelings, too, Mr. President. It was only because of the important seniority principle which was involved that I made the fight for the protection of my seniority rights. I had gone to the books. I looked upon what I had to do as being a task for a student of government. I believed I ought to do my paper work. Before the meeting on January 13 I had studied the precedents of the Senate of the United States and I knew that the Senate could not justify breaking the precedents of decades if the precedents were pointed out. I pointed them out to the members of the minority in the speech which I made on the subject on January 13. They ignored the precedents.

Where were the voices on the minority side? Only six Members stood up and were counted in support of protecting the precedents and traditions of the Senate of the United States on this issue of my seniority rights.

Mr. President, I make bold to say that the Senator from New York cannot submit an iota of evidence that shows there was any inclination or intention on the part of the minority in its caucus to protect the minority rights of the Senator from Oregon. What ruled in that caucus was politics, not principle—"get every committee assignment we can for Democrats" was the obvious tactic of that Democratic caucus.

"The Senator from Oregon," says one of them in a letter to a constituent, "has made his bed; let him lie in it."

I do not object to my bed, Mr. President. I am proud of the political bed I have made for myself. But I wish to say to Senators on the other side of the aisle that they are going to hear from me in 1954, across the country, on this matter of principle versus political expediency. They will find out in their own bailiwicks what the attitude of their constituents may be on the question of principle versus political expediency.

Let me say further, Mr. President, that it makes nice rationalizing to a constituent to say, "Well, we were in a difficult parliamentary position. The Senator from Oregon was maneuvered into a bad parliamentary position, and there was nothing we could do about that, but the first time we had a chance to help him we rallied to him and indicated that we were going to support his resolution."

That is an interesting alibi, Mr. President, that is what I call working both sides of the street, because the fact is that they were not interested in the position in which the Senator from Oregon found himself until, first, they took care of their own committee assignments. There were some choice ones made, too. Some of my alleged friends on the minority side got some choice committee plums on January 13. They picked

their plums first; then they started talking about protecting the minority rights of the Independent Party in the United States Senate.

Did they vote on committee assignments on January 13? That raises again the old question of form versus substance, because Senate rule XXIV reads as follows:

> In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof. All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.

Did they vote, Mr. President? Let the record show the form of the ballot they sent to the desk. The form of the ballot sent to the desk was a mimeographed copy of a political caucus list of committee assignments, at the bottom of which each Senator signed his name, and sent it to the desk as his ballot. They can call it a ballot if they wish to, but, in accordance with my sense of values, they sent to the desk an underwriting of a political caucus action, and I refuse to believe that, at least in some cases, it represented the true judgment of the individual Senator as to how he ought to have voted.

Some Senators have been kind enough and fair enough to tell me subsequently that they realized they did not send a ballot to the desk. In some instances they have formally apologized to me. Perhaps I have not been very kind, because I responded to their apologies by saying that I never accept an apology involving a matter of public policy. I accept an apology only in a matter that involves a social error or a personal affront. But an apology never rights a wrong against public policy. The kind of apology tendered was merely conscience salve for the apologizer, and some hard feelings have resulted.

If there is a desire to go into the question of personal relationships that have resulted, I may say that I recognize that this was an unfortunate incident. However, irrespective of the unfortunate personal relations which have resulted, I shall continue to fight on the floor of the Senate for what I think is the protection of a great principle, namely, the seniority rights of a Senator. I shall continue to try to make the record clear for future students of the history of the Senate, by showing that in this session of Congress there was at least one Senator who fought on the floor of the Senate to protect 8 years of seniority rights that were emasculated on January 13, 1953.

I believe that the unfortunate act of the United States Senate on January 13 in violating my seniority rights is going to plague future Senators and future Senates. If it is the attitude of the Members of the United States Senate that by disciplinary action they can inhibit and control insurgents of the future, they are mistaken. Unless I fail entirely to read the handwriting on the wall, I venture the prediction today that the number of independents and insurgents in the United States Senate in the years immediately ahead is going to increase, because increasing millions of American people are becoming sick and tired of the political expediency that has come to dominate both major parties in this country. That is why there is going to be an upsurge from the grassroots of America in opposition to the kind of political expediency that stalked the floor of the United States Senate on January 13, 1953.

So I say, in reply to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], that his explanation is not good enough for me, because the time for the Senator from New York, as a member of a minority party, to have acted was before he ever came to the floor of the Senate on January 13, when he saw that his party was about to follow the course of action which it followed on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The place for the Senator from New York to have acted was on the floor of the Senate, before he sent to the desk the mimeographed copy of the Democratic caucus list, to which he signed his name, and which he called a ballot. That was the time for the Senator from New York to have stood up on the floor of the Senate and be counted in defense of minority rights.

When I offered my resolution, and the Senator from New York asked permission to join in offering it, of course I granted him permission, but I would have been much more pleased if the Senator from New York had made the fight for minority rights prior to the time he sent to the desk something which I will never call a ballot under Senate rule XXIV.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the first place, I may say that not being on either the policy committee of the Democratic minority or the steering committee, I had no part in deciding on the minority membership of the committees. I accepted my membership on the committees, as did other Members of the Senate.

I may point out to the Senator from Oregon that it was the junior Senator from New York who strongly urged him to adopt the course of presenting Senate Resolution 32 to this body, rather than a resolution which he presented later on his own initiative, which would have meant bumping off the committees Senators who were selected by the two accredited and recognized committees of the Senate.

Furthermore, the Senator from Oregon may remember that it was at his suggestion and on his insistence that every Member of the Senate was required to vote on the ballot that had been presented, which he referred to as a mimeographed ballot—and it was a mimeographed ballot. So far as I recall this was not done at the insistence of other Members of the Senate, but at the insistence of the Senator from Oregon himself. I think the Senator from Oregon will recall that I strongly urged that the procedure outlined in Senate Resolution 32 was sound and fair, and that it recognized—and I wish to repeat the word "recognized"—three things which I believe are essential in any legislative body in a democracy.

First, it recognized the seniority rights of a Senator who had served for many years on important committees. Second, it recognized certain rights of an Independent Party—and I know the Senator from Oregon represents an Independent Party. The third point is the most important, to my mind, because I believe in majority government. I believe that a party which has been elected by the people of our country to serve as the majority party in a legislative body should be given the means of carrying out its mandate. Resolution 32, of which, as I have said, I was a cosponsor, recognized that viewpoint. It would have recognized that the Republican Party had a mandate to organize the Senate and its committees. It would have maintained the majority position, but, at the same time, it would have given the distinguished Senator from Oregon a place on the two important committees which have been mentioned, which I was very anxious that he have.

I will say to the acting majority leader and the acting minority leader that I think it is perfectly fair to the distinguished Senator from Oregon to criticize the committee, as I am criticizing it, for not having permitted the resolution to come before the Senate long before that, so that we might have had a right to vote in support of the resolution, which I think was fair, wise, judicious, and equitable. The resolution has not come before us.

That is my criticism, I will say to the Senator from Oregon. I join him in that criticism. I join him in saying that that resolution should be brought to the floor of the Senate, so that Members of the Senate may evidence and demonstrate their feelings in regard to its provisions.

In my judgment that is the proper, wise, and fair way to proceed. I must say that when that resolution comes before us—and I hope this debate, acrimonious as it may have been, will serve the purpose of bringing it out on the floor of the Senate—I think we shall have made a great gain in support of the principles of democratic government. I believe that that is the proper way to proceed, rather than, as the Senator from Oregon has done and is doing, in accusing Members of the Senate who, I believe, have just as consistent a record of liberalism as has the junior Senator from Oregon, of surrendering their principles and of being willing to yield to political expediency.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am always glad to have the comments of the Senator from New York on any subject, including this one. Usually, however, I find his comments more satisfactory and logical than I find them today. So I shall reply to the comments which he has just made, because I find them as unsatisfactory as his previous comments.

He has opened up the question as to what happened behind the scenes on January 13. I will tell the Senate some of the things that happened behind the scenes on January 13.

It is true that the Senator from New York suggested that some such resolution as the one submitted by me, Senate Resolution 32, ought to be offered; and some of his colleagues suggested it. But he did not say what my reply was. My reply was: "Why should I be submitting such a resolution? Why should I be placed in the position of having to stand on the floor of the Senate and fight for my minority rights? Why should I be placed in such a position that I have to nominate myself for membership on those two committees? In my opinion, I am entitled to membership on them under the rules of the Senate, as a matter of right. You gentlemen on the other side ought to be protecting my rights."

What was the reply? What was the comment of the Senator from New York and some other Senators on the other side? "You have us in a difficult situation. We have been maneuvered into a bad parliamentary position. We are in the position now where we must either vote for you and against a Democrat, or for a Democrat and against you."

What was my reply? I said, "You are in no such position at all. You are in the position where you must vote either for or against a principle. The principle involved is protecting the seniority rights of a Member of the Senate on the floor of the Senate, in keeping with the spirit and meaning of rule XXIV of the Senate, under which, by ballot, you are to decide who shall go on the committees. What criterion are you going to apply when you come to cast that ballot judgment? How can you escape the criterion of seniority rights?"

The trouble with Senators on the other side is that they did not want to do what they should have done in fairness. They should have recognized—because it was as clear as the noses on their faces—that they ought to have dropped the Member of lowest seniority, of the freshman class, on the two committees with respect to which the Senator from Oregon was entitled to retention of membership. That is how simple it was.

It was not a question of voting for or against a Democrat. It was a question of voting for or against protecting the principle of seniority in the United States Senate; and each and every Member of the minority party who sent the mimeographed caucus list to the clerk's desk failed to protect that principle. They can alibi and rationalize and argue all they wish, as the Senator from New York has done on the floor of the Senate this afternoon; but they cannot escape the pinch in which they are caught. He cannot escape the pinch in which he is caught. He did not vote to protect seniority rights on the floor of the Senate on January 13. He sent a so-called ballot to the desk which did not protect the principle of seniority rights; and he cannot cough that one out of his system; he cannot get it out. It is there for all time, for all to see. The same is true of his colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The minority party did not protect minority rights on January 13.

Let me make a further comment with respect to the remarks of the Senator from New York. Why did he not offer the resolution? Why did not a group of Democratic Senators offer the resolution? I wonder—and I only express wonder—if it was because they knew that their minority leader was against it, and so stated on the floor of the Senate on January 13.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr LEHMAN. I think the Senator's memory is very poor. He may recall—and we can consult the RECORD of January 13—that the first resolution which the Senator from Oregon submitted was Senate Resolution 32, which he submitted very early in the session of that day. My recollection is that the Senator from New York urged its immediate consideration, but the Chair declared that that proposal was out of order, because the resolution had to lie over for a day, which was in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Before he ever came to the floor of the Senate on January 13, what fight did the Senator from New York make within the Democratic Party to protect the rights of the Senator from Oregon? What fight did the Senator from New York ever make in the Democratic caucus, taking the position that the Democrat of lowest seniority ought to give way to the greater seniority rights of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LEHMAN. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that at all times, even though the Senator from New York was not on the policy committee or on the steering committee—and I am not even certain that those committees had been appointed prior to that time—the Senator from New York strongly urged the retention of the Senator from Oregon as a member of those two committees.

Mr. MORSE. Why did not the Senator vote that way?

Mr. LEHMAN. Because I felt, as I have stated, that Senate Resolution 32 was the right way to proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Even when the Senator knew that there was not a chance of getting it through the Senate?

Mr. LEHMAN. Even when I knew that the later method proposed by the Senator from Oregon would have meant the complete negation of the principle to which I am attached, of the right of the majority party to organize and conduct the affairs of the Senate.

I did not expect to say this, until this uncalled-for attack by the Senator from Oregon——

Mr. MORSE. The Senator asked for it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Perhaps I did.

Mr. MORSE. And the Senator's actions justify it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Perhaps I did ask for it. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that he will recall that I volunteered—no; I will not say this. It would not be fair.

Mr. MORSE. Go ahead.

Mr. LEHMAN. It was a statement made in confidence.

Mr. MORSE. So far as I am concerned no such statement need be regarded as having been made in confidence. Let the Senator proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well. I volunteered to withdraw from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in favor of the Senator from Oregon. It is true that that was after the vote was taken.

Mr. MORSE. Two days afterward.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether it was 1 day or 2 days, but it was still an offer made in good faith, and made in a desire, first, to show my confidence in the Senator from Oregon; and in the second place, because I felt that he would be an extremely valuable member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as he had been for many years.

Let me say in all kindness—and I know I am repeating—that although the Senator from Oregon has been in the Senate for many more years than I have, he has not been in public life longer than I have, or longer than some of my colleagues, nor has he served the people of the Nation longer, nor has he served liberal causes longer. I cannot help remark that the Senator from Oregon has no monopoly on liberalism, on liberal leadership, or on liberal action, and that some of the Senators he has attacked, both on the Republican and on the Democratic sides of the aisle, have records on liberalism which I believe would not suffer by comparison with his record, much as I admire and respect him.

He has no monopoly on liberalism, on liberal leadership, or on the support of liberal causes which extend over a great many years. Others too have principles and convictions. I am sorry that I had to engage in this colloquy with my friend from Oregon. It has not been bitter on my side, and certainly I did not want it to be, because in spite of statements and remarks which have been made by him both on the floor of the Senate and on the outside, I still have a great affection and admiration for the junior Senator from Oregon, and I have great confidence in him. He is a real liberal, but I do not think he is the only liberal in the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply to the ad hominem argument of the Senator from New York as follows: There is no one in this body who respects the liberalism of the Senator from New York more than does the junior Senator from Oregon. I think he is the giant of us all so far as the record on liberalism is concerned. I have said across the platforms of America on innumerable occasions that I do not think there is a greater liberal in the United States than HERBERT LEHMAN, of New York, and I still think that is true. That is why I am deeply grieved and pained that on this occasion he should walk out on his own principles and liberalism by failing to protect in this instance minority rights, as he has so heroically done in other instances.

The Senator from New York knows full well that he is getting pretty close to the beltline when he tries to imply by innuendo that the junior Senator from Oregon thinks he has a monopoly on liberalism in this country. I make no such profession. I do say, Mr. President, that when it has been pointed out that a principle of liberalism was at stake, I never knowingly walked out on it.

The Senator from New York has referred to a conversation which he had with me some 2 days after January 13.

Well, Mr. President, let us put it in the RECORD. He said he was very much disturbed about the course of action he had followed on January 13. He said he had voted his convictions and he thought he was right, but he was not sure that he was right. He said he thought he was right, but he wanted to talk to me on a proposal which he wanted to make to the Democratic Policy Committee. He wanted to offer to resign from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with the understanding that I be appointed in his place, because he thought I ought to be a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He thought also that I ought to be a member of the Committee on Armed Services, but he did not think he could do anything about that committee. He could do something, however, about the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because he is a member of it.

My reply to him in essence was that I knew he would not mean to insult me, and I asked him what made him think that I would accept through his charity what I was entitled to as a matter of right. I said that I would not think of accepting appointment to any committee through any action of charity of the Senator from New York. I said I held fast to the principle of seniority which had been emasculated by this body on January 13.

I desire to say further to the Senator from New York that he did not have to be a member of the Democratic policy committee, and he did not have to be a member of the Democratic steering committee to make his fight for the protection of minority rights in the Senate on January 13, or prior to January 13, through the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, he rebutted himself when he sent to the desk a ballot which cannot be reconciled with that resolution. He rebutted himself when, after he discovered on January 13 that not even his minority leader would go along with him on the whole question of protecting the seniority rights of a minority, he himself did not make the fight to protect that principle at the time of the balloting.

In my judgment there can be no question about the fact that, confronted with the problem my alleged friends were confronted with, and with the attitude of the minority leader on January 13 on my resolution, that they should have protected the seniority rights of 8 years service in the Senate, instead of giving superior consideration to seniority rights which were just taking root in freshmen Senators who had just recently walked onto the floor of the Senate. That is the major premise of the junior Senator from Oregon, and it is a premise which is consistent with the precedents of the Senate, except for the one of 1871. The Senator from New York has had nothing to say about the precedents of the Senate. He has had nothing to say about the fact that never, except for once in our history, has a Senator received such treatment in the matter of committee assignments as I received on January 13.

Since its formation on January 13, the District of Columbia Committee has held several meetings, has formed several subcommittees and scheduled hearings. The Committee on Public Works also has held several meetings, and has assigned a regular day for its regular meetings. Apparently these committees are discharging their functions without being handicapped by a vacancy on each committee.

I want to set the record absolutely straight by saying that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], came to me and asked me if I should like to have notices of committee meetings sent to me, because they assumed that I would be assigned to those two committees. I told them I appreciated their courtesy very much, but that I would await action of the Senate on my resolution and that I thought, to be very frank about it, I was in a very much better position, parliamentarily speaking, if I did not participate in any committee meetings until I was assigned to the committees by formal action of the Senate. I said I thought it was only fair to await action by the Committee on Rules and Administration on my resolution. However, I feel that I owe these two committee chairmen the courtesy of having the record show that they offered to send me notices of meetings of the Committee on Public Works and of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

It is clear that in the Senate the provision for an odd number of members is designed primarily to insure control by the majority party. Assigning the junior Senator from Oregon to these committees as the ninth or eleventh member would not serve that purpose.

It is not unprecedented to have a committee composed of an even number. I have not conducted an exhaustive research into this matter, inasmuch as time did not permit me to do so. However, I do not think it necessary to do so, for in choosing a back number of the Congressional Directory, I found an instance in the first volume I picked up—that of the 75th Congress, 1st session.

In that Congress—mark you this, Mr. President, it was the 75th Congress, 1st session—no less than 14 committees, including the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Education and Labor, the then Committee on Military Affairs, and the then Committee on Naval Affairs, had even-numbered memberships. It is true that the Democrats had a majority on the committees but the membership of the committees was even numbered.

I might observe that it would be possible to have the same total of committee posts and the same Democratic percentage of seats if the Senate were to reduce the membership of the Committee on Government Operations, as originally proposed. But the Senate has been persuaded that that committee should continue at the same strength as in the last Congress. I agree that such determinations of policy should take precedence over the percentage of committee posts, where the difference comes to less than one-half of a percent, as in this case.

Mr. President, let me reiterate: My proposal is to add one member of the majority party and the junior Senator from Oregon to both the Committee on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, and to contract both the District of Columbia and Public Works Committees from their proposed strength of 9 and 11 seats to 8 and 10 seats, respectively, the number with which they have been operating.

Let me assure the minority leader that the percentage of Democratic seats would remain practically unchanged.

I believe that my proposal also requires that the number of majority members who serve on more than 2 committees be expanded by 2. That number has already been increased and offset by 3 Democrats who can sit on 3 committees. The additional change seems slight. There are several Republican Senators who would be available for the two additional posts.

I close by saying that Senate Resolution 32, with the proposed amendments, offers the Senate an opportunity to reverse what otherwise will stand as a regrettable and dangerous precedent of infringement upon the rule of seniority for committee membership—as opposed to committee chairmanship—which is a salutary rule for the protection of minorities and the orderly selection of committees.

Mr. President, I now submit and send to the desk an amendment to Senate Resolution 32, and I request that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one other item in regard to this subject matter: I have been receiving a number of copies of letters which some of my Democratic colleagues in the Senate have been sending to constituents, in answer to protests they have received from constituents against the sacrifice of principle which in my judgment occurred on January 13. Those letters are very interesting letters of alibi. Without disclosing the name of the Senator who wrote the particular letter to which I shall now refer, I wish to read what almost takes the form of a form letter, for I understand that this particular Senator has received so many protests that he is replying to all of them, irrespective of who the sender may be, by using the salutation "My dear friend," and his replies appear to be identical.

In his letter of February 21, that Senator said:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
February 21, 1953.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I have before me now your letter of February 16 asking why the majority of Democratic Senators, including myself, deserted Senator MORSE in his fight for the Senate committee assignments.

I am afraid you and others have drawn erroneous conclusions from organization activities in connection with the establishment of the new Senate. As you may know, when a new Congress convenes, both the majority and the minority parties submit their lists of recommendations for committee assignments. In this Congress, the Senate has a membership of 49 Republicans and 47 Dem-

ocrats. This Republican membership, however, included Senator MORSE, and when the Democrats filed their list of committee membership they naturally did not include Senator MORSE, who is not and never has been a member of our party. When the Republicans filed their list they did not include Senator MORSE, and explained the fact by stating that he had publicly declared that he did not care to be affiliated with the Republican Party.

Let me digress long enough to say that I do not know how one could make it clearer than I did over the weeks, and then in the speech I made on the floor of the Senate, when, well in advance of January 13, I served notice on the Democrats that I was not seeking assignment by a Republican caucus or by any other caucus, but that I was seeking assignment under the Reorganization Act of 1946, by a vote of the Senate, acting as a committee of the whole—which was a sound parliamentary position for me to take.

The Democratic Senator who wrote the letter to which I am referring then stated in the letter:

You can readily see the situation that followed. He did not become a member of our party, and for us to place him on a committee assignment would be to take away an assignment from one of our Democratic members. It was a Republican "baby," and their responsibility, not ours.

Mr. President, where is the Senator from New York? I should like to have him hear it, because that is the alibi, the rationalization, the "out" that a number of Democratic Senators are using in answering complaining mail from their constituents in connection with this matter. Those Senators are saying, "It was a Republican baby."

Mr. President, it was no one's baby, but it was a precious principle of seniority rights on the floor of the Senate that the writer of this letter never so much as mentioned to his constituent, because if that Senator had done so, he could not have justified his vote with the alibi and rationalization he advanced in his letter.

I read further from the letter:

We refused to be placed in a position where we must lower our strength in order to make way for a member of their party—

Of course, he just got through saying I was not a member of their party—

that they had repudiated—

In a minute I shall have something to say about that—

and at a time when membership of the Senate and its control hung in such close balance that Senator MORSE'S vote could easily swing control, and he also had publicly announced that on organization matters he would not vote with the Democrats in the Senate.

That is an interesting comment.

The letter concludes as follows:

I hope this gives you a clearer picture of the situation that was presented to us.

Sincerely.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of my remarks at the point following the reading of the letter of Senator X to his constituent, my reply to the constituent, with the names of both the constituent and the Senator deleted.

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

MARCH 4, 1953.

DEAR Mr. X: Thanks very much for sending to me Senator X's alibi for substituting political expediency for political principle, as set out in his letter of February 21 to you.

The tragedy of this session of Congress so far has been the sacrifice of principle on the part of Senators who claim to be liberals. Senator X's explanation is completely fallacious, in my judgment. The Reorganization Act of 1946 says that members of committees are to be elected by ballot. It says nothing about members of committees being selected through a political caucus, either Democratic or Republican.

What happened in the Senate on January 13 is that both the Democrats and Republicans placed partisanship above principle, and they have to fall back to 1871 to find a precedent for their course of action.

It was then that Sumner, of Massachusetts, was kicked off his committees because he disagreed with another military President, Ulysses S. Grant.

I am enclosing tearsheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing my statements of January 13 and 29 on this committee issue.

It is a matter of great regret to me that colleagues in the Senate would attempt to alibi their unsound position on this issue, as Senator X did to you.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, the Senator who wrote the letter did not get by with it with his constituent, because his constituent saw through it as one sees through glass.

Let me say the Republican Party in the Senate tried to be fair; it never repudiated me. The Republican Party was courteous and kind enough to me to send me official notices to attend the Republican conferences of the organization of the Senate, prior to January 3; and I appreciated it, and I said so to the Republican leadership. But I also made clear that I meant it when I resigned from the Republican Party and stated that I would not be present at any Republican conferences. The Democrats knew that. So the statement of this Democratic Senator that I had been repudiated by the Republican Party was, as he must have known, a misstatement of fact.

No, Mr. President, in his letter he confesses that what the Democrats actually were interested in on January 13, was not in minority rights on the floor of the Senate, but in gaining as many Democratic seats on committees as they could, irrespective of the seniority rights of a Member of the minority. They have convicted themselves.

I have a sense of humor about it, too, Mr. President. I have some friends on the Democratic side who, during the late campaign, introduced me in various States. Oh, if I only had transcriptions of those speeches of introduction. Mr. President, would they show hypocrisy? I hate to think so, but it is impossible to reconcile those speeches of introduction of the junior Senator from Oregon, when I was fighting for what I believed was right in that campaign, with the votes of some of these Senators on January 13, because in those speeches of introduction they were talking about the importance of dissenters in American politics. They were lauding the independence of judgment of the junior Senator from Oregon in that campaign.

I was not entitled to any committee assignment; I would not have taken a committee assignment; in fact, I would have been insulted had a committee assignment been based upon any service I rendered in that campaign, because in the campaign I was simply standing for what I thought was right. But the record speaks for itself as to what that service was, and one will look in vain, Mr. President, for any Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle who fought harder and was in more "tough spots" on campaign platforms in supporting the presidential candidate of the Democratic Party than was the junior Senator from Oregon. Some say all is fair in politics. I presume it is, Mr. President, but it is also an interesting commentary on the kind of loyalty to their professions on the part of some of the Democratic Senators who made speeches of introduction in behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon during the campaign.

Surely, I know this subject is a "hot potato," and I am going to keep it hot until there is recognition on the part of some liberals on the Democratic side of the aisle that they have done a great injustice, not to me but to themselves. They have done an injustice to their own liberal principles. I shall await with interest to learn what steps they propose to take to rectify the injustice. It is not pleasant to be the guinea pig in the situation. I know full well what they have done and I am willing to pay the price. I am aware of the irreparable political damage this alleged group of liberals on the Democratic side of the aisle have done to the junior Senator from Oregon because for weeks there have appeared in newspapers across my State from 3 to 5 vicious editorials a day, inspired by reactionaries in my State who want to destroy me politically because they know they cannot control me. In these editorials there is the constant bombardment to the effect that "not even the Democrats will stand by him; not even the liberal Democrats will stand by him." Today "81 to 7" is the political slogan of Oregon, and has been since January 13 in respect to political attacks upon me.

Some of those on the Democratic side have the audacity to say in some of their letters to some of their constituents "the junior Senator from Oregon is bitter and he is a poor sport." Mr. President, let me tell you that I am not moved by name-calling tactics. If fighting in self-defense is poor sportsmanship, if disclosing to the constituents of these alleged liberal Democrats what they did on January 13 is poor sportsmanship, I accept the charge. If it is bitterness, I accept that, too. But let me tell you further, Mr. President, that this kind of walking out on minority rights in the Senate of the United States is something the junior Senator from Oregon is not going to forget, because he is convinced that he is making a fight to protect the principle that prevailed in this body for decades until January 13, 1953, when, for the first time since 1871 the principle of seniority was destroyed on the floor of the Senate. It was destroyed because an insurgent dared stand

for his convictions and refused to follow the advice of some of the Democrats, not to put them in such a position that they could be criticized if they failed to stand up and be counted under rule XXIV of the Senate and failed to elect to committees a Senator who, in their judgment, ought to serve on them. They voted and said one thing on the floor of the Senate, and within a matter of minutes, in the cloakroom and in the restaurant, some of them told me how much they wished they could have voted to put me on the Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare Committees. I have a phrase for that kind of conduct, Mr. President. It is political hypocrisy.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as I listened to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from New York—and perhaps similar colloquy may have taken place before I came to the floor—there flashed into my mind two brief sentences from Holy Writ, which I am glad to quote. The first is the question of Jeremiah, the prophet:

> Is there no balm in Gilead?

The other is the assurance given us by the writer of the Book of Hebrews:

> Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.

I urge my friends to take some hope and comfort from those verses of scripture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution is open to amendment.

ELEANOR M. HAHN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report the nomination of Eleanor M. Hahn, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant in the Nurse Corps of the Regular Army, I request unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this nomination. Lieutenant Hahn is presently serving in the grade of lieutenant of the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve and will be over age in grade for regular appointment under existing law on Saturday. This nomination went forward from the Navy Bureau of Personnel on February 9, but was unavoidably delayed at higher levels because of the backlog of pending business facing officials of the new administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—this is the kind of nomination which I think it is perfectly proper to approve in this manner. My policy of requiring nominations to remain on the table for a day goes only to the nominations of persons who control policymaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified.

LOYALTY CHECKS ON SENATE EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 16 to provide for loyalty checks on Senate employees.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 16, which has been reported from the committee on rules, is intended to provide for loyalty checks on Senate employees. Let me say at the outset that I understand an amendment may be proposed to change the word "loyalty" to "security," so as to make the resolution, in terms, provide for security checks. I should have no objection to such a change.

Mr. President, this is probably the mildest resolution of this nature which could be drafted.

It does not specifically require any form of clearance in advance of employment; nor does it even make such clearance a condition of continued employment. It does not specifically require a full field investigation in any case.

All this resolution does is provide for name checks on employees or prospective employees of the Senate, Senate committees, or individual Senators. In the case of a prospective employee, where the name check shows derogatory information, the resolution provides that the chairman of the committee or other appointing officer is to make or cause to be made such further investigation as shall have been considered necessary to determine the loyalty of such person. The extent of such an investigation is not stipulated, and this is left, therefore, to sound discretion. In the case of an employee already on the payroll, the resolution requires only that a name check be made. The procedure to be followed in the case of a report that derogatory information is contained in the files with respect to some particular person is to be left in each case to the committee or Senator, or other appointing power.

It might be that the Senate would wish to go further than this resolution goes. It would be possible to draft much more stringent provisions. As a matter of fact, I have in the past drafted stronger provisions than this in at least two different alternatives besides the bill which I introduced; and I made those drafts available to the Committee on Rules and Administration, if that committee wanted to use them. The committee chose to report the resolution now pending.

For the information of the Senate, I might say that one of the drafts to which I refer was so drawn as to make the loyalty test a prerequisite to appointment; that is, it would require a name check and a report, and the transmission of the information to the appointing authority, before an appointment could be made. The other draft to which I refer was, like the resolution now before the Senate, concerned with provisions of procedure to be followed after appointment. The difference is that the draft which was not introduced specifically required a further investigation in every case in which a name check should reveal derogatory information, whereas Senate Resolution 16 requires only the name check. Of course, it would be possible to add to the resolution a prohibition against employment, or continued employment, of any person who is a member of a Communist organization. There may be some question whether such a section should be included, since such a section would be, in effect, a limitation on the discretion of a committee, and would also operate to deny to a Communist Member of Congress, if such should be elected, the right to employ Communist assistants. Such limitations might be good; but I did not include them in my resolution, because I was interested in presenting the least controversial provision along this line which could be developed.

Just one further point might be worthy of mention. In preparing the various drafts of which I have spoken, in advance of submission of my resolution, I gave thought to the idea of setting up some sort of legislative loyalty board. This idea I discarded as being undesirable. There are a number of reasons for this, some of them administrative. Another reason for discarding the legislative loyalty board idea is that it might well lead to a sort of central-hiring system, which many Members of Congress would vigorously oppose.

I am very glad the committee has decided to report Senate resolution 16 and I hope some such resolution, either in the form of the pending resolution or in such modified form as the Senate may see fit to adopt, will be approved by the Senate.

The committee has amended the resolution to eliminate the provision for checking with agencies other than the FBI. This is probably a wise amendment, and I would not wish to oppose it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to indicate my support of Senate resolution 16. I should like to point out that for some time the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has voluntarily followed a policy of having all of its professional staff members fully cleared by the security agencies of the Government.

I believe that all employees of the Senate should be cleared. I hope that Senators will give their support to the resolution.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement I have prepared concerning the resolution.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

The resolution contemplates that name checks be authorized with respect to two groups of Senate employees.

The first group consists of those who already are on the payroll of the Senate, whether in the office of a Senator, on the staff of a Senate committee, or in some capacity which serves the Senate.

The second group consists of those who may be employed in the future by a Senator, by a Senate committee, or by the Senate itself.

It should be made clear that the name check to be made initially as to both groups contemplate that the advice of the FBI shall consist merely of the statement—without anything else being added—that there is or is not in the FBI files derogatory information

concerning the employee or prospective employee.

In the case of present employees, if the name check shows derogatory information exists, then more detailed information with respect to that derogatory information shall be furnished in accordance with the terms of the resolution. However, in the case of prospective employees, a name check shall be requested before they are placed on the rolls. If the FBI then finds that derogatory information does exist, then the FBI shall furnish, under this resolution, and to the proper person in the Senate, a statement which says only that such data exists, but without revealing in any fashion the nature of that data.

No general information may be obtained from the FBI which reflects on anyone unless the person investigated is actually on the Senate payrolls.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Nevada that I certainly favor his resolution. I see no reason why Senate employees should receive treatment any different from that accorded other employees of the Government. There can be no question that some Senate employees, because of positions they hold and because they have accessibility to security information, are in a very good position to do damage to the security of the United States, if they are not reliable persons. Therefore, I think that the power to check such employees is a power that we ought to vote for this afternoon.

As a lawyer, I am disturbed about the word "loyalty" which appears on line 11, page 1, and again on line 3 and line 12, page 2.

I wish to make myself very clear about this, because I am sure the Senator from Nevada knows how easy it is to be misunderstood on this matter. I believe that what we are after is to plug any loophole involving a violation of security. I suggest that the amendment I shall offer is even broader, in effect, than the term "loyalty." But as a lawyer it seems to me that it is much more difficult to lay down applicable criteria for testing loyalty than it is to lay down applicable criteria for testing reliability for security purposes.

My suggested amendment is that on page 1, line 11, the word "loyalty" be stricken, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof "liability for security purposes".

A person might be very loyal, but yet might be a very bad risk for security purposes. Let us speak hypothetically for a moment, to illustrate what the junior Senator from Oregon has in mind. Members of the Senate staff might be very loyal so far as our form of Government is concerned, but might be uncontrollable gossips. We might just as well publish the information in a newspaper as to allow such a person to sit in a committee meeting or have access to any of the files of the Senate. We could not get rid of such a person under the terms of the resolution as it stands, on any ground of loyalty. He would be loyal, but he might be so lacking in judgment that he would be a bad security risk.

If a person is disloyal, he is also a bad security risk. I think my phrase is broader than the term "loyalty," with respect to what we are trying to do, and that is to plug the loopholes with respect to security risks.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should look with favor upon the Senator's amendment if the language were "loyalty and reliability for security purposes."

Mr. MORSE. I will accept that.

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection. However, I am not a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to leaving the word "loyalty" in.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my suggestion.

Mr. MORSE. I simply say that whatever agency is to administer this law will have a great deal more difficulty laying down workable criteria for determining loyalty than criteria for determining security.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. So let my amendment be that wherever the word "loyalty" occurs, there shall follow immediately thereafter the words "and reliability for security purposes."

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MORSE. Let me ask the Senator if he has any objection to another amendment which I suggest, namely, in line 10 on page 1, and a corresponding amendment in line 10 on page 2, in the clause beginning "or officer", after the word "derogatory", in line 10 on page 1, and following the same word at the end of line 10 on page 2, to insert the words "and rebutting." If the files contain rebutting information, I think we ought to have the rebutting information. Does the Senator object to adding those words?

Mr. McCARRAN. Personally I have no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendments which I have just discussed, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the word "derogatory", it is proposed to insert the words "and rebutting."

On page 1, line 11, after the word "loyalty", it is proposed to insert the words "and reliability for security purposes."

On page 2, line 3, after the word "loyalty", it is proposed to insert the words "and reliability for security purposes."

On page 2, line 10, after the word "derogatory", it is proposed to insert "and rebutting."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I approve the amendments. However, I am not a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I cannot speak for that committee.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, there are 2 or 3 members of the Committee on Rules and Administration present. I do not think there is any objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should not think so.

Mr. MORSE. I think the resolution would be easier to administer if it were amended as suggested. I believe that the words "reliability for security purposes" would afford a much better check than the word "loyalty."

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

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask that it be stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section at the end of the resolution, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit the names of each Senator of the United States, incumbent on the date of the adoption of this resolution and hereafter entering upon the office of Senator of the United States, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of each agency (and if such is on file, any rebutting information) concerning the loyalty and the reliability of such Senator for security purposes. In any case in which such derogatory and rebutting information is submitted, the Committee on Rules and Administration shall make or cause to be made such further investigation necessary to resolve the issues raised by such report and to take such further action as it or the Senate shall deem necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on my amendment. I notice some smiles on the faces of other Senators. I think I understand why there should be such smiles, if they do not understand my reason for the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very glad to see the bright, genial smile on the face of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am more happy than the Senator from Nevada may sometimes think, I am sure. But even though I may have a smile on my face, I am in dead earnest about this matter.

Speaking hypothetically, if a certain Senator has access to security secrets, and if the FBI knows that in fact he is not a good security risk, even though he may have fooled the people of his State into electing him to the Senate, the interests of the country are greater than any tradition of the Senate.

The times in which we live are so serious that we cannot afford to take risks, even with United States Senators. If any Senator can be shown in fact to be a bad security risk, I believe we ought to apply the rule of the Senate under which we are the judges of the qualifications of our colleagues.

All my amendment does is to seek to give some meaning and effective jurisdiction to the rule. If there is a Senator who, investigation shows, is a bad security risk, then I think he ought to be treated as any other employee of the Government would be treated, and that he should come under the purview of

this resolution. In my opinion, the problem of security knows no person, in the sense that no person in our Government who has access to security files ought to have any immunity or ought to be treated as though the Senate were a sanctuary for his subversive operations. I am opposed to making the Senate a sanctuary for subservise politicians, if there be any.. That is why I have offered my amendment. I should be interested to learn of any argument which can be advanced against it. In effect, we would be volunteering to make ourselves subject to the same kind of investigation as that to which we propose to subject employees of the Senate.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Green	McCarran
Anderson	Griswold	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Beall	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bush	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Capehart	Humphrey	Purtell
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Ives	Russell
Clements	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cooper	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kefauver	Sparkman
Duff	Kennedy	Stennis
Dworshak	Kerr	Symington
Eastland	Kilgore	Taft
Ellender	Knowland	Thye
Ferguson	Kuchel	Tobey
Flanders	Langer	Watkins
Frear	Lehman	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young
Goldwater	Martin	
Gore	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a large number of Senators have just come to the floor of the Senate, I ask that the amendment be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be read again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the resolution, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit the names of each Senator of the United States, incumbent on the date of the adoption of this resolution and hereafter entering upon the office of Senator of the United States, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of each agency (and if such is on file, any rebutting information) concerning the loyalty and the reliability of such Senator for security purposes. In any case in which such derogatory and rebutting information is submitted, the Committee on Rules and Administration shall make or cause to be made such further investigation necessary to resolve the issues raised by such report and to take such further action as it or the Senate shall deem necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 16), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That hereafter when any person is appointed as an employee of any committee of the Senate, of any Senator, or of any office of the Senate the committee, Senator, or officer having authority to make such appointment shall transmit the name of such person to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed as to any derogatory and rebutting information in the possession of such agency concerning the loyalty and reliability for security purposes of such person, and in any case in which such derogatory information is revealed such committee, Senator, or officer shall make or cause to be made such further investigation as shall have been considered necessary to determine the loyalty and reliability for security purposes of such person.

Every such committee, Senator, and officer shall promptly transmit to the Federal Bureau of Investigation a list of the names of the incumbent employees of such committee, Senator, or officer together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed of any derogatory and rebutting information contained in the files of such agency concerning the loyalty and reliability for security purposes of such employee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN POSTAL RATES AND CHARGES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 49. This resolution relates to an investigation of certain matters respecting postal rates and charges in the handling of certain mail matter.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 49), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 3, in line 14, after the word "than", to strike out "February 1," and insert "January 31,"; in line 21, after the word "advisable", to strike out "to contract with firms or organizations for personal services,"; in line 23, before the word "services", to insert "reimbursable"; and on page 4, in line 2, after the word "council", to insert "of not more than ten persons," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation with respect to the following matters:

(1) Postal rates and charges in relation to the reasonable cost of handling the several classes of mail matter and special services, with due allowances in each class for the care required, the degree of preferment, priority in handling, and economic value of the services rendered and the public interest served thereby.

(2) The extent to which expenditures now charged to the Post Office Department for the following items should be excluded in considering costs for the several classes of mail matter and special services:

(A) Expenditures for free postal services;

(B) Expenditures in excess of revenues for international postal services;

(C) Expenditures for subsidies for postal services pursuant to law or legislative policy of Congress;

(D) Expenditures in excess of revenues, pursuant to the act of June 5, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), not enumerated in the preceding subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C);

(E) Expenditures for services of any character not otherwise enumerated herein which may be performed for other departments and agencies of the Government; and

(F) Expenditures which may be justified only on a national welfare basis and not primarily as a business function.

(3) Expenditures for the Post Office Department by other Government agencies which should be considered in connection with the cost for the handling of the several classes of mail matter and special services, such as employees' retirement, use of Government buildings, and maintenance services.

(4) The extent, if any, to which Post Office Department expenditures in excess of revenue, for its various services and for the handling of various classes of mail, are justified as being in the public interest.

(5) The costs of handling, transporting, and distributing the several classes of mail, and procedures whereby such costs can be reduced through improvements in methods and equipment.

(6) Other matters relating to the improvement of the postal system.

The committee shall report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1954, the results of its study and investigation under this resolution together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized 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 reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

(b) The committee is authorized to appoint an advisory council of not more than 10 persons which may include representatives of the general public, representative users of the mails, members of accounting, management, and engineering firms, postal experts, representatives of postal employee organizations and, with special reference to ratemaking in their fields, representatives of public transportation and distribution organizations. The functions of the council shall be to assist the committee in the studies and investigations authorized by this resolution. The council shall meet at such times and places as may be authorized by the committee.

(c) The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder whether we may have an explanation of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has requested an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this resolution involves nothing more than an appropriation of $100,000 for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Members of that committee appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration and explained the purpose of the proposed investigation. For example, the Post Office Department is running at a deficit which is growing larger each year. Last year it was approximately $500,000,000. This year it is estimated to be $614,000,000. It was the unanimous judgment of the Committee on Rules and Administration that something must be done to reverse this trend. The committee believes that the $100,000 provided by this resolution will prove to be money well spent, if by its expenditure there can be brought about greater efficiency, as well as better service, and deficits can be stopped or substantially reduced.

We understand that the House is also undertaking an investigation of this kind. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that this involves a big field. I forget how many thousands of employees the Department has, but the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is well acquainted with the procedure he intends to follow, and I am sure he will be able to answer any and all questions concerning this resolution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator inform us who appeared before his committee in an effort to justify this resolution?

Mr. JENNER. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], presented the budget and an explanation of the proposed appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did he produce any concrete evidence to show the necessity for it?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; he did.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did he produce any evidence which indicated that the Post Office Department is now engaged in doing the very thing that the chairman seeks to accomplish under the authority of this resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; but he made the statement, as I recall, that there was no reason why the legislative branch of the Government should rely exclusively upon the executive branch, when, although the executive branch has had this question under consideration for many, many years, the deficit increases each year. He thought it time that we, as legislators, should look into the subject. The Senator from Kansas is on the floor.

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

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was listening to what the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] said with reference to a bill passed last year, and with reference to the investigation of the operating methods of the Post Office Department. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana, does this resolution relate back to the authorization which was then made?

Mr. JENNER. I do not think so. I think what the Senator is referring to is the Purvis investigation of all Government employees, in all the departments of the Government.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will yield, I should like to be permitted to answer the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. It does refer to the resolution approved by the Senate last year, which was also approved by the House and signed by the President of the United States. The resolution was passed so late, however, that no effort was made to obtain funds for the purpose of making a study of the Post Office Department. That is the reason for this resolution, which has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which is coauthoried by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and which, as the distinguished Senator from Indiana said, has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Kansas that I was formerly a member of that committee. I knew that we had been very much interested in this kind of check-up and study of the operating methods of the Post Office Department. I merely wondered whether this particular resolution related to the action which had already been taken. I realize it was late in the session when the bill was signed and became law. Will the Senator point out whether this is over and beyond that, or whether it is in line with that which had already been authorized?

Mr. CARLSON. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that a similar resolution was submitted in the last session of Congress, upon which no action was taken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I again take the floor in order to assist my friends across the aisle in carrying out one of the important planks in the Republican platform—the plank having to do with economy. It strikes me that if the Senate is to be in a position to preach economy to other departments, we should practice economy ourselves. It was only last month that the Senate appropriated $500,000 to take care of a deficit which had been created by numerous and sundry investigations that have been ordered by the Senate.

Why do we not give the Eisenhower administration a chance to clean its own house? Why do we not give Mr. Summerfield a chance to make his own investigation as to what should be done in the Post Office Department? I talked to the Postmaster General yesterday, and he said that he had employed the services of accountants and engineers, who are now at work, in order to find ways and means by which the Post Office Department can be put on a more economical and efficient footing, thus saving our taxpayers money. But Mr. Summerfield's study is not enough. What are we being asked to do here today? We are being asked to create a committee, and provide it with $100,000, so it can spend our tax money, calling before it many of the people now employed in the Post Office Department in an effort to find out what improvements can be made. This committee is to employ management engineers and accounting firms, as is now being done by Mr. Summerfield. The approval of this resolution and the creation of a new subcommittee would be rank duplication, nothing else.

As I pointed out last month in the course of debate, the Senate is not leading the way, it is not showing the way, to economy. The expenses incurred by the Senate for investigations has increased tenfold during the past 10 years. In 1940 it was $170,268, and for 1952, it was $1,722,600—merely for investigative purposes. I am not opposed to legitimate investigations; some of them do a great deal of good; but I again ask, why do we not give the Eisenhower administration a chance to do its own investigating? Why do we not give the new administration a chance to clean its own house? If in the course of time they fail to make an improvement, that might be the time for us to offer our assistance.

As I pointed out further, the amount of money that has been appropriated annually to operate the Senate during the course of the past 10 years has increased from $3,936,986, in 1940, to the present figure of $12,850,000, almost 3½ or four times what we spent 10 years ago. Yet we are preaching economy. Why do we not practice it?

As I also pointed out, since 1946 the number of employees of the Senate has increased from 1,369 in 1946 to 1,950 in 1952—an increase of 42.4 percent—yet we are being again asked to add to that number. The total Senate expenditures since 1946 have increased from $5,963,000 to $11,354,000 in 1952, or an increase of 89 percent since 1946. Yet we stand here

and ask other departments to economize. We ought to practice what we preach and not merely give lip service to budget cutting.

I was recently attracted by the eloquent remarks of my good friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who sponsors this resolution. He made a speech on the floor of the Senate on February 27, which appears on page 1479 of the RECORD. At that time he said:

During recent years our tax burden has grown by leaps and bounds. Our Federal budget has and is mushrooming to a figure that is incomprehensible. Ever-increasing Federal taxes and budgets must be stopped.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas said further:

It seems to me our greatest responsibility today is to bring our Federal expenditures to a point where the budget is not only balanced but, in addition, we must have a program of progressive tax reduction. It is my hope that we can bring this tax reduction into effect in 1953.

I believe every Member of Congress must agree with the President's statement that our first obligation is to bring a balanced budget in sight.

And he added:

Regardless of the swollen budget that the previous administration has attempted for fiscal 1953, we should bring the total spending for the current year to a figure not exceeding $66.1 billion. This calls for readjustments and cutbacks, but the people expect it of us. The budget for fiscal 1954 will be entirely in our hands and our goal should be a lower figure than Mr. Truman's biggest year of spending.

Mr. President, we have a mandate to ignore the astronomical estimate of expenditures bequeathed to us by the former administration. We can discharge that mandate and start lifting the excessive burden of taxation from the backs of the American people if we have the determination. A spending ceiling for the current year of not more than $66 billion and a budget of something less than that in fiscal 1954 is the answer. The way to put our Federal finances in order is to start now.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kansas has struck at the heart of the matter. Now is the time to begin reducing expenses; yet here we are considering an increase in spending at the express request of the distinguished Senator from Kansas. As I pointed out a moment ago, we provided last year almost $1 million in the contingent fund to defray the cost of such things as the investigation which is now being requested.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield in a moment. Last Monday we provided for a deficiency of $500,000.

Mr. President, it goes without saying that we cannot balance the budget if we continue to increase our own expenditures. It is my hope that Senators will begin giving more than lip service to economy. We ought to practice it. We have an opportunity of doing so today, and my advice is that we do it.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I assure him that I share his concern. But there is a responsibility on the part of the Congress of the United States. In the past fiscal year the Post Office Department had a deficit in excess of $500 million. This year it estimated that it will be $640,000,000, and it is estimated that it will be more than $700 million next year. Is it worth while to spend $100,000 of the people's money to determine whether there is some way by which we can stop continuing deficits in that one department?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Post Office Department is now at work in an effort to do that very thing. I have been informed by the Postmaster General that he is employing a firm of consultants—experts on such matters—in order to make such a study.

Mr. President, the Hoover Commission spent thousands of dollars in its survey, and I am informed that the Postmaster General is making every effort to put into operation as much of the Hoover program as may be possible. Why should we not give Mr. Summerfield a chance? If he needs money in order to carry on his study, I should much prefer that it be furnished him rather than for the Senate to appoint a subcommittee, hire additional investigators, and incur other expenses.

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad the Senator has mentioned the fact that the Postmaster General is conducting a survey. I assure the distinguished Senator that our committee, I am sure, will be most pleased to cooperate with the Postmaster General. We state in our report that we expect to cooperate with the Postmaster General and with the Post Office Department in working out a coordinated program. We can work very closely with the present Postmaster General, and we expect to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have heard that before when I have opposed other resolutions. But the Senator has just stated, or perhaps it was some other Senator that not only is the Senate going to undertake an investigation, but that the House will be engaged in a similar investigation.

Mr. CARLSON. The House is going to make an investigation along personnel lines. It is to be hoped, at least, that we may make a study of the distribution of different classifications of mail. There will be no duplication of effort between the Post Office Department, the House of Representatives, and the Senate committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a series of questions.

Does he agree with me that the first responsibility for bringing about economies in a given department of the Government rests upon the head of that department?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Louisiana believe that the Postmaster General, a member of the Cabinet, has adequate money and personnel to make such investigations as may be needed in order to bring about economies and efficiency in his department?

Mr. ELLENDER. If he has not, he should come to Congress and ask for it; and I would be the first to vote for it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator inclined, at least, to have a "hunch," as I have, that considering the tremendous budget the Postmaster General has and the large number of personnel serving under him, if there is the will to bring about greater economies and efficiency in the Department, he is in position to do it?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my position.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Louisiana agree with me that as a matter of policy the Senate of the United States should not initiate investigations into possible economies in various departments of the Government until a given department demonstrates that it cannot be relied upon to put its own house in order and bring about economies which are possible of being brought about?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the position I have been taking all along, I will say to the Senator. Let us give Mr. Summerfield a chance to work out a method by which savings can be accomplished. That is his duty, and I am sure he will fulfill it. He is a man of intelligence. There is no doubt that with the employment of engineers he can do a good job, if left alone. If, in the course of time, it becomes clear that a better job can be done than Mr. Summerfield may accomplish, there will be time enough to start an investigation. But let us give the Postmaster General a chance. That is what I am pleading for. At the same time, we should try to practice what we are preaching to the departments. We should economize at home—in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that the primary purpose of a Senate investigation, and the only legal justification for one, is to seek information and data which may be of assistance to the Senate in passing whatever appropriate legislation may be needed?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; that is my conception of it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator share my suspicion that in some cases we seem to be moving in the direction of conducting investigations from the motivation of interfering with the administration of a department, and determining the department's administrative policies rather than getting information which will help us as an aid to the passage of needed legislation?

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be leading to that.

Mr. MORSE. My last question, which is really a recapitulation of one of the other questions, is this: The Senator, then, takes the position, does he not, that until the Post Office Department, under Mr. Summerfield, shows that it is not capable of bringing about the economies and the efficiency that may be needed in the Post Office Department, we should not be appropriating money to investigate what amounts to the administrative policies of the department?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly my position.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator, and we should have a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, in a conversation yesterday with Mr. Summerfield, the present Postmaster General, I was provided the information which I have just given the Senate. The investigation has been going on for quite some time; it was ordered by Mr. Summerfield.

Two or three days ago, Mr. A. B. Strom appeared as a witness before the Senate Appropriations Committee. He works under Mr. Summerfield. He indicated to our committee that a thorough investigation is now being made by the Post Office Department in an effort to find out what, if anything is wrong in the way of administrative practices and where savings can be accomplished. These problems are being studied in the light of providing better service to the public. That testimony appears in the record of the hearings which were held recently in reference to the second supplemental appropriation bill.

In addition to all this, Mr. President, the Senate spent $200,000 for an investigation of air mail subsidies during the 81st Congress, through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—under the chairmanship of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The $200,000 was spent under contract with a firm of expert consultants who were hired to investigate the problem at hand. This problem was "a survey of certified interstate, overseas, and foreign carrier operations, with a view to drafting legislation requiring the separation of mail compensation from any Federal subsidy payments." The same thing will have to be done, or is intended to be done, under the resolution now under consideration.

We have all the data. I do not know what has become of the recommendations which may have ben made by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but $200,000 has been spent in order to get the investigation under way, and to make recommendations as to what ought to be done.

Aside from that, hearings were held by the Post Office Committees of the Senate and the House during 1951. Bills for adjustment of postal rates were considered by those committees. There were considered at that time three Senate bills, S. 1046, S. 1335, and S. 1339, and the committee held extensive hearings. The transcripts of the hearings consisted of 918 printed pages, and the cost of printing those hearings alone was almost $11,000.

In 1950 another bill with reference to postal rate increases was considered by both the Senate and the House. More hearings were held, and another volume of printed hearings was issued, consisting of 464 pages. Included in this volume was a vast amount of information, which I know will be duplicated if the pending resolution should be agreed to. The cost of printing that last hearing alone was more than $5,000.

In 1949 three bills were considered; namely, S. 1103, H. R. 2945, and H. R. 2982, all pertaining to the adjustment of postal rates or postal rate revisions.

In all, the first hearing, on S. 1103, consumed 1,139 pages. On H. R. 2945, in two parts, the hearings consumed 1,761 pages. On H. R. 2982 the hearings consumed 776 pages. The total cost of printing those hearings alone was $41,816. Yet we are being asked for another $100,000 in order to make a further investigation of postal rates. Mr. President, to my way of thinking that resolution is not now necessary. Let us give Mr. Summerfield, who has just come into office, a chance to see what he can do. Let us not send investigators to his office taking up his time, and trying to tell him what he ought to do. Let us first give him a chance to act.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to make the point, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so, that I am quite familiar with the hearings which were held from 1949 on. Every year the postal deficit has been increasing at a rate of $100 million a year. Does not the distinguished Senator think that not only is it time that we hold hearings but also that we do something about the situation?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, and perhaps the Senator from Kansas likewise recalls, the postal rate increases were made necessary because of salary raises which were given thousands upon thousands of employees. But the point I wish to make is that the Senate, as a legislative body, should give the executive branch a chance to do its work before stepping into the picture with a crew of hired investigators. I feel sure that within the next 4, 5, or 6 months good results will be obtained from the work now being done by Postmaster General Summerfield. From all the information I have been able to obtain, he is an able, competent man. Aside from those whom he is employing to help do this work, I understand Mr. Summerfield has an excellent staff under him who could assist in carrying on this activity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, may I have this point made clear: Is the Post Office Department presently employing managerial engineers?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has that been begun recently?

Mr. ELLENDER. Since Mr. Summerfield has taken office. I talked to him yesterday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has a reputable outside firm of management engineers been hired?

Mr. ELLENDER. The firm that has been hired is Heller Associates, the same firm which helped in the work of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in connection with the Veterans' Administration.

The Senator from Louisiana has referred to the growing postal deficit of $100 million a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is more than $600 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But it is growing at the rate of $100 million a year. Does the Senator recall that when we voted for a postal rate increase, we at the same time stepped up the salary scale, and that at that time public notice was given that the increased postal rates would not compensate for the increase in cost?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my recollection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I feel sure that the Senator from Louisiana also realizes that the Post Office Department has to handle a large amount of the business of the American economy in the form of communications of various kinds, and as that economy steps up its production in the flow of goods, a greater burden is necessarily imposed upon the Post Office Department. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So, really when we consider the deficit, without, of course, having intimate knowledge as to the apparatus and operation of the Post Office Department, the deficit is, in fact, composed of two factors: First, an inadequate rate structure; second, the stepped-up nature of the American economy. I suppose that, thirdly, one might say that the apparatus or machinery of the Post Office Department—that is, its distribution machinery, its mechanical equipment, and the other parts of the Department—may not be as up to date as they should be.

Mr. ELLENDER. I might inform the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that Mr. Donaldson, the former Postmaster General, had been at work for many months experimenting with systems of operation to see if money could not be saved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Louisiana recall that during the campaign a pledge was made to restore two deliveries of mail a day?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not recall that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that such a pledge was made. How can the postal deficit be reduced if there are to be two deliveries of mail a day? It has been ascertained that the cost of an additional delivery would be rather substantial. Mr. Donaldson reduced deliveries in residential areas to one a day as an economy measure.

I think the Senate might want to take note of that, because investigation or no investigation—and I am not passing judgment on that at the moment—I submit that one of the problems is additional revenue. If we are going to fulfill the commitment, or at least the suggested commitment, of greater service, it appears that it will be necessary to have more manpower. If it is necessary to have more manpower, it will be necessary to have greater revenue. If there is to be greater revenue, there must necessarily be higher charges or else there will be an increased deficit. It is just that simple.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to go into that phase of the problem. I repeat that the only thing I am trying to suggest to the Senate is that what should be done now is to give to the executive department, to the brand new Postmaster General—who is starting out afresh, full of vim and vitality—a chance to see what he can do. The Senate should permit him to use to the utmost the fine investigators or engineers whom he has engaged, the Heller Associates.

We should let him try his hand. Then, if within the 6 months or a year he does not succeed, or if he needs more money to carry on the work, I, for one, would be willing to give it to him. But let us see what the new Postmaster General will do before burdening him with a group of Senate investigators, hired at great expense to our taxpayers. Let us not duplicate.

Under this resolution, the committee proposes to employ management engineering and accounting firms at a cost of $40,000. That is not much, as Federal spending goes, but it is still $40,000 in tax money that could otherwise be saved. There are also proposed three staff positions for consultants, technicians, and rate experts, with average salaries amounting to $9,000 each; four stenographers, with average salaries of $4,500. Reporting the proceedings will cost $4,000; travel per diem, $7,000, and telephone, telegraph, and supplies, $4,000.

Mr. President, Mr. Summerfield is the boss of the Post Office Department. He is the one who is in touch with the situation. He is the one who could obtain results by fully investigating the situation, without being bothered by a horde of investigators and being called up to the Hill to testify as to what ought to be done. Let us give the man a chance. He has already begun a study of the department. Thus, at the same time—at least for the moment—we can save $100,000 for the taxpayers.

Providing $100,000 for a duplicating investigation would require the income taxes to be paid by 339 soft-coal miners earning $4,562 a year each; it would require the income-tax payments of 6,666 textile workers receiving an average annual salary of $2,758 each. That is where some of our tax money would go.

If we are to balance the budget, let us start now by practicing economy in the Senate; and if we practice economy in the Senate, we can more consistently preach it.

INTERNATIONAL MUTUAL AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PACTS

Mr. MALONE and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

UNITED STATES ENTIRELY SURROUNDED BY MUTUAL-ASSISTANCE PACTS; UNITED STATES FINANCES BOTH SIDES OF THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call the attention of this distinguished body to the fact that we are completely surrounded by mutual assistance and economic pacts and treaties.

A few days ago the Russians said that of course they were furnishing Communist China with war matériel under their mutual-assistance pact. Both England and France have mutual-assistance pacts with Russia—and we have the Atlantic pact with 11 of the European nations which includes both England and France—each of the 4 treaties or pacts contains a pledge of mutual economic assistance and all are in full force and effect and are being observed to the letter.

In addition England recognized Communist China. This closes the gap so that we finance our own war in Korea—and our opposition in Korea, China, and in Russia.

In March 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada called to the attention of this body the fact that both England and France had separate mutual economic and assistance pacts with Russia reading startlingly like the Atlantic pact with us.

ENGLAND'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

In the pact between England and Russia, which was signed by Anthony Eden and V. Molotov, and which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in toto in March 1949, article 6 reads as follows:

> The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

This pact has 10 more years to run—and no notice has been given or attempt made to cancel it.

FRANCE'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

In a similar agreement made between France and Russia, and signed by Molotov and Bidault, of France, article 6 reads as follows:

> The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war, with a view of facilitating and accelerating reconstruction of both countries, and in order to contribute to the cause of world prosperity.

This pact also has several years to run and there is no indication that either party wants it canceled.

CHINA'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

A few days ago the press carried the announcement that the Russian representative here had stated that, of course, Russia was sending war material to Communist China under the mutual-assistance pact signed with China, which still has a considerable time to run, and there is no indication that either party wants it canceled.

Article 6 of the alliance between the Russians and the Republic of China says:

> The high contracting parties agree to afford one another all possible economic assistance in the postwar period in order to facilitate and expedite the rehabilitation of both countries and to make their contribution to the prosperity of the world.

UNITED STATES PACT WITH ATLANTIC PACT NATIONS INCLUDING ENGLAND AND FRANCE

On April 4, 1949, or about that date, we approved a treaty called the North Atlantic Treaty. Article 2 says:

> ART. 2. The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations. * * * They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them . . . to promote conditions of stability and well-being, and to encourage economic collaboration. It should facilitate long-term economic recovery through replacing the sense of insecurity by one of confidence in the future.

UNITED STATES COMPLETELY SURROUNDED WITH MUTUAL ASSISTANCE PACTS

I call attention to the fact that beginning in 1942 with the English pact with Russia and the French pact with Russia, and continuing with Russia's pact with China and our pact with the European nations, we have been completely surrounded with pacts, all agreeing to help one another.

As a result we are financing both sides of our own war.

FURNISHING RUSSIA THE SINEWS OF WAR

Many times since March 1948 the junior Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate and explained this seeming paradox. At that time he placed in the RECORD 86 trade treaties between Russia and the Iron Curtain countries on the one hand, and 17 Marshall plan countries, several of them made by England and France with Russia, calling for the shipment of everything needed by the Russians to enable them to fight world war III with us.

Later—in 1950—he placed 96 such trade treaties in the RECORD.

The point is that we are completely surrounded by pacts. We agreed to help the European nations. We have built factories there so that they could increase their production from about 96 percent in 1948, when we passed the first Marshall plan, to about 160 percent at this time.

The four mutual-assistance pacts complete the circle—we are at war with ourselves—the cold war, that is. The junior Senator from Nevada called attention at that time to the lack of markets for the goods to be produced by the Marshall plan countries except in Russia and the Iron Curtain countries.

Under the mutual-assistance pacts, the European countries sell goods to Russia and Russia sells the necessary goods to Communist China.

Therefore the taxpayers of America are furnishing about 75 percent of the material used to kill their own boys in Korea.

THE "NEW" PLAN

There are two notable visitors in our midst today, Mr. Butler and Mr. Eden.

Mr. Butler is the author of the slogan "Trade, not aid." There is no secret about the fact that that slogan emanated from the same agency which coined the phrase "reciprocal trade."

Of course, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is not reciprocal, and was never intended to be. But the slogan "reciprocal trade" sold free trade to the American people under a misleading date line.

THE GREATER OUR DEBT, THE GREATER OUR WEALTH

Their Lord Keynes first sold an ailing president on the theory that the greater our debt, the greater our wealth—we now owe approximately $270 billion.

THE MORE WE DIVIDE OUR MARKETS, THE GREATER OUR WEALTH

They are now selling us the proposition that the more we divide our markets with the nations of the world the greater our income will be. All we have to do is to complete the job of wiping out all protection to our workingmen and investors. We have already transferred the constitutional responsibility of the Congress of the United States to regulate foreign trade through the imposition of duties, imposts, and excises to the executive department through the enactment of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—Reciprocal Trade Act.

The executive department has for 20 long years regulated our foreign trade

with only one idea in view. What is that view, Mr. President? It is to divide the markets of this Nation with the nations of the world, so that we will all live alike, average our standard of living with the sweatshop labor of foreign nations.

ANOTHER $7 BILLION

In the meantime, of course, we are to make up the trade-balance deficits with seven billion or nine billion or ten billion dollars annually, whatever it requires.

Mr. Dulles and Mr. Stassen have just completed a trip to Europe to get information with which to support another $7 billion appropriation.

MR. ANTHONY EDEN (BRITAIN)

Mr. Eden arrived in this country on March 4 and in a New York interview with a New York Times reporter said, among many other things, "We are asking nothing from you."

Mr. President, in that same interview, Mr. R. A. Butler, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the father of the slogan "Trade, not aid"—slogan which further confused our people—voiced the expectation of selling this idea to the American people.

I read from an article published in today's New York Times. The headlines read: "Eden Reveals Aim on Convertibility of the Pound Sterling," meaning that the United States must put up five to ten billion dollars more to maintain the fictitious pound value. "He links progressive freeing of pound to United States guaranty of dollars as protection."

He asks for nothing. Therefore, he asks for everything including our life's blood—our very sources of our income.

FICTITIOUS VALUES SUPPORTED BY DOLLARS

This is the "nothing" he asks for:

The United Kingdom, as banker for the Commonwealth, to undertake a staged and progressive advance to convertibility of sterling into dollars but on a stout leash limiting payments to current trade accounts, as distinguished from accumulated storing debt and to designated dollar commodities.

We will find within a very short time the suggestion being made that $5 billion or $10 billion be granted to them through a new bank or through the World Bank in order to support the fictitious price of the pound, as well as other European currencies.

I read further from the interview as reported in the New York Times.

These are his aims:

The United States Government, or an international agency like the International Monetary Fund, to create a guarantee fund of dollars to underwrite the success of the effort and protect Britain's meager gold-and-dollar reserves.

Mr. President, we have been losing our gold reserves at the rate of about two billion dollars a year. They buy our gold with the money we give them. So here it comes. We are to stabilize the pound at its fictitious value. I quote further:

The exchange rate of the pound sterling in terms of dollars to be unpegged from the current official par value of $2.80 and permitted to fluctuate within a predetermined range below that figure with the objective of enhancing the competitive status of Commonwealth exports in world markets.

MANIPULATION OF MONEY VALUES FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

Mr. President, there is a trick involved in the manipulation of the currency of a nation. It simply means that when a nation wants to export more it merely lowers the price of its money, and when it wishes to import more it merely raises the price of its currency.

We do not manipulate the value of the dollar, we are the victim.

At one time the sterling bloc had as many as 28 different values for its pound. The price of the pound is fixed in each area with respect to whether or not imports are desired.

When a nation within the sterling bloc wants to encourage imports from another country it raises the price of exchange in that nation's money, and when they want to discourage imports from that country it gives less in terms of value of that currency.

CHILE—EIGHT DIFFERENT VALUES FOR ITS MONEY

I recently discussed the question of the import duty on copper on the Senate floor.

At that time I put into the RECORD eight different values of the Chile peso. The peso is used in exactly the same way; to regulate trade. Its value is manipulated with reference to the value of the money of the country from which the imports are to come or are to be prevented from coming.

NO COUNTRY KEEPS TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH US

There is not one foreign country—and I say this without fear of contradiction—which has kept the spirit of its trade treaties with the United States.

THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES WILL NOT TRADE WITH EACH OTHER

Italy cannot even sell an orange in one of the other European countries, and the countries cannot sell their products in Italy. That is just an illustration. They all act alike in preventing trade between themselves. The bars are up between all the countries in Europe; yet the whole area of Europe is less than about half the area of the United States but containing practically twice the population.

WE SUPPORT IT ALL

The trick is that we are supporting all of this subterfuge, and now we are getting ready to step into it again and divide what markets we have left with them. I read further:

The United States to remove or modify existing impediments to international trade of the free world through lower tariff rates, simpler and more expeditious customs procedures, more equal opportunity for British and other foreign shipping to compete for American freights.

Mr. President, let us watch this attempt at customs simplification. I have not read the recently proposed legislation on customs simplification, but when the subject was seriously proposed 2 years ago I did read the proposed legislation very carefully. This was the fishhook in it. They would change to the use of the foreign valuation of the article for fixing the existing tariff or import fees or duties, as the Constitution of the United States calls such regulation, instead of the American value, which would cut in two or reduce to one-third or one-fifth of the amount of the import fee that exists at the present time when fixed on the American dollar value. That is the fishhook.

Mr. President, there are many ways of lowering the tariffs. That is only one way. One other is through trade agreements which are never kept by anyone but this country. Another way is through inflation. It is a well-known fact that the dollar is worth about 33 to 35 percent of what it was worth in 1934; therefore, the effective duty or tariff protection is lowered accordingly.

I quote further:

The United States, by long-term agreements or otherwise, to lead the way toward more stable prices of raw materials, particularly in the sterling area, and thereby reduce or eliminate wide fluctuations in the British balance of payments with the Western Hemisphere.

That means the same thing that was suggested by Mr. Churchill when he arrived in this country a short time ago, namely, that we enter into a cartel agreement and guarantee that certain materials coming from sterling bloc countries would always have a profitable price to the sterling countries.

We are asked to enter into the very thing that we avoid in this country through the Sherman Antitrust Act.

I read further:

The items on the Commonwealth prospectus are there because, in the view in the recent Commonwealth conference, they require some solution before there can be any bridging of the "dollar gap" through "trade, not aid."

Yet, Mr. President, Mr. Eden says he asks for nothing.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the great propaganda splurge made immediately following the election. They started immediately after the election to sell the "trade, not aid" slogan to this administration. Some of the suggestions would do credit to a highwayman.

Mr. President, I have before me an article published in the New York Times of November 30, 1952. The headline reads:

WHAT THE COMMONWEALTH WANTS FROM UNITED STATES

I quote:

For one thing, the United States tariff on dutiable imports has been cut some 60 percent between 1937 and 1951 without any noticeable affect on imports. For another, customs regulations designed to encourage stoppage rather than entry of foreign goods have been vastly more effective than tariff rates in holding down imports.

Mr. President, that is where they intend to switch from the American value to the European value, thereby cutting the tariff down by one-third to one-tenth.

I quote further:

If only for psychological reasons, however, career economists—

Mr. President, note that it refers to career economists—

here assume that the customs simplification law will be passed at the next session of Congress and that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be extended beyond the June 30 terminal date.

Mr. President, in the same interview, as reported in the New York Times of

March 6, 1953, Mr. Butler is quoted as follows:

Although it was known in this country as the point 4 program, Mr. BUTLER described as "point 1" among the things he would have this country undertake, "a greater volume of overseas United States investment, private and public, in developing the good things of the earth, especially in underdeveloped countries."

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that when any investor invests money in almost any foreign country, including England, he cannot get his capital investment out of that country; he cannot sell his property and return the capital to the United States from that country.

Therefore, United States investors are not investing in those countries. Of course, Mr. President, if any foreign nation will safeguard the integrity of such investments, there will be no difficulty in getting investors to invest in that country, and there will be no shortage of investments there, if it simply will guarantee not to confiscate the investments, as has become the custom.

I read further from the article in the New York Times, quoting Mr. Butler:

We want the chance of trading commercially with the dollar with the minimum barriers of tariffs, discrimination in shipping policy, "Buy American" legislation and the like.

In other words, Mr. President, at one time we were smart enough to give our Government officials, when making purchases of materials, 25-percent leeway in connection with the purchase of materials produced in the United States, knowing that in most foreign countries the wages paid are probably one-tenth of those paid in the United States, and certainly never more than one-half, with the exception of Canada. Therefore, there is no chance of competition between goods produced in the United States and goods produced in those foreign countries, unless there is some way or means by which to favor the goods produced in the United States. However, foreign countries now wish to have that United States legislation repealed.

I read further from the New York Times article quoting Mr. Butler:

I welcome the trends in this direction in recent reports of the Committee for Economic Development and the Advisory Board for the Mutual Security Agency.

Mr. President, if there is anyone who does not know what the Committee for Economic Development is, let me advise him that it was organized about 1938 by Mr. Paul Hoffman, the man who spent the money under the Marshall plan and ECA, and who, in his articles in various magazines, which I have read from time to time here on the floor of the Senate, advocated that we break down all protection to the American workingmen and investors and permit all foreign materials to be imported into the United States, as in the case of butter imported from Denmark and other countries. We did break down the protection to the dairy farmers and now the Government is purchasing the butter that is produced in the United States and storing it in warehouses or caves in the United States—as was done in the case of eggs at one time. I do not know just where all of the butter is stored, but millions and millions of dollars' worth of it has been put in storage, and much of it has become rancid.

Finally, the stored butter is either thrown away or given away, while the American people eat the butter that is imported from abroad or the oleomargarine.

The result is that the United States is stabilizing the world price of butter. That action is similar to the action our Government took in the case of potatoes—until finally the Government had so many potatoes that it gave away tremendous quantities of them and also destroyed and burned quantities of them, and finally there was a shortage of potatoes in our country. Of course, Mr. President, it takes experience to be able to run out of potatoes.

MR. STASSEN, MUTUAL SECURITY DIRECTOR

At this point I wish to call attention to a statement made by Mr. Stassen. Even Mr. Stassen has stated now that our European friends are trading with the enemy. I quote now from an article appearing in the Chicago Tribune of March 2, 1953:

Harold Stassen, foreign-aid administrator, said today too much British rubber and other strategic materials supplied by nations supposedly friendly to the United States are going to Russia.

Mr. Stassen proceeded to make recommendations to stop those shipments.

Of course, Mr. President, all that is necessary to stop those shipments is to require of those countries, as the price of our cooperation with them, that they stop trading with the enemy; that is all that is needed.

The Wherry-Malone-Kem resolution stopped that trading with the enemy; but thereafter this body decided to supplant that measure with the Battle Act, which permitted the President of the United States to decide how much trading with the enemy would be permitted. The result has been that those countries have continued to engage in that trading, without restraint.

TWO APPROACHES TO DESTROY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, there are two approaches to destroy the United States, the political approach and the economic approach.

COMMUNIST APPROACH

The political approach is called communism. As a matter of fact, socialism may be just as bad; it is simply communism in the infant stages. However, we seem to have caught up with communism. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are handling that phase of the matter. I believe that the matter is in good hands. We will eliminate the third gender in the State Department and many of the individuals who have been working with the enemy, instead of for the United States.

ECONOMIC APPROACH

However, there is another approach to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate. It is the economic approach.

We can destroy our country economically, just as well as we can destroy it by any particular "ism" on earth. The political approach in an attempt to destroy the United States is by our potential enemy, Russia; but the economic approach is by our supposed allies, or at least our potential allies. Some of them—the sterling bloc—are represented in the United States today. Supposedly they are, or will be, our allies; but in the meantime they would destroy us by means of a division of our markets—the source of our income.

We are supposed to remove the duties, imposts, and excises—to a point where all the low-wage, sweat-shop countries will be able to export to our shores the products of their sweat-shop labor.

That is proposed to be done by removing all duties, imposts, or excises, which represent the difference between the costs of production in those low-wage, sweat-shop countries and the costs of production in the United States with our higher wage standard of living.

The materials produced in those foreign countries are very often produced by means of materials and machinery we have previously given to them. Yet now they propose that we remove all duties, imposts, and excises, so as to make it possible for them to maintain their sweat-shop, low-wage conditions, and for their manufacturers to keep or pocket the difference between their production costs and what the traffic will bear here. Mr. President, anyone who stops to think can readily understand that such procedure would encourage those countries to continue to hold down the wages paid to their working people.

ENCOURAGE HIGHER FOREIGN STANDARD OF LIVING

However, Mr. President, we should follow the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution charges Congress with the responsibilites for regulating foreign trade. If the duties and imposts were fixed on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, so as to give the foreign countries an equal opportunity to enter our markets, but without giving them any advantage in that respect, and if provision were made for flexibility, so that as the wages paid in those countries went up, the duties here would go down, then those countries soon would see that they would receive no advantage by paying low wages, and thus they would be encouraged to raise their standard of living, so as to move toward a high standard of living.

Mr. President, a tremendous propaganda machine has been working on the American people, since the date of the last election.

So we may know what their real objective is, let me refer to an article in Look magazine on November 18, by Arnold J. Toynbee, who is described as following "the tradition of great historians." In that connection, I now read from a description which appeared in the magazine Look on November 18, 1952:

Arnold Toynbee * * *, the world's foremost living philosopher-historian.

Mr. President, in that issue of Look magazine, Mr. Toynbee's article is entitled "The Next Step in History." It is a 3-page article, but we have to read only 1 paragraph—which I shall read

into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—in order to know exactly what Mr. Toynbee thinks the next step in history will be. I read now from his article:

THE NEXT STEP IN HISTORY

(By Arnold J. Toynbee)

The steps that are needed are not emergency measures but permanent arrangements for putting and keeping our house in order.

After including in the article a great deal of material to the effect that we are moving toward a one-world government, Mr. Toynbee says:

This, though, would be unlikely to be the end of the process of western constitutional development, for a western electorate would soon begin to ask itself why it should not elect this common western legislature as well as the local national legislatures. If democracy means the control of governments by legislative bodies that are elected and reelected by the people, then democracy would call for the direct election of a common legislative body charged with the supreme responsibility of controlling the western community's common executive services.

There is where we are headed, Mr. President, according to the great historian, Mr. Toynbee; and it is no secret that the entire European setup, led by the sterling bloc, is headed toward that particular objective to bring us into the family of European nations. They would have one legislature for the Atlantic Pact nations, added to from time to time as they see fit to take in new member nations.

Then the Congress of the United States would become a State legislature, and our present State legislatures and State governors would become county commissioners, I suppose. That is about the way such a plan would work. We would be outvoted all of the time.

Mr. President, all this material goes to show us exactly what is the objective of the visit to our country of Mr. Eden and Mr. Butler, who now are in the United States to arrange the next logical step to level our economy with the European nations.

We are to abolish all duties and all other regulations of foreign trade, as the Constitution directed the Congress of the United States to do. The Congress has transferred such control to the Chief Executive, and he now has full control of the regulation of foreign trade; Congress no longer has such control.

So we pay subsidies to American producers, and allow foreign products to enter the United States free of any tariff or duty.

How we can continue to pay subsidies and still reduce taxes is something that no one has yet figured out. I notice that everyone now says we must find out how much money each of the departments want before we can reduce taxes. If one ever gets into a serious conversation with the head of a department, he will be crying with him before the conference is over. It will be found impossible to reduce the appropriation. Not only that, it will probably be found necessary to raise it, and there will therefore be no reduction of taxes.

I like what Mr. REED says: "Let us reduce taxes to what we think the people of the United States can pay, and read the menu backward—then go home, and let them scream." That is the only way we can reduce taxes.

Now, Mr. President, I want to call attention for a moment to an article written by a columnist whom I have quoted several times on this floor. The article is entitled "Forgotten Treaties With Russia," and it is written by Constantine Brown. It was published in the Washington Evening Star on February 16, 1953. People would find it profitable to read. Exactly as the junior Senator from Nevada has already quoted, there is but one objective, and that is to reduce this country's living standard, and when we finally run out of money with which to pay the subsidies, with all of the material coming in from foreign nations, we will then begin to understand what foreign trade on a free basis with the lower living standard of wages of other nations means.

I should like to call attention to Britain's relationship to Japan. I have before me the U. S. News & World Report of December 5, 1952, from which I read:

John Foster Dulles, as Secretary of State, is to find himself in the middle of a trade war between America's principal allies in the Far East and in Europe. Japan and Britain are at each other's throats in a bitter battle for world markets.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada, as Senators may remember, stood here on the Senate floor to suggest that the treaty written by Mr. Dulles and approved by the Senate had then and there lost Japan; it was only a matter of time until they would make a decision.

Anyone who knows, anyone who will study the natural sources of the raw materials available to them and their natural markets, will know that when we lost China to the Communists—and we did it deliberately—we then and there laid the groundwork to lose Japan. Reading from the U. S. News & World Report of December 5, 1952, I continue:

Britain, hard up and alarmed by Japan's recovery, is working desperately to check the flood of Japanese goods into normally British markets. Japan, struggling to rebuild her trade and obliged to restrict dealings with Communist China, is determined to regain markets in southeast Asia and to get more markets in Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

In this head-on clash, old antagonisms between these two allies of the United States are coming to the surface. British Commonwealth countries are raising barriers against Japanese goods, British traders are making charges of cutthroat competition.

Their skilled labor is even lower paid than it is in Britain. It was from 7 to 12 cents an hour when I was there in 1948.

I continue:

The British Government is trying to keep Japan from getting most-favored-nation treatment. The Japanese are accusing the British of dirty dealing. Anti-British feeling is rising, fanned by a quarrel over whether Japanese authorities shall have power to punish British and Commonwealth troops for offenses committed in Japan.

* * * * *

Japanese competition already is squeezing the British. The sterling area which Britain looks upon as her market, bought $244 million worth of Japanese goods in 1950 and more than twice as much in 1951.

Mr. President, I read further in the article, the following:

British countermeasures to meet this competition are becoming more drastic and are a matter of growing concern in Japan. British and Commonwealth countries recently have raised new import barriers aimed at Japanese products. The importing of Japanese textiles by Singapore, Hong Kong, west Africa and several other areas has been cut sharply or suspended.

Britain is trying to limit Japan's trade in other areas, also. This is being done by delaying Japan admittance to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Japan outside GATT, is denied the benefits of lower tariffs in effect among the 34 member countries.

Mr. President, there is little point in reading further. It is simply a matter of leaving Japan on our payroll. We are sending money there, spending it for national defense purposes, and when we quit Japan is going to China.

Certainly we cannot continue to allow their imports to come in here free of any duty. Four crockery plants have closed down in Ohio, within the last few weeks. That is only a start.

When we get around to considering the American people, the workers and investors, as a part of our responsibility, then Japan has this choice: Where is she going to go? Can she trade with the Far East, right at her doorstep? No, she cannot, as long as the colonial system exists, and we support it.

She must trade within her natural area, and in order to do that she will have to make a deal—and she will make it with China when the time comes.

MR. FORD—EUROPEAN PLANTS

Now, Mr. President, we have had lately a statement by a great industralist, Mr. Ford. Mr. Ford says that we should drop all our tariffs and all our duties and have free trade throughout the world, that it would be wonderful.

Mr. Ford has a plant in England where he can produce his Ford automobiles cheaper than he can produce them in the United States after paying standard-of-living wages.

I cannot say that I blame him, except that I think he is shortsighted. In other words, when he builds up competition, as he will, if he gets away with this statement of his—which, of course, I hope he does not—and if the people of the United States wake up in time, he certainly will not get away with it.

But if he did, and he thereby threw these people in the United States out of work in the various areas, from the mining areas to the crockery areas, in the watch manufacturing areas and the textile States, and almost every place else—and as a matter of fact, that is exactly what it would result in—then what happens?

As it is now almost every man in the United States who has a job is a potential buyer of a Ford, or an automobile of some kind. With the kind of wages they have over there, from 40 cents a day up to $2 or $3 a day, not 1 in 100 is a potential buyer of an automobile.

I believe that by ruining the home markets he will ruin himself if he could bring about the change. He possibly thinks he can work the slave labor against the high standard-of-living labor in this country, and profit by it. God help him if he did get away with it; that is all I can say.

The business machines, General Electric and in general big business, will be for this free trade I predict. What is big business? I would describe it for the purpose of this statement as business of such size and such a nature that it can put its plants in the area of low wages, behind the sweatshop labor curtains and import the goods at a lower price than they can produce them here paying our standard-of-living wage.

The little businesses are the ones that cannot do that. They must stay home and take the consequences. I think they will rise up to stop this silly business.

NEVADA, CALIFORNIA, AND FREE TRADE

I have received a telegram which indicates that the legislature of the State of Nevada is passing a resolution memorializing Congress to stop this business of free trade which affects mining, the cattle business, the wool business, the textile business, the crockery business, and practically all small business in this country.

If Congress is going to ignore the production areas that make this country great, and which pays the taxes—I guess they think it time for them to take a hand. I will have the resolutions at the next session of the Senate.

Also, I am advised through Senator Harold J. Powers, President of the California Senate, that they have passed a resolution along the same line in the California legislature, and I hope to have that resolution by the time we return for the next session of the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, I think—and this is merely the junior Senator from Nevada speaking—we should have a domestic policy that would safeguard the integrity of our economic system, that would place a floor under the wages and investments in this country, that would preserve our market to the extent of giving foreign nations an equal break in our markets but no advantage.

Let the 1934 Trade Agreements Act expire. The people of the Nation are waking up; they pay the bills to pay for the appropriations which this Congress so blithely makes.

Let the 1934 Trade Agreements Act expire, and it automatically goes back to the Tariff Commission, which is an agency of the Congress whose responsibility it is to fix duties, excises, and imposts, and to regulate foreign trade.

Let the Tariff Commission fix such duties on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

That is simply commonsense in keeping ourselves in business in this country.

A report recently made by a former chairman of the Budget, Daniel W. Bell, now acting chairman of the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security, contained 10 recommendations. I ask precedent. There being no objection, the outline will appear in the RECORD at this point.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of March 5, 1953]

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations made in the Bell report are:

1. Basing trade policy on national rather than group interest and adopting measures to help industries affected by the change in policy readjustment by extending unemployment insurance, retraining workers, diversifying production, and converting to other lines.

2. The adoption of a new simplified tariff act providing for a general reduction in duties and the elimination of present uncertainties by consolidating tariff rates into seven basic schedules. The redrafting of the Tariff Act would be done by the President according to standards set up by Congress.

3. Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without time limit.

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION

4. Customs simplification by the prompt passage of a bill similar to the one passed by the House in 1951, plus the creation of a commission to propose further measures along these lines.

5. Reduction of tariffs and elimination of quotas on agricultural products to allow freer import at world prices of goods not produced in this country, with a repeal of section 104 of the Defense Production Act.

6. Elimination or reduction of tariffs on metals and minerals, of which imports are a major part of United States supplies; in cases where domestic production must be increased for defense purposes, it should be encouraged through special purchases and contracts.

7. Elimination of import excise taxes on petroleum products. If imports should reach a level where they impede domestic exploration and development, other measures to assure a domestic industry adequate to defense needs may be taken.

8. Elimination of the requirement that 50 percent of the cargo on aid and loan shipments is reserved to domestic carriers, except in the case of countries that discriminate against American vessels.

BUY-AMERICAN STUDY

9. Reconsideration of buy-American legislation.

10. The establishment, with United States participation, of an international organization to promote the objectives of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

In its recommendations for a new tariff act, the report suggests that the 7 basic schedules consist of a free list, 4 groupings of commodities bearing duties of 10, 20, 30, and 40 percent ad valorem; a specific list for basic agricultural and mineral raw materials, and an extraordinary list of commodities whose importation should be limited for security reasons.

The first recommendation is enough. It appears we are supposed to take the miners, the people in the sheep business, and the sheep herders and teach them how to make hats, unless the hat business is also destroyed by competition from abroad.

If we placed a tent over the city of Washington, we would have nothing but an international lobby, and Mr. Bell has apparently fallen heir to the common affliction.

I hope that before the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—comes up for extension that there will be a sufficient number of Senators who will stand on the floor until it dies.

Mr. President, I received a letter from a man in Tonopah, Nev., not long ago. I had asked him if there was anything I could do for him in answer to his first letter. He said a little testily, "Don't do anything for me. Just do not do anything more to me. That is all I would ask."

CHAIRMAN OF THE MINERALS AND FUELS COMMITTEE

I should like to make the further announcement, as chairman of the Minerals and Fuels Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that I am organizing the subcommittee at this time, and I intend to accomplish two things: First, to determine the strategic and critical minerals and materials, including fuels, which are available to us in wartime; and, second, to determine where such materials are available to us in peacetime.

We will have some of the best engineers and advisers in the country to work with the committee. From my experience in engineering over a period of 30 years, I believe the Western Hemisphere can be made practically self-sufficient in the production of strategic and critical minerals and materials, including fuels, this would keep our production so that it could be immediately increased in case of trouble.

Mr. President, let us get ready and get busy, and catch up with our plane manufacture so that neither Russia nor any other nation is ahead of us, and let us also catch up on submarine manufacture, so we need not fear anyone.

Let us reach the point where every nation in the world will know that if they pull the trigger on us, we can defend ourselves

If we do that we would not have a war for 50 years. We are led to believe that in order to get nuclear ores from the Belgian Congo we must protect Belgium. That we have to protect certain nations in the Far East so we can pay through the nose for rubber and tin. If we keep on alienating the Moslem world, 350,000,000 of them, they will not be on our side. They will fight with bare hands, if they do not have anything else. We are even told that we are short of ammunition for the Korean war. Unless we change our methods, we are riding for a fall, and it is brought upon us by those people who are divided in their allegiance. We must let the people know that there is a political approach and an economic approach to destroy this Nation—and that they are equally dangerous.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN POSTAL RATES AND CHARGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 49) to investigate certain matters respecting postal rates and charges in handling certain mail matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the subject matter of the resolution which is now before the Senate was included last year in a law passed by the House and Senate. The law was passed late in the session, and no appropriation was provided. When Congress passes a law calling for the expenditure of money, the money must be appropriated to carry out the terms of the law. It was simply an enabling

act which was passed last year. We are asking that the Senate make the investigation, instead of it being made by the House and the Senate. We are dealing here in large figures. It takes approximately $2,400,000,000 to operate the Post Office Department.

Something has been said concerning the deficit for the current fiscal year being approximately $640 million. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the reason why there is such a deficit. There has been very little additional personnel in the Post Office Department since the war, but there has been during that time an increase in expenditures of more than $1 billion which was caused by the increased salaries voted to postal employees by the House and the Senate. We cannot blame the Postmaster General and the Post Office Department for that. They cannot eliminate that burden. The blame, if any, is upon the Congress. The Congress must pass the necessary laws to meet the obligations of the Post Office Department.

The resolution will enable us to look into the different classifications, first class, second class, third class, and fourth class, and try to determine how much of the deficit should be allocated to the first, second, third, and fourth classes. That is a big problem. When we considered the situation last year we passed a bill which would have cared for approximately $250,000,000 of the deficit. There was a dispute as to whether it should have been that much in the first place. We want to look into it and try to find a solution, through our experts. The Post Office Department cannot do that. Congress will have to pass a law to wipe out the deficit. The Post Office Department cannot do it. They do not do anything but make recommendations, and their recommendations have been sent to the Senate and the House year after year.

We are asked to help the Department eliminate the deficit by raising rates, but we are not told in what classes the rates should be raised. That point is not touched at all. We are merely told the amount of the deficit, and are then asked to grant more funds for the operation of the Post Office Department. I myself was chairman of the committee previously, and in all fairness to the new chairman, I believe it is absolutely necessary to have the investigation made, in order to ascertain the facts concerning the deficit, and to enable Congress to raise money for the Post Office Department to apply to the proper classes of mail.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has made the point that $200,000 has been appropriated to enable the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to study air-mail rates. I feel sure that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina will agree with me that it is necessary to use the money for that purpose at the present time, because this year there is a deficit of $71 million in the air-mail subsidy. It is necessary to use that money for the purpose for which it was intended, and also to obtain additional funds with which to conduct other necessary studies.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct. It is necessary to make other studies, such as a study of the franking privileges of the Senate and the House, and of penalty mail, which has increased over a period of years, and has helped build up the large deficit that exists at present. Our desire is to wipe out that deficit.

I have voted many times in the past for such investigations as the one now proposed and I intend to vote for them in the future, until I know a little more about conditions by virtue of having had competent persons look into the situation and state in what classes rates should be raised in order to wipe out the deficit. It is not as easy as some might think to get information enabling us to say whether rates should be raised on one class of mail or another. The question is so complicated that even the persons who spend hours, days, and months making investigations disagree as to what should be done.

I am one Senator who believes the money provided by the resolution will be well spent, although the amount requested has been criticized. There would be three staff positions at $9,000 each. That would be the limit. Then four stenographers are provided for, with average salaries of $4,500 each; for reporting proceedings $4,000 is allowed; travel and per diems, incident to the making of the necessary investigation, $7,000; telephone, telegraph, and supplies, $4,000.

Something has been said about the remainder of the appropriation of $100,000, namely, the $40,000 to employ experts in this particular field, to work with the Senate staff in order to reach a proper conclusion. I for one believe that the Post Office Department would welcome such assistance.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Kansas, if he has discussed that point with the Department.

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to be able to tell the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I have asked the Postmaster General about that matter, and he sincerely hopes that we will make a study and cooperate with the Department, as we expect to do, in an effort to help the Department work out a solution to the problem of the deficit of $641,000,000. It is a problem that concerns not only the Post Office Department, but every citizen of the United States as well.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was my understanding, and it was my reason for asking the question.

It will also be noted that the resolution was unanimously reported by the committee. It was not a question of Republican or Democratic policy. The entire membership of the committee was present and voted to report the resolution. Not only did the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service unanimously favor the resolution, but the Committee on Rules and Administration to which it was referred, also reported it favorably.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield in order to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator from Kansas tell me the number of positions the proposed appropriation would create which are not now held by employees of the Senate?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. Before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service asked for any funds, we submitted a budget to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as is required by that committee. There would be created three staff positions with average salaries amounting to $9,000 each, or a total of $27,000; and four stenographers with average salaries of $4,500 each, or a total of $18,000.

Mr. MORSE. That would make seven positions, would it not?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. That is all the additional help that would be required, in addition to whatever aid might be received from the managerial service.

Mr. MORSE. I merely devised to have the RECORD show that the appropriation would increase Republican appointments by seven new jobs.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I merely wished to let it be known that I am very strongly in favor of the resolution.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on a recent day the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] wrote a very sound letter to the Washington Post entitled "More Defense For Less." The editor of the Washington Post saw fit to attach to the letter of Senator LONG an editor's note which reads as follows:

> The Washington Post is a spokesman for no one but itself. Both Senator LONG and Senator MORSE have chosen to overlook the paragraph in our February 18 editorial which asserted that "no doubt some of the objections to duplications, lack of planning, and burdensome construction practices are entirely valid" and commend the point that overseas bases ought to be manned as largely as possible by troops from the country concerned.
>
> Our criticism was focused on two points: First, the Senators' amazing ability to produce detailed comments on individual bases in light of the acknowledgment in their report that their tour covered 60 separate installations and 30,000 miles in a total of 41 days; and, second, their excursions into high strategy despite their assertion that "We have deliberately avoided inquiring into our Nation's war plans."

However, the editor of the Post did not see fit to point out, as the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon had previously pointed out in speeches on the floor of the Senate, that our study was really based on 18 months of analysis of the budgets of the Defense Establishment in relation to the bases before we started our trip. We were thoroughly familiar with the bases before we ever started. We knew their locations, their size, and what was involved in them, but we desired to see for ourselves exactly how the money was being

spent. I may say to the editor of the Washington Post that by reason of our 18 months' work before beginning the trip, it is not at all remarkable we were able to arrive at the conclusions we reached.

Moreover, the comments we made in regard to the policies of the administration had nothing to do with war plans. Our comments were concerned with policies made known to us in our briefings; and I may say that those policies need a thorough overhauling if our country is to have stronger defenses.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter written to the Post by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] together with the editor's note with respect thereto.

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

MORE DEFENSE FOR LESS

I have read with great interest and, in most respects, with approval, your editorial of February 23 entitled, "More Defense for Less." In the last paragraph thereof you made an unqualified statement to the effect that any efforts to reduce military expenditures have always faced the major obstacle of official resistance.

This statement is particularly intriguing in the light of your editorial of February 18, entitled "Senators Off Base," in which either wittingly or unwittingly you transformed your editorial column into a special pleader for those responsible for these obstacles. You allowed your newspaper to become the mouthpiece and spokesman for the military wastrels you so heartily condemned 5 days later. It would appear that the Washington Post should undertake to provide some form of unification for its editorial page in view of these two occurrences.

It is not necessary for me to belabor your editorial of February 18 with all of its inaccuracies and distortions in view of the fact that Senator MORSE discussed it at length on the floor of the Senate the day it appeared, pointing out among other things that one of the statements in the report which you described as illustrating the "slap dash thinking" contained therein was in fact a statement which the military, while agreeing to the fundamental soundness thereof had asked to be deleted for security purposes.

After their representations to the subcommittee, I would think that the very military people you defended in your editorial were no doubt amused at your juvenile choice of illustrations to prove their case.

You made no reference whatsoever to the only recommendation in the report to the effect that the entire program should be restudied; nor were you interested enough in objectivity to point out that the identical step recommended had actually been taken by the new Secretary of Defense, and that he had frozen construction and is now in the process of causing to be made a complete restudy of the whole problem.

You might well point out to your military cronies that when they describe our thinking as "slap dash," they should append the same label on the Secretary of Defense—and I doubt that he would appreciate such reference to himself from his subordinates.

Perhaps, too, you were not aware—and if you were not, I now state it to you as a fact—that already the director of installations had denied requests for new authorizations during fiscal 1954 approaching $5 billion because his studies had revealed that the services have a total outstanding authorization of $11.7 billions, against which $9.1 billions had been appropriated with only $4.9 billions having been obligated as of January 1, 1953. In other words, the three services combined have asked for and obtained nearly twice as much in appropriations and more than that in authorizations, than they have been able to spend, even in the face of funds wasted in so-called "crash" programs.

You reached the ridiculous on February 22, when one of your feature writers asserted that the difference between perhaps 1,000 men on an overseas base as distinguished from perhaps 10,000 would be the difference between striking a retaliatory blow in 12 hours or striking in 30 days. The truth is that there would not be a difference of 5 minutes. The concept you supported must explain what happens to the tens of thousands of women and children living on those foreign bases which would concededly be atom-bomb targets. The Air Force planning that you supported has the additional burden of supporting an expensive system of parking aprons that makes it simple for an enemy to destroy our planes on the ground.

Actually, the report of the Sarnoff Commission is abundant proof of the validity of the report of the subcommittee I had the honor to head. It failed only in one respect. It did not point out the considerable savings that can be achieved when this excess military personnel is removed from the bases, thereby reducing the required amounts of barracks, messing facilities, recreational facilities, family housing, and expenses incident to maintenance of the families of these excess personnel around the world.

I shall always wonder in the light of your editorial of February 23 how you got booby-trapped on February 18.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
United States Senator.

WASHINGTON.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Washington Post is a spokesman for no one but itself. Both Senator LONG and Senator MORSE have chosen to overlook the paragraph in our February 18 editorial which asserted that "no doubt some of the objections to duplications, lack of planning, and burdensome construction practices are entirely valid" and commend the point that overseas bases ought to be manned as largely as possible by troops from the country concerned. Our criticism was focused on two points: First, the Senators' amazing ability to produce detailed comments on individual bases in light of the acknowledgment in their report that their tour covered 60 separate installations and 30,000 miles in a total of 41 days; and, second, their excursions into high strategy despite their assertion that "We have deliberately avoided inquiring into our Nation's war plans.")

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many letters have come to my office protesting a series of indignities which have been suffered in recent days by a number of Norwegian seamen at the hands of American officials. Their treatment is causing us untold damage in Norway and throughout Europe. It is not in keeping with our Nation's traditions and I rise officially to protest the incidents to the Congress and to the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The story first reached the ears of America through the distinguished radio commentator, Mr. Eric Sevareid. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sevareid's broadcast of February 11, 1953, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

The new Ambassador to Norway, I'm told, will be Mr. Carin Strong, of Tacoma, Wash.; if and when he replaces Charles Bay, Mr. Truman's unfortunate choice, in Oslo, Strong will confront a problem no other American Ambassador there has had to face in recent memory—a growing anti-Americanism among Norwegians, who have always regarded America almost as their second home.

The reason for this is the McCarran Immigration Act and what it is doing to the Norwegian merchant marine and Norwegian seamen. In Norway the merchant marine directly involves every other family; merchant sailing is an old and honorable way of life; these are proud and respectable men, largely family men, quite unlike the riff-raff found in some of the waterfronts of the world.

Enforcement of the McCarran Act in American ports has resulted in startling experiences for these sailors, the stories of which are now spreading through every farm and hamlet in Norway. The act is designed, of course, to keep subversives and other undesirables out of this country. Under the act, no foreign seaman can remain here more than 29 days.

Consider some of the experiences of the Norwegians alone. Not long ago immigration police tried to search the Norwegian Seamen's Home in Baltimore. There was a strong protest and they left. Last Sunday police stopped and cross-examined the worshipers as they walked out of the Norwegian Seamen's Lutheran Church in Baltimore. If a seaman gets sick and overstays the 29 days, he can be put into Ellis Island to await deportation; among the others, there are about a dozen Norwegian sailors imprisoned on the island now because they were unable to sign on a ship within the time limit. Two young men voluntarily went to the immigration office when 2 of their 29 days still remained. Yet they were immediately taken to Ellis Island. A few weeks ago 11 crewmen asked to sign off the merchant ship *Pleasantville* when it reached Boston. They had been at sea 2 years and were ready to fly home to Norway. The Scandinavian shipping authority sent 11 men to Boston to replace them. These 11 boarded the ship; then immigration officials refused to allow 9 of the original 11 to get off. No reasons were given. The ship is now heading for the Far East, its captain paying for the extra crew and also violating security rules on lifeboat space. Those nine men may not see their families for another 2 years.

Many foreign seamen are not signing off in American ports even when allowed to because they dare not. They have no way of knowing whether they can sign on again in time to avoid imprisonment. Foreign ships can no longer put into American docks for repairs if the repairs take more than 29 days. In order to get out in time, bo'suns have signed on as deckhands, electricians as messboys, losing status and pay.

Interrogations under the new law have not yet discovered one Communist among Norwegian seamen; there may be some Reds among them, but the real Communists, of course, simply deny it. Many American immigration officials detest what they must do under this law as much as do the victims. For example, there are women serving on Norwegian ships as mess stewards or radio operators; this is a familiar and respectable career in Norway. When they reach America, these women are asked if they have ever engaged in prostitution; men are asked when they last visited a brothel, if they intend to commit bigamy in this country, and so on. The complications and humiliations have reached the point where some Scandinavian maritime officials believe that American trade with that part of the world will be seriously affected.

Meanwhile, stories about the humiliations suffered their seamen have spread throughout Norway. It has now become a popular byword with them that life in an American port is like their life under the German occupation of Norway. One Norwegian official put it this way: "You may as well close down your American information services in

Norway; as long as this goes on," he said, "they are fighting a losing battle for the good will of my people."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I draw particular attention to Mr. Sevareid's warning that the McCarran Immigration Act is responsible for a "growing anti-Americanism among Norwegians who have always regarded America as their second home."

I commend the reading of Mr. Sevareid's broadcast to every Member of the Senate. Particularly do I commend it to the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the officials of our Government in the State Department.

Mr. Sevareid's broadcast is consistent with a news story written for the Oslo Daily Arbeiderbladet by its Washington correspondent, Mr. Anders Buraas. This newspaper is the third largest in Norway. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

Investigations in Baltimore where the McCarran Act supposedly is being exercised less strictly than in other American ports, bring out the following facts:

To sign off a ship is both a difficult and a dangerous experiment; that the Norwegian Seamen's Home is bound to show a deficit as a result of the decline in the number of reservations; that for a sailor to be left behind when the ship leaves (without regard to the reasons) can lead to his being deported, and also to the captain being fined in case the seaman cannot reach the ship in another American port; that few seamen dare any more to spend his vacation in the United States, and that no seaman can be put ashore in America even if he is not fit for his job.

The law is still not being exercised as it is written, but when that takes place another result will be that seamen who are confined to a hospital for more than 29 days can be deported; that Norwegian ships must avoid repairs in American ports that will take more than 4 weeks to finish if the owner does not want his entire crew to be deported, and that no ship is permitted to sail between American ports for a period of more than 29 days.

Twenty-nine days is the maximum time a seaman who has signed off his ship can stay in the United States. Fearing that he won't be able to find a new job within the time limit, seamen are naturally reluctant to leave their jobs. It has already happened in a number of cases that electricians have signed on as messboys in order to avoid arrest and deportation.

Another reason he is reluctant to sign off is that he reacts very strongly to the questions asked by the immigration authorities. Female crew members have been asked whether they are prostitutes, male members whether they have ever visited brothels. A result is that the pool of seamen so important for Norwegian shipping on the United States have shrunk to a dangerous degree. But even a sailor who has decided to sign off his ship has no guaranty that he will be permitted to do so. Recently five crew members of the motorship *Bykleffjell* wanted to sign off. Four of them were turned down by the immigration authorities. No reasons for this decision were ever given.

A few weeks ago 11 crew members aboard the motorship *Pleasantville* wished to sign off in Boston. The captain cabled the shipping office in New York, asking for 11 new crew members. The 11 men who wanted to sign off in Boston were turned back by the authorities. The 11 new crew members had already entered the ship. The motorship *Pleasantville* left with all of them aboard, but when it called on Baltimore two of those who originally wanted to sign off were permitted to do so. No reason why the other nine had to stay aboard was ever given. Then the ship left for the Far East with too big a crew, causing extra expenses for the owners; with the captain violating security regulations, since the ship did not have enough lifeboats for so big a crew; and with men aboard who had wished to sign off in Boston in order to go back to Norway, but who now instead found themselves on their way to the Pacific.

The same thing happened recently to the motorship *C. J. Hambro*, which left Philadelphia for the Mediterranean with six extra crew members.

In spite of the fact that the Port Authorities in Baltimore have been leaning over backward trying to be helpful, a couple of painful episodes have taken place. After the service in the Norwegian Seamen's Church in Baltimore on February, the congregation found the police waiting for them outside the church, requesting everybody to produce his or her credentials.

Another episode took place a few days ago when the police drove up in front of the Norwegian Seamen's Home in Baltimore and policemen were posted around the block. Three police officers entered the building and demanded to be allowed to inspect the hotel and its guests. Following a rather heated quarrel the manager finally succeeded in getting them to leave.

Norwegians in Baltimore do not deny that the act has its advantages. It has put an end to too frequent shifts in the crew. It has also imposed upon the seamen the necessity of acting like "perfect gentlemen." In both cases it is Norway who profits from this and not the United States.

Item: A Norwegian seaman who was interrogated in New York confessed to having been a member of the Communist Party back in 1938. He explained in detail why he had become a member and also why he had decided to leave the party. He did not want to sign off the ship, but the Immigration Authorities also refused him permission to go ashore.

Item: Two Norwegian seamen who for 27 days without success had been looking for a job, on a Norwegian ship, decided to inform the Immigration Authorities of this, and also of the fact that they did not intend to break the law. In other words, they wanted some extra time to find jobs. In spite of the fact that they had still two more days in which to try their luck, they were immediately arrested and carted off to Ellis Island.

As previously stated a seaman is only allowed a stay of 29 days in the United States, beginning with the arrival of his ship in an American port. If he signs off, let's say 14 days later, he has only 15 more days to go.

If a seaman should wish to leave his ship after a couple of years in order to sign on another one, neither he himself, nor his captain nor the owner of the ship can make this decision, if the ship happens to be in an American port. The American Immigration Authorities have the final say as to how long he should stay aboard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that a responsible Norwegian newspaper carrying an article by a very responsible journalist tells of the indignities which have been suffered by certain citizens of the nation of Norway, and points out some of the very serious problems which will grow between our country and the country of Norway.

NORWEGIANS OFFENDED

On February 20, Senator MCCARRAN, calling Mr. Sevareid's statements "highly inflammatory" and "misleading," placed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Argyle R. Mackey, Commissioner of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, commenting on Mr. Sevareid's broadcast. I wrote to Mr. Sevareid on February 25, bringing these developments to his attention and offering to bring his reply to the attention of the Senate.

I digress to say that I believe that those who are brought under the scrutiny of the Congress, or who are criticized by a Member of the Congress, should have the right and the privilege to have their replies placed in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my letter to Mr. Sevareid and his letter to me of February 28, together with the transcriptions of his broadcasts of February 26 and 27, which he enclosed, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FEBRUARY 25, 1953.

Mr. ERIC SEVAREID,
Columbia Broadcasting System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SEVAREID: I am enclosing with this letter a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1953. You will find 1 nthat RECORD on page 1334 a speech on the floor of the Senate by Senator MCCARRAN in which he brings to the attention of the Senate a memorandum from Mr. Argyle Mackey, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Mr. Mackey's memorandum comments on your broadcast of February 11, 1953, in which you state that the McCarran Immigration Act is responsible for a "growing anti-Americanism among the Norwegians who have always regarded America as their second home."

I would appreciate it very much if you would write me commenting on Senator MCCARRAN'S speech and on Mr. Mackey's memorandum as they affect your broadcast. I think it is important in the interest of accuracy and fair play that your reply be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am prepared to insert your statement in the RECORD.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

CBS RADIO,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have your letter of February 25, pointing out that my broadcast of February 11 on the operations of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act as they affect Norwegian seamen and Norwegian public opinion, has been challenged on the Senate floor by Senator MCCARRAN.

You very kindly offer to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any reply of mine. I should like to take advantage of your offer.

As answer to the remarks by Senator MCCARRAN and to the memorandum from Commissioner Mackey that Mr. MCCARRAN also inserted in the RECORD, I have made two short broadcasts over CBS, on Thursday and Friday nights of this week. Copies of these broadcasts I enclose with this letter.

Because of broadcast time limitations, they are not as complete an answer as I should have liked to make, but I believe they do cover the essential points, however briefly, and I believe they constitute a convincing answer to the Senator's statement that my broadcast was "inflammatory and misleading."

In appreciation of your interest in this matter, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ERIC SEVAREID,
Chief Washington Correspondent, CBS.

[Eric Sevareid, CBS Radio News, February 26, 1953]

On February 11 I commented here on the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act as to its enforcement on Norwegian seamen in particular. I cited cases of painful hardship and humiliation suffered by Norwegians and said that these events are resulting in anti-American feeling throughout Norway, where almost every family has some connection with the merchant marine.

Representative WALTER telephoned me to say in entirely cordial fashion that he wanted any real defects in the law corrected, but that he thought my broadcast to be in error. On Friday Senator MCCARRAN inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a long letter from Argyle Mackey, Immigration Commissioner, as an answer to my points. Neither Mackey nor MCCARRAN have accused me of any deliberate falsification, but the Senator declared in the RECORD that my statements were highly inflammatory and misleading.

I have always thought it a misuse of the broadcasting privilege for a commentator to engage in personal debates with others—he also runs the risk of boring his audience—but since my veracity has been challenged in this official and public manner, my only recourse is to make answer here.

The more I have checked this problem of the seamen, the more I am inclined to believe I understand the case. Where Mackey is right and I was wrong is on the case of the motorship *Pleasantville*. I had said this vessel was obliged to sail overseas with nine extra men, violating safety regulations. This was based on the report of the ship's master. However, his predicament was relieved when he called at further American ports, because the Barber Line representatives intervened with authorities. Mackey had this information when, later, he wrote his letter for MCCARRAN, though I did not.

I am informed, however, that other ships have been obliged to sail overstaffed, the motorship *Hambro*, for one, and that still other vessels have had to sail understaffed, because of difficulties encountered under the law.

In answer to other points I made, Commissioner Mackey fails to deny that immigration police tried to search the Norwegian seammen's home in Baltimore and encountered a strong protest. Interrogation of individuals there, of course, is routine; a search is not. I said that police on Sunday, Febru-8, cross-examined worshipers as they came out of the seamen's Lutheran Church in Baltimore. Mackey writes that this, done by city police, had nothing to do with the law in question. This may be true; it did occur, however, and to the seamen, of course, was another example of their new humiliations.

One of the principal aims of the law is to keep Communists away from our shores. Mr. Mackey does not deny my statement that interrogations under the law have failed to uncover a single Communist among Norwegian seamen; the same, incidentally, is true for the Swedes. He does not deny my statement that Norwegian women stewards and radio operators have been asked by immigration investigators if they have engaged in prostitution. He does not deny that rigid enforcement of the shore-leave time limit and consequent fear of Ellis Island have forced seamen to sign on ships at lower ratings, with loss of pay. In fact, I have before me a list of 77 such cases on Norwegian ships alone in the few weeks the law has been in effect. I said that sickness can result in Ellis Island imprisonment because of an overstay. Mr. Mackey in his letter implies that such injustices are avoided. The truth is that this is the No. 1 complaint of the Norwegian seamen's union. He might check as examples the cases of seamen Konnerud, Flathaug, and Larsen, all under doctors' care, but all locked up with dozens of other men, Larsen suffering with a hernia.

I wish to discuss the bigger aspects of this whole problem tomorrow, but perhaps the best answer as to the veracity of the broadcast is that in Baltimore 8 days ago American officials called a meeting with the Norwegians and promised new methods of enforcement. Today the manager of the seamen's home there said, "Your broadcast has improved things already."

[Eric Sevareid, CBS Radio News, February 27, 1953]

This will be the second, and, I hope, final installment of my answer to Senator MCCARRAN about the hardships and humiliations imposed upon Norwegian shipping and seamen, among others, growing out of the McCarran-Walter immigration law. Senator MCCARRAN stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that my original remarks were inflammatory and misleading and he inserted a letter from Immigration Commissioner Argyle Mackey, to support his contention.

I might have added last night that if the Senator would check with the White House, he will find that a foreign seamen's petition has arrived there, asking the President for changes in the law. It says: "Give us the freedom, justice, and equality that America has always promised." According to Chairman Silas Axtell, of the Andrew Furuseth Legislative Association, this petition was signed by several hundred foreign seamen in New York, Norwegians, of course, included.

In his letter, Commissioner Mackey implies that female crew members asked the humiliating question if they have engaged in prostitution, are so asked only in individual cases where there are real grounds for suspicion. This, I think, is not the case. When the Norwegian luxury liner, *Stavangerfjord*, reached New York this month, I am told, virtually every one of the dozens of women employees on board was asked that question.

On Friday, Senator MCCARRAN put in the RECORD an article from the Nordisk Tidende which speaks favorably of the new law. The Senator calls this a Norwegian newspaper, and the implication is that Norwegian opinion is not unfavorable; I had said it was. In the first place, the Tidende is an American newspaper, Norwegian only in language. In the second place, that article was printed when the law had been in effect but 1 week. In the third place, on February 19, the day before the Senator's insertion, the same newspaper carried column after column of itemized cases showing the painful effect of the law's enforcement on Norwegian shipping. If the Senator will check the editorial pages in Norway, he will find that the whole Norwegian press, from right wing to left, has denounced the law and what the Arbeiderbladet calls the insufferable atmosphere it has created. He will find the same reaction in the Swedish press.

Unfortunately for the Senator's belief about Norway's satisfaction with the law, I can reveal now that on the very day the Senator spoke for the record the Norwegian Embassy, on specific orders from Oslo, filed its third protest with the State Department—an 8-page memorandum summarizing the confusions, uncertainties, and hardships resulting from the law and its severe and unpredictable enforcement. It covers many of my points and much more.

Norwegians would not dream of treating our seamen in their ports as we now treat theirs in ours, and of their deep resentment there is no doubt whatsoever. Theirs is one of the biggest and perhaps the most efficiently managed merchant marine in the world. For years, through their consular offices, their seamen's union, and their health and welfare offices, they have exercised careful daily control over each individual Norwegian sailor in our ports. For years they have worked closely and successfully with the FBI to keep out subversives or criminals. They fail to see the need for these new police-state controls and humiliations.

During the big war their fathers and brothers drowned by the hundreds keeping our soldiers supplied; their ships are their biggest contribution to our common defense under the Atlantic Treaty; their sailors are their front-line troops in our mutual struggle with Communist imperialism; their merchant marine is their national pride, and that pride we have injured.

They have not contended—nor have I—that the whole law is bad. They think different enforcement methods would help in some respects. But altogether, as things stand today, they feel certain that something has got to give.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I make the same request with respect to portions of a document prepared by the Norwegian Seamen's Union as it relates to our present immigration laws. I ask that the document by the Norwegian Seamen's Union be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. The indignities described by Mr. Sevareid and the Norwegian sources I have cited are unnecessary. They reflect a callousness on the part of the McCarran-Walter Act and on the part of our officials, which is doing us incalculable damage abroad. As a descendant of Norwegians myself, I am terribly aggrieved at the loss of prestige which my country is today suffering in Norway as a result of the McCarran Act. Many other Minnesotans of Norwegian descent share my sentiments.

Representative WALTER placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A638, an article from an American newspaper published in the Norwegian language, indicating a lack of concern on the part of Norwegians with the operation of the McCarran-Walter Act. It is interesting that that article appeared on January 1, 1953, only a few days after the act went into operation.

I ask unanimous consent that the translation of an article appearing in the same newspaper, the Nordisk Tidende, for February 19, 1953, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be printed in the RECORD as requested.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. The article is further evidence of Mr. Sevareid's thesis.

I make note of the fact that this is the same newspaper which, on January 1, 1953, I believe, according to Representative WALTER, carried an article which did not seem to be too critical of the McCarran Act; but on February 15, 1953, it took an entirely different point of view.

In that connection, too, I bring the attention of the Senate to an editorial which appeared in Colliers magazine last month which can be found in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A966. The editors of Colliers call the section of the McCarran-Walter Act affecting foreign ships and sailors and visitors from other countries "one of the most inept, insulting, militantly chauvinistic and obviously ineffectual items in the whole category of Federal legislation."

Let me make it perfectly clear that I am quoting from the editorial in Colliers.

More than our relations with Norway is at stake, however. I am informed that our State Department has also received official protests from Denmark, Sweden, England, and France.

I want that statement to be a matter of public notice. I have reliable information that our State Department has received official protests on the operation of the McCarran-Walter Act from the Governments of Denmark, Sweden, England, and France.

In that connection I refer to an article appearing in the February 23, 1953, issue of the New Leader, written by the London correspondent of that anti-Communist weekly, Mr. T. R. Fi-vel. He lists the enactment of the McCarran-Walter Act as an event which has "caused renewed flurries of anti-American feeling" in England. No similar action by the United States, he said, "for many a day has received such unanimous criticism in the entire British press."

It is not my purpose to repeat on the Senate floor other complaints registered against the law and its application. They will be found in the RECORD. I do want to take this occasion, however, to say that I am deeply aggrieved at the nature of the debate on the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

SENATE DIGNITY

It has been my objective, as a member of the Senate, to comport myself with a dignity becoming the office and to respect the dignity of my colleagues in this body and in the other Chamber. In spite of that, the authors of the McCarran-Walter Act have seen fit to reflect upon the integrity and the patriotism of those who oppose the legislation.

Recently the senior Senator from Nevada has been distributing through the mails, under his frank, an article which he placed in the body of the RECORD on January 7, 1953—page 178—and which Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD—page A13—by a Herbert G. Moore, appearing in a magazine called the National Republic for December 1952. That article attempts to identify me and my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and all of us who opposed the McCarran-Walter Act with the Communist Party. It is an inaccurate and unfair article which plays loosely with the facts and which I consider to be insulting.

In the interest of accuracy and truth, I ask unanimous consent that an article prepared by me on "Who's Fighting the McCarran Act" which appeared in the New Leader for March 2, 1953, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be printed in the RECORD as requested.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. On February 18, 1953—page 1163—the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] again raised the issue of communism in connection with his law by citing a news story from the Chicago Tribune, according to which the blueprint for Communist operations calls for the formation of blocs of legislators in Congress to achieve various legislative purposes. The Senator has the article reprinted in the RECORD and states that one of these Communist-espoused purposes is the repeal of the McCarran Immigration Act.

I consider this statement and innuendo to be another illustration of distorted half-truth and unfair tactics used by the proponents of the McCarran-Walter Act. I comment further by referring Members of the Congress to the newspaper article itself. While it lists the repeal of the McCarran-Walter Act as one of the Communist aims, it also lists repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act as another aim. Examination of the RECORD will reveal that in 1947 the Senator from Nevada voted against the Taft-Hartley Act and to sustain the President's veto. In 1949 he voted with the repeal bloc against the Taft substitute for the bill repealing the Taft-Hartley Act. In this illustration the illogical position of the Senator from Nevada might well be used against him, for in accordance with his terms, he might well be one of those in a formation of blocs of legislators in Congress to achieve various legislative purposes of the Communist Party.

I reject any such notion insofar as Senator MCCARRAN is concerned just as vehemently as I reject the tactics used by Senator MCCARRAN toward my colleagues and myself.

In that connection, Mr. President, I have in my hand an editorial from the New York Journal-American of January 3, 1953, to be found on page 420 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, 1953, which reflects the policy of the Hearst newspapers. I welcome the opposition of the Hearst newspapers to the McCarran Act. More particularly, however, I refer to a sentence in the editorial which states that Senator MCCARRAN was in error in declaring that the opposition to his bill from the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization was a "rehash of the radical left-wing slant."

In saying this, the Hearst newspapers are expressing a thought consistent with an editorial which appeared in the New York Times for January 20, 1953, condemning Senator MCCARRAN for recklessly implying that opponents of his act must be Communists or Communist sympathizers. The editorial says:

> Opponents of the McCarran Act include men and women of every religion, of every national strain, including his own; of every political party, of every occupation, and every walk of life. A little more confidence in honesty of motives and a little less suspicion that every opponent is a spy or a traitor would go a long way both on and off the floor of the Congress of the United States.

I refer also to an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post for December 24, 1952, criticizing the article in the National Republic reprinted under Senator MCCARRAN's frank. The editorial calls the article pernicious nonsense. I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post of December 24, 1952]

MCCARRAN INAUGURATION

There is a pathetic irony in the fact that the eve of Christmas should have been chosen as the date for putting into effect the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act—an act unparalleled, so far as American legislation is concerned, in its expression of ill will toward men. The McCarran-Walter Act apes the Soviet fear of foreigners and tramples on American traditions. Some of its provisions go so far as to mock the meaning of the Statue of Liberty standing in the harbor of our greatest seaport and beckoning to the persecuted and oppressed of all lands.

Like so much contemporary chauvinism, the McCarran-Walter Act is defended in the name of national security. But the security of the United States does not depend upon degrading naturalization, as this act does, to a conditional, or second-class form of citizenship. The security of the United States does not require this Nation to deal meanly and arbitrarily with aliens who come to its shores. Restrictions and quotas on immigration in the interest of the American economy there must be; but they need not discriminate, as does the present act, against the persecuted and in favor of the persecutors.

The supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act are much given to defending it by attacking the patriotism of its critics. There has come to hand, for example, a reprint from a publication calling itself National Republic—a reprint distributed, incidentally, under Senator MCCARRAN's frank—which quotes the Daily Worker as opposed to the McCarran-Walter Act and then declares blandly: "If we find that Communists and left-wingers are against such a bill, then it is safe to say that loyal Americans should be for it." It is safe to say that this is pernicious nonsense. Loyal Americans do not need to define loyalty in terms of blind anticommunism. Moreover, opposition has come from great numbers of sober, careful, conservative, and indisputably loyal American organizations and individuals.

Among the critics of the McCarran-Walter Act is Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. "Only second-class Americanism tolerates second-class citizenship," he said in a speech on Boston Common, October 21. "It's time to get rid of what remains of both, and that includes rewriting the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act." We believe that in the real interests of American security the job of rewriting cannot begin too soon.

[From the New York Times of Tuesday, January 20, 1953]

REVISION OF MCCARRAN ACT

On this day when General Eisenhower becomes President Eisenhower it is appropriate to remind the new administration and the new majority in Congress than on October 17 in Newark he made the following statement:

"The McCarran immigration law must be rewritten. A better law must be written that will strike an intelligent, unbigoted balance between the immigration welfare of America and the prayerful hopes of the unhappy and the oppressed."

Even without regard for the hopes of the unhappy and oppressed, a better law must be written in the exclusive interests of the safety and the welfare of the United States. For the racist and reactionary philosophy of the McCarran-Walter Act not only does nothing to increase the security of our country; it actually lessens that security by undermining the principles of liberty, equality,

and justice for which this Republic stands. To the unthinking it gives a false illusion of safety against Communist penetration; to the thinking it gives a distorted picture of the real ideals of democratic America.

The report of President Truman's commission exposing this law for what it is has now been placed in the hands of Congress. The seven-man commission included a former dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School; the secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities; the president of the Lutheran Theological Seminary of St. Paul; the honorary secretary of the American Friends Service Committee; two high Government officials, and a former Solicitor General of the United States.

It should be unnecessary to comment on Mr. McCARRAN's implication that opponents of the act must be Communists or Communist sympathizers. Opponents of the McCarran Act include men and women of every religion, of every national strain, including his own, of every political party, of every occupation and every walk of life. A little more confidence in honesty of motives and a little less suspicion that every opponent is a spy or a traitor would go a long way both on and off the floor of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not know whether the inclusion of the National Republic article in the RECORD is a violation of rule XIX of the Rules of the Senate. I ask the President of the Senate, the majority leader, and the minority leader to examine the material in the hope that they will have it expunged from the RECORD. I desire to make it crystal clear that I do not intend to have anyone impugn my patriotism or loyalty by associating me with what I consider to be the great international conspiracy of the Communist Party. I find on examining the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that it does that. I ask the minority leader and the majority leader to read that article and to determine whether or not it is in conformity with rule XIX of the honored rules of the United States Senate. I make the same request with regard to an article which Representative FORRESTER, of Georgia, placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A68.

M'CARRAN ACT OPPOSITION

I address myself now to some of the opposition to this act. I realize that there are honest differences of opinion, and I am not under any circumstances challenging the motives or objectives of those who were the proponents of the act. They have their political philosophy and political point of view, and I have mine. There is plenty of room for differences in a democracy. It is said that even in heaven there are many mansions, and it seems to me that therefore on earth we have a right to have differences. I am rather proud of the association in which I find myself in opposing the McCarran Act.

There is, I am sure, no need for me to tell the Senate or the American people of the overwhelming responsible opposition to the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act on the part of many millions of Americans. Both General Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson, as our major candidates for President, stated their opposition to the act during the course of the campaign.

On October 17, General Eisenhower in a speech at Newark, N. J., called the McCarran immigration law "another glaring example of failure of our national leadership to live up to high ideals. The McCarran immigration law must be rewritten."—the New York Times, October 18, 1952.

In Bridgeport, he said, according to the New York Times:

> We must repeal * * * the unfair provisions of the McCarran Act.

In Boston, he stated:

> Only second-class Americanism tolerates second-class citizenship. It is time to get rid of both, and that includes rewriting the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act.

I salute our President for those courageous statements. I want him to know that I will stand with him in every effort he makes to modify, revise, amend, or repeal the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I hope that he will present us with such a program so that we may work on it.

One of the distinguished citizens of my State, Rev. Thaddeus F. Gullixson, president of the Lutheran Theological Seminary of St. Paul and chairman of the Lutheran Resettlement Service, was a member of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization which unanimously condemned the McCarran Act.

The National Lutheran Council, representing 4 million church members of 8 denominations, requested Congress to rewrite the McCarran Act when it met recently at its 35th annual convention at Atlantic City.

The National Council of Catholic Women met recently in Washington. This organization adopted a statement of principles calling for an immediate change in the McCarran Act.

The National Board of Young Women's Christian Association likewise adopted a resolution on February 6, attacking the McCarran-Walter Act as manifestly unfair.

Msgr. John F. O'Grady, a member of the President's Commission and secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, a distinguished friend of many Senators, has been one of the leaders of the move against the McCarran bill. During his recent trip to Rome he stated that by reason of the McCarran Act "Italy could go over to the Communists during the next few months." He said that "there is every evidence that the Communists will make full use of the discrimination against Italians in the act."

Cardinal Mooney, of Detroit, has denounced the law as discriminatory. Archbishop Cushing, of Boston, recently demanded revision of the law to purge it of several un-Christian and un-American provisions; and Bishop McVinney, of Providence, stated that the law reminded him of Hitler's principles. Bruce M. Mohler, director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference Bureau of Immigration, recently reviewed the Catholic Church's long-standing opposition to the national-origins-quota policy as unfair, unscientific, and highly discriminatory.

The American Baptist convention recently passed a resolution urging Congress to revise the McCarran-Walter Act, so that it would be more in keeping with our democratic traditions. The Disciples of Christ approved a more or less similar resolution, as did the triannual general convention of the Episcopal Church, last September.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the opposition to the McCarran-Walter Act is rather respectable. It does not appear to me to be coming from the cesspools of the Kremlin or from the mouthpiece of the Kremlin in America, the Daily Worker. It seems to me it is coming from people who believe in Christian compassion, Christian decency, and democratic honor and integrity.

I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Caspar Nannes, church news editor of the Washington Star, and appearing in that newspaper February 22, 1953, summarizing the position of the various church groups, be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

(See exhibit D.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Republicans, as well as Democrats, have opposed the McCarran-Walter Act—and for good reason. I was delighted to read an Associated Press dispatch in the Washington Post of February 16, 1953, reporting a speech by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, calling for repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. He said—and now I shall quote the Governor of Maryland. I have never been quite so vehement as he was in my criticisms, and I wish to make it crystal clear that I am quoting now from the report of the speech made by the Governor of Maryland. He said the act "is the mid-20th century version of the alien and sedition laws of 150 years ago. In time we shall look back on the McCarran law as a great folly and an ignominious chapter in our Nation's legislative history."

He continued, as follows:

> Quite apart from its offensiveness to two great groups in America—the Jews and Catholics—its harshness is indictable for two distinct reasons grounded in good ethics and practical political considerations:

The Governor of Maryland continued:

> First, it contravenes the spirit that made the United States a refuge for the oppressed who, coming here, helped to make this country great.
>
> Second it undermines our influence as a responsible leader in the community of nations by suggesting that the tarnish of racial hatred and religious bigotry guides our actions.
>
> We must not let this episode discourage us, but work to bring this abomination to an early end.

Mr. President, that statement was made by a distinguished Republican governor. If my memory serves me correctly, he made one of the speeches nominating the gentleman who became the presidential candidate of the Republican Party in the recent election, the gentleman who now is the President of the United States.

I am also gratified at the overwhelming editorial response in favor of our position, and opposed to the McCarran Act. I have in my hands a series of editorials and articles from the Wash-

ington Post, the New York Herald Tribune, the Boston Daily Globe, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, and the New York Times, opposing the McCarran Act. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials and articles be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post of February 16, 1953]

MCCARRAN ACT REPEAL ADVOCATED BY MCKELDIN

VALLEY FORGE, PA., February 15.—Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, took Maryland's venerable Act of Toleration as his text today in calling for repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

The occasion was Maryland State Sunday at Valley Forge State Park.

Besides explaining the development of and reasons for the old 1649 law on religious freedom, McKeldin dealt particularly with periods when reaction, harsh and oppressive, brushed it aside.

"Examine the meaning of the recessions that occur now and then in the forward march of man," he suggested.

"A similar wind of intolerance is blowing in our time.

"The McCarran-Walter Act is the mid-twentieth century version of the alien and sedition laws of 150 years ago.

"In time we shall look back on the McCarran law as a great folly and an ignominious chapter in our Nation's legislative history.

"Quite apart from its offensiveness to two great groups in America—the Jews and Catholics—its harshness is indictable for two distinct reasons grounded in good ethics and practical political considerations:

"First, it contravenes the spirit that made the United States a refuge for the oppressed, who coming here, helped to make this country great.

"Second, it undermines our influence as a responsible leader in the community of nations by suggesting that the tarnish of racial hatred and religious bigotry guides our actions.

"We must not let this episode discourage us, but work to bring this abomination to an early end."

McKeldin described Maryland as a State of paradoxes, geographically, economically, politically, and philosophically. He cited its contributions to medicine and science, culture, political action, and thought.

Quoting an unnamed source, he said:

"[Maryland] is a place where one cannot always do as he pleases, but where his right to say anything he pleases is respected—even when he speaks foolishness or worse."

[From the Washington Post of January 2, 1953]

IMMIGRATION POLICY

A genuinely illuminating study of the immigration problem has been produced by the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. Appointed in September under the chairmanship of former Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman, the Commission held hearings in 11 widely scattered cities, took testimony from some 600 interested individuals and organizations—many of them expert in the field and representing a great variety of religious, educational, welfare, and labor institutions—and found a consensus among them "to the effect that the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (the McCarran-Walter Act) injures our people at home, causes much resentment against us abroad, and impairs our position among the free nations, great and small, whose friendship and understanding is necessary if we are to meet and overcome the totalitarian menace."

The report of the President's Commission rests, apparently, on a radically different premise from that of the McCarran-Walter Act. In place of the "attitude of hostility toward and distrust of all aliens" which it ascribes to the recently enacted law, the Commission report reflects a firm faith in immigration as a vital source of American strength. It would approach immigration policy with the idea of affirmative selection of recruits for the American society. It would select these newcomers with due regard for the capacity of the American economy to absorb them. It would screen them with the most jealous concern for American security—but without the blind panic and arbitrary procedure of the existing law. It would welcome them, upon proof of their fitness, to full membership in the American society—without making their citizenship conditional and inferior to that of the native-born, as the McCarran-Walter Act does.

The most controversial feature of the Commission report is its flat recommendation that the national-origins-quota system, on which American immigration policy has been based since 1924, should be abolished and that instead there should be a unified quota system—admitting an annual maximum of one-sixth of 1 percent of the population of the United States as determined by the most recent census—with visas allocated in terms of family, economic, and political needs, but without regard to national origin, race, creed, or color. The report proposes creation of a permanent Commission on Immigration and Naturalization to allocate visas and administer immigration and naturalization policy.

"The quota system," as one of the Commission's expert witnesses, Prof. Oscar Handlin, of Harvard, pointed out, "was, in its origins, and remains now, a reflection upon the Americanism of many of our own citizens; it stands in the way of a rational consideration of the present utility of immigration; and it is an unnecessary burden in our dealings with the rest of the world. * * * A moderate flow of newcomers, regulated in terms of our changing needs, would add social and economic strength to our Nation."

The Commission report, in addition, bespeaks a return in dealing with aliens to the ancient American concepts of due process and fair play. It would temper justice with mercy and discretion to take care of hardship cases. It would facilitate the admission of temporary visitors, especially leaders in art, science, business, and the professions; and it would make all those who were honestly naturalized secure in their citizenship. This is an immigration and naturalization program for an adult and secure America, unafraid of strangers, confident as America always has been in the past of her ability to take and use and gain enrichment from the seekers of opportunity and freedom.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 3, 1953]

REPORT ON IMMIGRATION

The seven-man Commission set up by President Truman in September to study and evaluate the immigration and naturalization policies of the United States has now submitted its report. It has conducted 15 days of hearings in 11 cities, has made a comprehensive analysis of the testimony, has arrived at some reasoned conclusions, and has based on them a set of interesting recommendations. The report follows fairly closely the lines of the President's message of June 25, vetoing the McCarran-Walter bill, and constitutes both an attack on certain features of that bill and a prescript to be used in rewriting it.

Instead of the present system, based on national origins, the Commission recommends what it calls a unified quota system. Under it the maximum annual quota would be one-sixth of 1 percent of the total population of the United States—slightly more than 250,000 on the basis of the 1950 census. This quota would be allocated by a proposed Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, whose members would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They would be guided by the following criteria: The right of asylum, the prospect of reuniting families, the needs of the United States, the special needs of the free world and the general desirability of welcoming qualified immigrants. The relative weight to be given to these criteria would be determined from time to time by the Commission. In the upshot, supposedly, the immigration law would provide a means of relieving distress in any part of the world and would be, moreover, a powerful instrument of American foreign policy.

The Commission has made out a strong case against the national origins quotas, but the fact remains that quotas thus established are definite and automatically resist the pressures of special groups, whereas the criteria listed by the Commission are indefinite and automatically invite such pressures. Certainly the law should encourage rather than discourage immigration and should have enough flexibility to permit exceptional treatment of exceptional cases. In particular, as the Commission suggests, the whole subject of denaturalization and deportation needs thorough legislative reexamination. The new administration will find much of value in this painstaking study and will undoubtedly have reason to be grateful for the time and thought that went into its making.

[From the Boston Daily Globe of January 2, 1953]

"WHOM WE SHALL WELCOME"

"The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation in all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment."

So declared the first President of the United States 170 years ago, setting forth the principle which was to govern our immigration laws and the spirit in which these were to be administered—until enactment of the McCarran-Walter Act last June sought to turn the Nation's back on both.

The distinguished members of President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, whose study of that act is today presented to the public, seek to return our country's immigration policies to the broad highway of our traditions whence the ineffable Senator MCCARRAN'S efforts have temporarily detoured them.

It is unlikely their endeavor will fail, though given the complexity of the problem, the task may require considerable time. Meanwhile, it may be noted that seldom in recent political history has there been a more heartening illustration of the functioning of the democratic process for correcting ill-considered legislation than this report and its summons to public opinion.

The strength of the commission's stand and the validity of its plea for complete revision of the law (which became operative less than a fortnight ago) are attested by the fact that spokesmen for every major religious faith in America, together with a host of civic organizations, members of the professions, patriotic societies and outstanding citizens from all walks of life, urged this study to be made. All gave it assistance. The quality of its membership also lends weight to its proposals.

It is not often that a major law, so recent in origin, is subjected to an attack so scathing as this 319-page study. The act, says

the commission, violates American principles, handicaps the economic development of the United States, endangers foreign relations and weakens national security.

It conjures racial discrimination through an archaic quota system and an entirely unscientific assumption of racial differences. It hampers the adjustment of population problems. It thwarts this country's efforts to strengthen the economic and political stability of our allies.

Worse: It blunts one of the most important psychological weapons in the cold war by snatching from the refugees from tyranny the goal of freedom itself. Finally, in numerous administrative provisions, it nullifies ideals as old as the Republic.

The 17 major recommendations put forward by the commission merit careful study from the incoming administration. They are practical, well found in experience, abreast of the times, yet consonant with Washington's advice and the principle he defined.

Abolition of the old national origins quota system and its replacement by a unified quota system which would allocate visas without regard to national origin, race, creed or color is probably the most important of these. The plea for transfer of all immigration and naturalization functions to a new agency also deserves close examination. So do the several suggestions for fairer hearings, a saner deportation policy, the improved security procedures.

President Truman, in the veto message which Congress rejected, pointed out that the McCarran-Walter Act was a step backward. The need for a modernized immigration law was not met by this statute. General Eisenhower also assailed the act during the recent campaign. This useful report provides an ample foundation upon which to build a new structure of law in keeping with traditional principle and contemporary need.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of January 2, 1953]

MCCARRAN ACT DEFECTS

President-elect Eisenhower expressed the view during the campaign that the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, which went into effect just before Christmas, must be rewritten. Helpful to that purpose would be the report just issued of a Commission appointed by President Truman. Among the members of this Commission are two Pennsylvanians highly esteemed in this community—Earl G. Harrison, former dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, and Clarence E. Pickett.

The Commission holds that the McCarran law should be reconsidered and revised from beginning to end.

A biting comment on the law is that while it was intended to codify and clarify previous laws on the subject, it is even more complex than preceding legislation, and in some respects unworkable.

The law, the report charges, violates American principles, handicaps the economic development of the country, endangers foreign relations and weakens national security. Various provisions are cited as unduly harsh, even cruel, of punitive nature, and in some cases retroactive.

The whole national-origins principle on which our legislation has been based since 1924 is criticised, and a substitute quota system is suggested.

Such a radical change as the Commission suggests may be impossible to get through at this time. But there is wide room for removing obvious crudities and unfair and oppressive provisions of the act, some features of which have already evoked foreign protest. Congress can hardly avoid at least commencing the remodeling of the law.

[From the New York Times of February 14, 1953]

THE MCCARRAN ACT: STILL BAD

Senator MCCARRAN predicted last December that the fight against the new McCarran-Walter Immigration Act would be pushed vigorously after the new Congress convenes by the Communists and those who serve them and others. President Eisenhower, who in his state of the Union message called the act unjust and discriminatory, is of course among the others. So are Senators LEHMAN and HUMPHREY and many members of the President's own party. On the other hand, Senator WATKINS, of Utah, chairman of the subcommittee on immigration, says he knows of no need for changes in the law. Most of the 400 witnesses who testified before Mr. Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization thought otherwise, but it could be that Senator WATKINS did not read or did not believe that testimony.

At any rate, the drive to civilize the act is now getting started again. It would be pleasant to hear that strong bipartisan support was rallying to this drive. Certainly there is nothing on the record or in the facts to justify division along party lines. This is bad, deceptive, and bungling legislation. In theory it would let in close to 155,000 immigrants, the great majority from the British Isles and northern Europe. Since quotas are based on 1920 United States census figures and are not pooled, the quota total is meaningless. In effect, the doors are open to thousands who don't want to come, closed to other thousands who desperately want to come. And this under rules and conditions that treat every intending immigrant or traveler as an evildoer or conspirator until he proves he isn't.

The act and the problem are too complicated to be disposed of in a few days. However, the worst abuses could be removed by amendment and a revised law, wiser and fairer, could be worked out later.

[From the New York Times]

EASE IMMIGRATION, LUTHERANS PLEAD—THEIR NATIONAL COUNCIL ASKS THAT CONGRESS MAKE LAW FAIRER TO DARK PEOPLE

(By George Dugan)

ATLANTIC CITY, February 5.—The National Lutheran Council, at its 35th annual convention here, formally requested Congress today to rewrite the controversial McCarran-Walter immigration law. The council is a cooperative agency representing 4,000,000 churchgoers affiliated with 8 Lutheran denominations.

Noting with "gratification" that President Eisenhower asked Congress in his state of the Union message to review existing legislation on immigration and naturalization, the church body suggested the following changes in the McCarran law:

1. Substitute for the national origins quota system a "just and workable" plan that would avoid racial or religious discrimination. (An estimated 81 percent of the present European quotas are allocated to northern and western countries.)

2. Establish for the next 3 years a "statutory priority" for the admission annually of 100,000 refugees, expellees, escapees, and displaced persons.

3. Amend the present law to give naturalized citizens who have acquired United States citizenship "in good faith" the rights and protection enjoyed by American-born citizens.

PROPOSALS BY DR. T. F. GULLIXSON

The proposals were presented to the council by the Reverend Dr. Thaddeus F. Gullixson, of St. Paul, a member of the Special Commission on Immigration and Naturalization appointed last fall by President Harry S. Truman to study the McCarran law. The law, in effect since last December, represents an extensive codification of earlier legislation. It has been attacked as discriminatory and outdated.

"The discriminations written into the very wording of our immigration laws cannot stand uncontested in the face of the rising tides of racial self-respect among all the darker peoples of the earth," Dr. Gullixson said.

"It is obvious that the collective citizenship of our country has the right to decide who shall be invited to the privilege of citizenship here. It is also obvious that the law by which they come should not carry implications which are at variance with the principles upon which the Nation is founded."

Between 1930 and 1951, Dr. Gullixson declared, only 1.1 percent of our quota immigrants came from Asia, 0.3 percent from Africa, and 0.4 percent from the Pacific islands.

The "real crux" of the problem, he commented, is "our relation to that two-thirds of the human race which is not white."

Dr. Gullixson told the council that proposals were now being considered in both Houses of Congress for emergency legislation to care for the needs in some European countries with refugee and overpopulation problems. He warned, however, that while emergency legislation might be a stopgap it "leaves unanswered an issue which is even more important to the United States in her present attempt to achieve world leadership."

That issue, he said, is the "opportunity to tell the nonwhite two-thirds of the human race that we do not regard them as inferior members."

[From the New York Times of February 6, 1953]

MCCARRAN ACT CRITICIZED—NATIONAL BOARD OF YWCA ASKS DISCRIMINATION BE ENDED

Legislation to remove from the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act all unjust and discriminatory practices was advocated yesterday by the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, 600 Lexington Avenue.

The board adopted a resolution urging laws to assure that our immigration policy was based on a consideration of human welfare as well as on our own special needs and responsibilities. The resolution further advocated immediate legislation to admit to the United States its fair share of refugees and remaining displaced persons.

The board declared that the McCarran-Walter system fixing immigration quotas on the basis of national origins of our population was manifestly unfair because immigrants from Great Britain and Western Europe will still receive preferential treatment.

[From the New York Times of January 25, 1953]

AID TO REDS SEEN IN MCCARRAN ACT—MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY ASSERTS IN ROME LAW MAY TURN MANY ITALIANS TO COMMUNISTS

ROME, January 24.—An American Roman Catholic priest asserted today that complete disillusionment with new United States immigration laws seriously threatened to drive many Italians into Communist ranks.

Msgr. John O'Grady, of Washington, D. C., who served on President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization last year, declared in a prepared speech:

"There is a great danger lest many Italians, on the basis of complete disillusionment in regard to our immigration legislation, may vote for the Communists in the next election. * * * It is conceivable that by reason of our immigration legislation, Italy could go over to the Communists during the next few months."

A general Italian election, the first since 1948, is scheduled this spring. The present pro-Atlantic Pact government faces a bitter ballot-box bid for power from the Communists, who claim 2 million party members in Italy, plus powerful pro-Communist Socialist allies.

Monsignor O'Grady, speaking at a meeting sponsored by the Italian Catholic Migration Committee, said there is every evidence that the Communists will make full use of the discrimination against Italians in the McCarran-Walter Act.

The Washington monsignor said the McCarran Act seemed to belie all the fine things America stood for.

Italy is troubled by unemployment, overpopulation, and has some 700,000 Italians who were forced back to Italy after the war from the colonies and Balkans, and for these reasons emigration is essential, he declared.

He said that the President's Commission found a rising tide of public opinion in the United States that favors a constructive immigration policy. Such a policy is supported by the great majority of church leaders of all denominations, he added.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask that an article by Dr. Clement S. Mihanovich, director of the department of sociology at St. Louis University, on Catholic Views on Our Immigration Law, be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

(See exhibit E.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the article by Dr. Mihanovich reports a 2-day Institute on Immigration on October 22–24, 1952, "to secure something of a unified opinion" toward the McCarran Act among Catholics. Dr. Mihanovich lists 20 major provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act which the institute unanimously objected to and criticized. He then goes on to list other objections and recommendations for drastic change in the McCarran Act.

The evidence is clear that the religious and democratic conscience of America is against our present immigration laws.

DANGER OF RELIGIOUS BIAS

There is one other item which I now wish to discuss in connection with the McCarran-Walter Act. On February 12, Representative WALTER placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief excerpt from a story which appeared in the New York Times, reporting an address delivered for me in New York on January 28, on the question of immigration legislation. I fail to see the point of Mr. WALTER's selectivity in lifting from the news item only one paragraph unless he is, thereby, attempting to demonstrate his often refuted point that his immigration bill is being opposed primarily by those who are concerned with the terrible tragic suffering now being undergone by the Jewish people in Europe. In the interest of accuracy, I think it is important that my whole address—the entire text of the address—be printed. By the way, Mr. President, the address was also recorded, so there can be no doubt or question as to the accuracy of the text. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit F.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. WALTER's thesis is not accurate. It is also inadvisable and dangerous, in that it may result, knowingly or unknowingly, in religious controversy, division, bias, and misunderstanding. The inaccuracy of the thesis is demonstrated by the evidence presented in these remarks.

M'CARRAN-WALTER ACT NEEDS REVISION

Mr. President, in conclusion I want to express my hope that the Congress will act to carry out the part of President Eisenhower's state of the Union message calling for a drastic revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I am ready to join in a bipartisan effort to accomplish that objective. I regret that this proposal was not listed among the 11 "must" items, emanating from the recent conference at the White House between the President and the leaders of the majority. The facts are available, the campaign pledges are clear; the time for us to act is now. I urge the majority to expedite the necessary committee and floor action so that we can begin rewriting and improving the McCarran-Walter Act in the next days to come.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in understanding that the Senator from Minnesota has again submitted or is about to resubmit the series of amendments in which I joined him at the last session?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Minnesota about to resubmit them?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that, as in the last session, so in this one, I shall be very happy to join the Senator from Minnesota in those amendments, because I think we have already been proven—so far as the general sentiment in the United States is concerned—to have been correct when we first fought for those amendments. In fact, I believe one of the most interesting things about the last campaign was that in the midst of the campaign the Republicans rather changed their position regarding the entire immigration issue. During the campaign they talked quite differently from the way they talked here on the floor of the Senate when the McCarran bill was pending, and when the debate on that bill was proceeding.

When the Republicans began to discover that large groups of people in the United States were aware of the fact that that bill was in serious need of amendment, the Republicans' campaign speeches began to take on a tone a little different from the one they had used in the early days of the campaign, as the Senator from Minnesota will recall.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do.

Mr. MORSE. The newspapers of the country were writing editorials telling their readers what an acceptable bill the McCarran bill was, at the time when it was before the Senate; but as the campaign progressed, the newspapers began to change their tune, too, because they realized that the bill was a political liability.

In view of the experience the newspapers have had and the barometer readings they have taken, I believe perhaps the Senator from Minnesota is now in a better position to have the amendments adopted; and I wish to say that I am very happy to join him in the amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recall very well that the Senator from Oregon was one of the stanchest supporters and defenders of those amendments. I wish to say to him that if those amendments had been adopted, much of the indignity we have had to suffer and much of the suffering that has been caused would not have come about at all. I believe that throughout the country there has been a great reawakening, or at least a learning process, on the part of millions of people and many respectable organizations in the United States who now realize that something has to be done quickly.

So far as the investigation of the Voice of America is concerned, inasmuch as I have not had an opportunity to participate in that investigation, I shall not comment on it, except to say that the Voice of America now is being largely nullified by the McCarran-Walter Act. I can say that eminent members of the Norwegian Government and eminent members of the Swedish and Danish Governments have told me that the voice that is being heard in their countries today is the voice of bitterness toward the United States, because of indignities which we have forced upon their people by law and by the actions of our officials.

Of all the countries on the face of this earth none have been more like kinfolk to us, brothers and sisters, than have the Scandinavian countries; and yet, Mr. President, they are angry, righteously angry—and I may say there is nothing more justified than righteous anger—because their own people, people who have been as true and faithful in their love and spirit as any people the world has ever known, are now suffering in American ports under the terms of this law. When we ought to be breeding the spirit of good will toward people who were our friends, what are we doing? By our official acts we are casting doubt on their decency, their honor, their democratic faith. This has happened in port cities not any further away from Washington, D. C., than Baltimore, Md. Mr. Sevareid explains in his broadcast that immigration officials literally met Norwegian seamen coming out of the Norwegian Lutheran Church on Saturday to apprehend them—why? Because of the law.

Mr. President, I desire to make it quite clear that there are a great many people who are anti-Communist. Anticommunism needs to be better outlined and defined by setting forth what one is for. Hitler was anti-Communist—he said so, at least. I think the question is, Is one profreedom? is he proliberty? is he prohuman decency and prodemocracy?

Mr. President, I am not at all interested in seeing laws placed on the books

of the United States Government that are merely designed to be anti-Communist, if they are also insulting to liberty-loving people throughout the world. No amount of money we might appropriate can redeem our good name once we have officially injured the pride, offended the sense of fair play, and reflected upon the good name of people whom we would like to have as our friends.

I shall stand on the floor of the Senate time after time until some definite action is taken about the present immigration law, to remind this august body that while we can spend billions of dollars trying to revamp the Voice of America, or trying to build good will, or mutual security, yet by failing to act on certain humanitarian legislative proposals, or by acting in the way we did in passing the McCarran-Walter Act, we will destroy everything we are trying to build. What the people of the world want today more than anything else is acceptance. They want to be held in a spirit of equality. They want to be respected. They want to be treated as equals. We have set ourselves up as some kind of superpatriots, so to speak, pointing the finger at people from all over the world who have helped make this Nation rich and powerful, and saying to them, "You are not clean."

I conclude by saying that any nation that closes its doors will soon close its mind and close its heart; or perhaps I should turn it around and say that we begin to close our doors, the portals to this great Republic, when we have closed our hearts and closed our minds. It is easy to give away money, but it takes real character to show affection and respect for other people around the world; and that is the job that we must face up to. I submit that unless we do, it will not make any difference what kind of radio transmitters we have. We can hire the finest public-relations experts we can get from the best public-relations firm, and we can spew over far-off areas and coo to them the finest words man can possibly conceive, but I submit that our bad deeds drown out our words, just as our good deeds can drown out any evil propaganda against us.

My comment today is not only in defense in the integrity of those who have opposed the McCarran-Walter Act—that defense was made strictly as a matter of personal privilege—but I also make my comments today in behalf of a more rational and reasonable approach. It may not be as I would want it, but at least there is room for improvement, and I call upon this administration, I call upon anyone, to work with us in modifying what I consider to be some of the most onerous and indefensible portions of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Next week I shall offer in this body a resolution calling upon the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to spend its time—a little of its time—looking into the effect of this act upon our foreign policy. I think the effect of this act upon the foreign policy of our country and our relationship with other countries is very important.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator for the announcement he has just made with regard to the resolution he proposes, and, if he does not consider my joining with him in the resolution a liability, I shall be very happy to join in it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I never assume that any association of mine with the Senator from Oregon is a liability.

EXHIBIT A

THE MCCARRAN ACT AND ITS APPLICATION

(By Einar Johansen, Norwegian Seamen's Union)

THE NORWEGIAN MERCHANT MARINE AND NORWEGIAN SEAFARERS

Norway has great traditions as a seafaring nation. For many of you it might seem strange that Norway with its small population should make international shipping the most important part of the country's economic structure. After a closer study of the country itself, you will not only find it less surprising but quite natural. First of all, our shoreline, including fiords and long inlets, is about 12,000 miles, although the general outline of the coast is only about 2,100 miles. It is not very surprising that 3 out of every 4 Norwegians are living within 20 miles of the sea, and that a large part of the population has to go to sea for a living and for transport. About 74 percent of Norway is made up of mountains and moors, glaciers and lakes, which make beautiful sceneries but have very little productive value. Forests cover 23 percent of the country and only about 3 percent, which is less than 3 million acres, is cultivated land. A great part of Norway's population of a little more than 3 million make their living from the sea or industries connected with it, and international shipping offers the only opportunity to cover foreign trade balance. These are a few of the reasons why Norway's merchant marine throughout history and today are the most important factor of the country's economic structure.

Conditions for our seamen on board and ashore are founded upon the principle that any seaman has equal rights with any citizen making a living ashore, and a little more due to conditions around the world and the character of shipping in itself. A Norwegian A. B. is paid more than the average mechanic. When it comes to other conditions, such as unemployment insurance, health and accident insurance, old-age pensions, conditions on board ship, accommodation and food, safety-at-sea regulations, and so on, Norway is second to none. The system covers a seaman his entire lifetime, according to the principle that everyone who all his life has worked for the benefit of society is entitled to economic and social security for himself and his family. A seaman's right to pay off wherever he chooses with notice agreed upon and his right to be paid his due wages are recognized principles. During the last World War the Norwegian seamen were always at the front.

On the afternoon of April 9, 1940, the masters of the oceangoing ships of the Norwegian fleet received radio instructions direct from Oslo: "All Norwegian ships will proceed at once to Norwegian or neutral ports." On the heels of the message from the invading Germans came a second, this time from London: "Norwegian ships will proceed with all possible speed to British or Allied ports." In the China seas, off the Panama Canal, off the French coast, in the Pacific, in the Atlantic, at Antwerp, in the North Sea, Norwegian captains scratched their heads—and made their choice. A thousand masters, all those outside occupied ports, commanding nearly 3,800,000 gross tons of shipping, without exception obeyed the London call. Thus about 80 percent of the Norwegian merchant fleet, the fastest, the most modern, and the fourth largest in the world, was saved from German seizure. It was the biggest prize of the oceans, then or since, and was said to be worth more than a million soldiers.

As explained before, the control of the Norwegian seamen in the United States has been through the consular office, the Norwegian Seamen's Union, later followed up by the Scandinavian Shipping Office, the Norwegian Public Health Service, the Norwegian Seamen's Welfare Office for the Norwegian Seamen. A broad social legislation such as health and accident insurance, together with unemployment insurance are applied to the Norwegian seamen even ashore in the United States, where the Norwegian Seamen's Union is represented. That means that a bona fide Norwegian seaman signed off a Norwegian ship in the United States, at no time can become a public charge to the United States of America, if he follows a few simple rules. When a seaman pays off in the United States or elsewhere he is, according to agreement and Norwegian law, paid 1¾ days' vacation for each month served. After his vacation, he will be covered by the unemployment insurance, which pays him $3.50 a day during the time he is applying for a job. During his service on the ship, his vacation ashore and the time he is applying for a new job, both the seaman himself and his family are covered by same insurances. Such a bona fide seaman can never be a burden to any other country, if he does not wilfully stay ashore in the United States longer than permitted. Further, according to the McCarran Act, the shipowners are responsible up to five years for any alien admitted to the United States. The risk therefore seems to be minimal if bona fide seamen were granted more freedom of movement under the new McCarran Act, those who are counted as security risks exempted.

SCANDINAVIAN SHIPPING OFFICES IN THE UNITED STATES

Since September 1936 the Norwegian Seamen's Union has maintained offices in the port of New York. Later on, offices were opened in Baltimore, New Orleans, San Pedro, and San Francisco. During all the years our union has been represented in the United States, we have cooperated with the American authorities with regard to immigration rules, Coast Guard regulations, and lately the Internal Security Act of 1950. In the above-mentioned cities we have also established joint supply offices known as the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., for the purpose of shipping seamen to Scandinavian ships. The Scandinavian Shipping Office in New York was organized and incorporated in June 1938 by the following organizations: Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish shipowners' associations, Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish seamen's organizations. A board of directors was appointed by the above organizations consisting of the consul general of Denmark, consul general of Norway, and consul general of Sweden, one representative each from the shipowners' associations, and one representative each from the seamen's associations.

The purpose of the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., is to facilitate a just and immediate distribution of jobs to be filled from time to time on Scandinavian ships. As soon as the seamen have been signed off in New York, they report to our office in 156 Montague Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., in order to register for reshipment. A card is issued for every seaman and the jobs made available to the seamen according to the length of time they have been registered. At the end of the day, if no suitable jobs have been available, the seaman's shipping card is stamped with a date stamp which signifies that the seaman has been willing and available for any vacancy. A seaman is allowed to refuse three jobs offered to him and receives a specific mark on his card for each refusal. The masters of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish vessels are instructed by their owners to obtain the seaman needed on board through the Scandinavian Shipping Office's

headquarters, 115 Broad Street, New York City.

We believe that this organization is in this respect rather unique inasmuch as the seamen who really intend to reship are kept under daily and strict control by us. As an example it can be mentioned that during 1950, 2,140 Norwegian seamen signed off in New York and 2,325 Norwegian seamen were signed on different Norwegian ships. According to report from the Royal Norwegian Consulate General in New York, the number of Norwegian and foreign seamen signed off Norwegian ships in New York in 1950 was 3,157. The number of Norwegian and foreign seamen signed on Norwegian ships was 3,929. As can be seen, this is 772 more departures than arrivals. The year 1951 shows that 2,233 Norwegian seamen and 1,222 foreign seamen signed off Norwegian ships in New York, while 2,344 Norwegian and 1,588 foreign seamen signed on. This shows the same picture as in 1950, namely, 447 more departures on Norwegian ships from New York than arrivals. In 1952 records at the Royal Norwegian Consulate in New York show that 2,294 Norwegian and 917 foreigners signed off Norwegian ships in New York. Same year 2,575 Norwegian and 1,421 of other nationalities signed on Norwegian ships. Again this shows 785 more departures than arrivals of alien seamen on Norwegian ships.

It can also be stated that our cooperation with American shipping authorities during war, with regard to exchange of seamen when needed, is well known. Many American ships were able to leave only because our shipping office was able to supply men.

In 1950 when the Internal Security Act was passed our shipping office at once, in order to be helpful in enforcing same, gave the following in writing to the foreign seamen:

"United States security provisions: We point out that crew members of Norwegian vessels entering United States ports are subject to the security provisions laid down in United States Public Law 831, the so-called Internal Security Act 1950, and prevailing Coast Guard regulations relating to the safeguarding of vessels, ports, etc. Under these security provisions, any alien who has been a member of, or affiliated or sympathetically associated with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, or combinations which are, or have been designated by the United States Attorney General as being totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or any person who has taken part in un-American and subversive activities, is liable to be refused entry to United States on the vessel's return and may risk being detained and subsequently deported. To avoid any such difficulty you will be required to declare before being hired that you have not taken part in any subversive activity as described above."

It should not be necessary, but for the record I would like to point out that offices of the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., and the Norwegian Seamen's Union at the same time worked in cooperation with other authorities enforcing this law and in full understanding with the American seafarers belonging to the A. F. of L.

Due to the above facts, it is very hard for the Norwegian seamen's union to understand the strict enforcement of the new McCarran Act. As we understand it, same act could be applied more liberally and without hardship to the seamen if the spirit of the law was followed.

THE M'CARRAN ACT USED FOR COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Representing the Norwegian union, I would like to state that we, before and after the Second World War, realized that certain forces were trying to destroy our achievements and the ideals of freedom and liberty which we stand for. We have seen destruction of free unions behind the Iron Curtain, where freedom is nothing more than a memory, and existing conditions impose in our opinion strict duties on all free labor. We must choose between freedom and servitude. We as a union and Norwegian labor as a whole have made that choice. We are in full accord with the responsibilities accepted by the International Transportworkers Federation in regard to the Communist attack on Korea, and safe delivery of arms under the Atlantic Treaty, without delay or sabotage. Delegates to our 11th convention in September 1950 supported ITF's stand on the international platform, all resolutions condemning Communist activities and supporting the United Nations' fight in Korea and the principles the United Nations stand for. At the same time our convention decided that no Communist could hold office in our union.

I would also like to draw attention to two resolutions adopted recently at a meeting of the International Transportworkers Federation (ITF) in London on January 19 this year. Present at this meeting were representatives of officers and seamen's organizations from Belgium, Denmark, Estonia (exile), Finland, France, Germany, Holland, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

RESOLUTION ON M'CARRAN ACT

"The seafarer's sectional committee of the International Transportworkers Federation, meeting in London on January 19 and 20, 1953, after careful study and consideration of the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act relating to seafarers, sympathizes with the general purpose of that law insofar as it is designed to safeguard the democratic way of life.

"The International Transportworkers Federation has ever stood in the forefront of the struggle against totalitarian regimes and fifth-column machinations. Because of their deep conviction and experience that such regimes aim to suppress the freedoms of the workers and tend inevitably toward aggression and war, the seafarers of the International Transportworkers Federation voice the opinion that it is the duty of all freedom-loving people to welcome measures designed to expose those who knowingly or unknowingly have become the tools of dictatorships, be they the people's democracies or any other totalitarian regime. They accordingly declare their willingness to cooperate to the fullest with any government which takes action to meet the challenge and threat of totalitarianism of any kind.

"It must be realized that the ITF is concerned with the welfare and well-being of genuine seafarers. The seafarers' sectional committee therefore urges very strongly that in the application of regulations under the McCarran Act everything possible be done to prevent avoidable hardships to seafarers or irksome restrictions upon their traditional freedom of movement, and requests the secretariat of the ITF make the necessary representations to the United States authorities with a view to simplifying the procedure applied to seafarers under the act.

"ILL-TREATMENT OF SEAFARERS IN COMMUNIST-DOMINATED PORTS

"During the discussion attention was drawn to the treatment afforded to seafarers serving in ships which visit ports in certain parts of the world. The meeting registered a protest against this state of affairs in the following resolution, which was also adopted unanimously:

" 'The seafarers' sectional committee of the ITF, meeting in London on the 19th and 20th of January 1953, deplores the indignities, injustices and acts of violence committed upon seafarers who arrive in Communist-dominated ports. In these ports seafarers are not only denied elementary freedom of movement ashore or even permission to go ashore, but in many cases have been arbitrarily arrested and sometimes sent to concentration camps without any form of trial.

" 'The committee protests most strongly against this treatment which violates all democratic laws and humanitarian principles. It draws the attention of public opinion to the situation and requests all affiliated organizations to intervene with their respective governments with a view to protecting seafarers in the exercise of their calling.' "

In above resolutions, the International Transportworkers Federation are trying to meet and minimize propaganda tactics used by the Communists that are trying to spread bad will against the United States due to the McCarran Act. Seafarers of the free countries are well fitted to be ambassadors of good will, due to the nature of their calling. But on the other hand, every hardship case inflicted upon a non-Communist bona fide seaman can be used for the opposite purpose.

It seems therefore that careful thought should be given to the application of the McCarran Act, as not to give a free hand to communistic agitation against free trade unions and freedom-loving democracies. Following is an example of pamphlets distributed among Greek seamen:

"LET US STOP ARRESTS AND EXPULSIONS

"To All Greek Officers and Crew Members.

"Fellow Seamen: The fascistic and anti-foreign McCarran Act has begun to be applied in its sharpest form also against Greek seamen. Up until now over 20 fellow seamen have been arrested. A band of them was on its way to the immigration offices with Fournarakis in order to renew their permits and were locked up on Ellis Island. Others were seized in the offices of the shipowners while going to work.

"These are the first victims of the reactionary McCarran Act, which for seamen means the smashing of our unity, shipping out at low wages, deportation to Greece, and confinement on board for those who have embarked. The law is directed against seamen of all nationalities and its purpose is to serve the war cargoes of warmongers and the shipowners' interests.

"We must unite

"The arrests expose Fournarakis and Poulakis, who promised the seamen permits and understanding on the part of the shipowners and their agencies. The arrests dissipate the promises and illusions. The OENO (Federation of Greek Maritime Unions), in the face of the danger which threatens all seamen without exception, is making an appeal to Fournarakis and Poulakis to drop the demagogy and for us all to unite in order to find ways and means to meet this serious situation.

"As a first step the OENO proposes an essembly or conference of all seamen in order to discuss the new situation and adopt decisions. With the interests of the seamen as its only guide the OENO proposes this conference and has not demanded that its representative participate if this means the creation of impediments for the unity of all seamen of all branches.

"However, it notifies Fournarakis and Poulakis that if they refuse to take a stand on this serious issue, then in the face of the danger of having the seamen confined on Ellis Island the OENO will call upon all honorable seamen and the officers of all branches to take the necessary steps. We extend a hand to all who are interested in the welfare of our fellow seamen. Let those who are responsible reflect and not think that the seamen will not criticize them.

"Measures and decisions

"The great majority of the American people condemn the McCarran Act. This makes it possible for us to stop the arrests and expulsions.

"From the conference there should be formed a seamen's board to visit: (a) The port authorities and the consulate; (b) the

shipowners whose ships may have trouble; (c) the editors of the newspapers (Atlantis, Kiryx, and Vima); (d) the archdiocese and the presidents of Greek-American organizations—patriotic and trade union; (e) the American organization, (labor) unions in New York, and, above all, the seamen's unions—officers, engineers, radio operators, and crew members.

"Fellow seamen, with a good concerted movement, with the support of the Greek-American patriotic forces, there is every possibility that we may avoid arrests and expulsions. One by one we shall be lost. All together we shall win.

"OENO SECTION OF NEW YORK,
"IR. ARNAOUTIS, *Secretary*.

The above circular letter has already done much harm inasmuch as it can be said that the application of the McCarran Act has brought hardship to anticommunistic bona fide seamen on foreign ships, especially with regard to their traditional freedom of movement, which is so necessary due to their calling as seamen.

PRESENT APPLICATION OF THE M'CARRAN ACT

Although the full effect of this act as yet cannot be determined, it is already clear that a strict enforcement will bring hardship to alien seamen either in American or foreign ships. In Seafarer's Log dated January 9, 1953, we read the following:

"M'CARRAN ACT PROBLEMS

"The much-discussed McCarran Immigration Act went into effect with a big splash 2 weeks ago. Much controversy has been aroused, centering on denial of shore leave to foreign-flag crewmen. Actually the act has weighed heaviest on aliens aboard United States ships, with many of them denied payoffs.

"The McCarran Act is a broad piece of legislation covering much besides seamen's shore leave. Contrary to what has been said in some newspapers, the SIU has not endorsed it. The union hasn't taken any position yet because, like everyone else, it is waiting to see how the act works out.

"What the SIU did endorse months ago was the principle of screening foreign-flag crewmen who enter restricted port areas. At that time an article in the Seafarer's Log exposed the security loophole which permitted Iron Curtain and runaway ships to enter these areas, but required American-flag seamen and dock workers to have Coast Guard clearances.

"The McCarran Act goes far beyond that. All alien seamen under all flags are being screened in all ports. For aliens on United States ships it means a double screening. They have already been cleared by the Coast Guard. Now they have to be cleared by Immigration. The difference is that where the Coast Guard is concerned with subversive affiliation, Immigration deals with a broader set of requirements.

"The result has been, for example, that two seafarers who have clearance and have been sailing SIU for years have been denied discharge because they are nationals of countries that were taken over by Russia. Other seafarers have been similarly treated for a variety of other reasons. From reports already received, it appears that the restrictions placed upon aliens sailing American ships will be changed in the new Congress and this hardship removed."

Another article in the same seafarer's Log states that a sizable number of alien crew members have been denied payoff and discharge in the first days of operation of the new act. Later is quoted examples of how an Estonian seaman who suffered back injury was denied discharge, although he was permitted to go ashore under guard for treatment. Other cases quoted seem to prove that a change of the act is necessary also for the smooth running of American ships.

As the act gives full authority to the individual inspector and everything seems to be left to his discretion, it seems that any alien seaman whether still on board his ship, domestic or foreign, and seamen legally entering the United States should be given a smooth and easy way to appeal his case to a local authority or committee, whichever is most convenient. The application of the law on Scandinavian ships shows that different inspectors follow different practices. I would like to give the following examples and reports:

1. Seaman Karl Persson, sailing on the steamship *Olga Torm*, admitted on D2 card in New York January 7, 1953, and registered to reship foreign or depart on any vessel on or prior to January 19, 1953. Granted extension in New York to February 5, 1953, but for this extension he had to pay $10. He shipped on the motor transport *Iselin* from New York January 29, this year.

2. Danish seaman Leif Nielsen signed off the Norwegian ship *Eidanger* in New York January 5, 1953. Given D2, and time for leaving United States January 20, 1953. Later extended to February 3, and for this extension he paid $10. On February 2, he went to the immigration authorities to apply for a longer extension but was asked to come back the day after, on which day his extension expired. Next day he was taken to Ellis Island into custody. If he will be granted conditional parole is not known at the present time.

3. Holger Sjøgren, born in Finland, signed off steamship *Scania* in Philadelphia, January 16. Allowed discharge and departure set to February 14. He was given 29 days at once. This is no grievance but only to show that the law can be applied easier.

4. Norweigian Olaf Olsen reported signed off *Eidanger* on or about January 5. Given D2 card with time limit January 20. On reporting to immigration authorities was requested to come back and pay $10—or else he would be in the United States illegally. Because the seaman did not have $10, he would be deported. His departure not known. All in all this shows that payment of $10 is more important than the spirit of the law, which the above-captioned seaman tried to follow.

5. Case of Norwegian seaman Karl Werner Henriksen, born April 2, 1935. Signed off *Skvauann* as bone fide seaman. D2 card in order, but the 29th day expired on Saturday, January 24, 1953. Did not have $10. All papers in order and registered with the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., where his card was stamped every day. Monday, January 26 at 10 a. m., he got a job on the steamship *Gimle*, which he was to join same night. He was assigned to the ship and his room and board paid for at the Norwegian Seamens' Hotel. Around noon on Monday, January 26, he was picked up and sent to Ellis Island. The Royal Norwegian Consulate General and the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., in New York tried to get him released, but did not succeed until late Tuesday. This seaman intended to depart, had signed on a ship, but due to the fact that it was a Saturday and Sunday and that he was short $10, he was taken into custody. What will happen to him after his trip to Ellis Island is unknown. Will this man on his next arrival in the United States be denied shore leave? Will he later on be denied discharge in the United States for the same reason?

6. Case of Norweigian Seaman Lars Arne Rossevold, born February 2, 1920; from motor transport *Shetland*, a Danish ship. District File E–082–499. Was detained on arrival in New York, January 10, 1953, because his passport was not valid for 6 months. On January 12 he and the wireless operator went ashore to extend passport. He had orders to wait for the wireless operator and return with him. Missed him, and drove around in a taxi to the amount of $7 to $8—most of the night in order to locate his ship. Because he did not master the language and was not well acquainted with New York, he did not reach his ship. He went to the Seamen's Institute and the next morning directly to the agents, Furness, Whitney. The agents gave him plane ticket to Cartagena. About three-quarters of an hour before he was supposed to leave for the plane, he was picked up and sent to Ellis Island. He was to leave about 4 p. m., and was picked up at 3:15 p. m. He remained on Ellis Island until Saturday, January 24, and was then given until February 13 to leave the country. Registered Scandinavian Shipping Office, Monday, January 26. This according to the seaman himself.

7. Another seaman, Gunnar Filland, on the *Elin Hope* trading between Canada and United States, was unlucky enough to be left behind when the ship left. He was picked up and sent to Ellis Island. Deportation proceedings started. Next trip sent back to his ship, but detained on board on later trips. Case in hands of Royal Norwegian Consulate General, and appealed to the Attorney General. No answer yet.

8. Report from the master of the MV *Pleasantville*. The ship arrived in Boston, first port in United States en route from Casablanca. Gave 11 names of the crew wishing to sign off in United States, some with the intention of returning to Norway, others to reship foreign. All with clear papers and with a service from 15 months to 2 years. Four of them were allowed to sign off after the master had informed that they should leave on the *Stavangerfjord* for Norway, departing January 27, 1953. The other seven got shore leave (D1) but no discharge because they were not able to name the ships on which they were to depart. The ship was en route to New York and they were told to apply for discharge to the Immigration Service in New York. On arrival in New York they were not granted discharge because D1 in the first port of arrival could not be changed to D2 in a later port in the United States.

9. Case of the steamship *Emu*. Following service of about 8 months on the above-named ship, Torkel Bjørnevik was given discharge in Philadelphia on January 20, 1953, and given 10 days in which to return to Norway. Five other men were denied payoff for the purpose of reshipping foreign. As told by Mr. Bjørnevik on January 23, 1953, at 1:45 p. m.

10. Oiler Magne Bratholmen, ex *Reinholt*, denied discharge in San Pedro the 6th or 7th of January 1953, together with others of the crew. Given D1. On arrival in New York January 26, 1953, he was given discharge (D2) and allowed to reship foreign. Between Pedro and New York, the ship called at Cristobal.

11. Case of sick seamen, Trygve Konnerud and Skule Stein Flathaug, ex *Wilchief*. This ship arrived in New York from Colombia on the 10th of January 1953. They both felt sick on arrival and had told the master that they would see a doctor. They could not be paid off, but were given D1 cards. They went to the Norwegian Public Health Service and Konnerud was at once declared not fit for duty. Flathaug was sent to a specialist and was declared not fit for duty. They moved their belongings to the Norwegian Seamen's House. The ship's wireless operator reported to the Consulate General that he and Konnerud had been informed by the Barge Office on Saturday that it would be O. K. that Konnerud was ashore for treatment. Konnerud was requested to report when he was fit for duty. (Possibly to be given D2.) Flathaug reported to the barge office Monday, January 12. The ship had departed at the time. He was given same information to report when fit for duty. Konnerud and Flathaug were both under doctor's care from the time they were declared not fit for duty. Flathaug was in the hospital from January 13 to January 16. They were picked up outside the Norwegian Consulate General on January 20 about noon and brought to the Barge Office. Both were still under doctor's care. After about 3 hours'

questioning they were brought to Ellis Island. Hearing on Wednesday and notified that they would be released on Thursday. This following intervention from the Norwegian Consulate General in New York. They were released on Friday, January 23 and given until around February 12 to depart from the United States. Konnerud was sent home on the steamship *Stavangerfjord*. Flathaug, when being declared fit for duty, will reship foreign. Both men told at Ellis Island that they were sick and needed special treatment, but were locked in a cell together with about 30 others.

12. Seaman Karl Lafton arrived January 28 on the *United States* in transit to the motor vessel *Tancred*. Should be picked up by the driver from the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., New York, but driver reported that he was not even allowed to talk to the seaman who, by the way, understood very little English. Lafton was taken to Ellis Island. After intervention from the consulate, he was later released and sent to his ship.

13. Steamship *Solglimt* in New York. Five men did not have their passport in order. Detained. Later O. K. Two others detained. Not Norwegians. Reason unknown. The Norwegian consulate reports that quite a number of Norwegian seamen on different ships are detained for reasons unknown.

Danish seamen, members of Danish Sailors' and Firemen's Union, who have after termination of their allotted stay to remain ashore, in order to reship on a Danish (Swedish-Norwegian) vessel, have been detained, and arrested, by the Immigration authorities, when applying for extension.

14. Gunnar Pedersen, able-bodied seaman, born on August 3, 1925, at Køng, Denmark. Paid off steamship *Aggersborg* (Danish) December 31, 1952. D2 from December 29, 1952. Reported to Immigration on January 26, 1953 (29 days) and was detained. He was released on January 30, 1953, on conditional parole for voluntary departure.

15. Hans Ove Zenius Hansen, able-bodied seaman, born on September 9, 1928, at Roskilde, Denmark. Paid off same ship and all the same conditions and consequences.

16. Erik Nielsen Kjaer, able-bodied seaman, born on February 15, 1926, at Mariager, Denmark. Paid off from steamship *Tessa Dan* (Danish) in Mobile, Ala., and was issued D2 (No. S–606470) on January 6, 1953, and proceeded to New York with permission of the Immigration (stated on the D2 form) and registered here on January 12, 1953, for reshipping. Reported to Immigration on February 3, 1953 (29 days) and was detained. P. t. on Ellis Island.

17. Aage Vestergaard Pedersen, able-bodied seaman, born on March 18, 1929, at Vestervig, Denmark. Paid off same ship, same place (D2 No. 606469) and came also here to New York, but had D2 issued on January 7, 1953, but went with his shipmate up to the Immigration the same day as he (one day earlier than 29 days) but was told to come back next day, on the 29th day, and "he would then be detained," they said. (Immigration.) He is going up there today, the 29th day (February 4, 1953) and expects to be detained.

18. Svend Erik Pedersen, able-bodied seaman, born on November 12, 1929, at Copenhagen, Denmark. Paid off from motorship *Tekla Torm* (Danish) on January 5, 1953 (D2—from January 5, 1953). Registered here for reshipping on January 6, 1953. Went to the Immigration on expiration of his 29th day in anticipation of extension, but was detained (on February 2, 1953). P. t. on Ellis Island.

19. Reports from our offices in San Pedro, San Francisco, and New Orleans indicate that most bona fide seamen are denied discharge as they cannot tell what ship they are going to depart on. Other indications show that another reason for denial of discharge seems to be lack of jobs in the port the seaman applies for such.

20. Representatives of the Swedish Seamen's Union in New York reported January 28, 1953, that the Swedish Consulate General in New York had been informed by telephone from the State Department that no alien seamen will be given extension for shore leave. The time granted in the first place, if 10, 15, or more days would be the deadline for departure. Before the new law went into effect extension for voluntary departure was given without charge even after 29 days, when the seamen had registered to reship foreign. Practice after the new law has been given us to understand, will be that extension will be granted up to 29 days, but after that the seamen will be illegally in the United States and taken into custody.

21. Due to the application of the McCarran Act, several seamen had to take lower ratings than they were qualified for. Especially on Panamanian ships cases have been reported, from the Greek representative in the ITF in New York that denial of discharge has been used by the captain for the purpose of giving lower wages to those seamen so denied. It seems then that a strict enforcement of the McCarran Act can be used by foreign flag ships, not represented by a union, for the purpose of exploitation.

Letter from the Greek representative in New York, giving name of seaman who was forced to take lower wages and other facts, given to the assistant commissioner of immigration in Washington by Willy Dorchain, February 6, 1953.

It must be quite clear that Scandinavian ships and Scandinavian seamen will suffer undue hardship if such rules are to be followed, or extension for the purpose of reshipping foreign will be denied, especially on Norwegian ships, of which about 80 percent seldom or never arrive at a home port and have to rely upon supply of crew in foreign ports replacing those paid off for a rest period before again shipping foreign, or due to seamen's wish to change ship, or due to sickness or accident. Sick or injured seamen seem to be in a spot. A sick seaman will, as the law is applied, not be allowed to sign off the ship. He will, fortunately, be allowed hospitalization; but if the ship leaves without him, he will technically be illegally in the country and, consequently, be deported in due time. As a bona fide seaman, and through no fault of his own, he will later be detained on board any ship on which he arrives in the United States, due to his deportation. It also seems that a seaman during his convalescence after his ship has left will not be allowed to be a free individual but detained on Ellis Island and not be allowed treatment outside the hospitals. If hospitalization is not needed, the application of the law seems to be that he shall be detained on Ellis Island, although he later, through intervention from the consulate, can be given extension for voluntary departure.

Worse yet seems to be that the McCarran Act can be used for pressing wages down on those foreign ships that are not represented by a union. Also, it has been stated in a report from the Royal Norwegian consulate general to their Embassy in Washington that, due to denial of discharge, new men signed on had to join the ship in addition to the crew (case of MT *Carl J. Hambro* in Boston). Consideration should in those cases be given to ship's accommodations for the seamen, lifeboats, and lifesaving equipment.

SUGGESTIONS FOR APPLICATION OF THE ACT

Rules in the McCarran Act re seamen and shipowners' liability seem to be covered by the following sections of the law:

"Section 101 (a) 15D: Classifying a seaman as nonimmigrant, but liable to pay a fee of $10 for any extension granted according to chapter 9, section 281 (5). Bona fide alien seamen should be able to get an extension without pay, similar to other groups as 101 (a) (15) (F), students, etc.

"Section 212 (a): It seems that this section covers all reasons for which a seaman can be excluded from the United States. As mentioned in the ITF resolution in part 4, free trade unions around the world sympathize with the general purpose of the law, insofar as it is designed to safeguard the democratic way of life. As the individual inspector has full authority to make decisions according to his discretion, it seems that any alien seaman should be given a smooth and easy way to appeal his case to a local authority or committee, whichever is most convenient."

Passports have to be valid at least 6 months ((a) (26)). Those seamen with passports not valid are detained. On Norwegian ships new passports or extension of old ones can be arranged for Norwegian seamen through consular offices. Several cases of the detention reported due to this paragraph, especially seamen on Norwegian ships of other nationalities whose consular offices do not extend passports or issue new ones. Some arrangements could be made in these cases to allow the seaman to visit his consulate for renewal of passports.

"Section 237: Alien seamen seem to be exempted from this paragraph, but their deportation taken care of in section 252. It is a change from the old law, as this section in the old one covered all aliens.

"Section 241: This section will probably have some effect on a few seamen as one of the deportation reasons for nonimmigrants seems to be that he is not allowed to take any job ashore. This has been strictly enforced as it should be, but even a job as dishwasher for one night for an alien seaman might be followed by deportation proceedings without chance for voluntary departure. Foreign representatives in the United States should strive to make this known, and help the authorities in enforcing it. Union representatives should make this quite clear to the seamen.

"Section 242 (a): This section seems to cover our seamen in such a way that they can be released under bond of not less than $500, or be released on conditional parole. It seems that extension of a seaman's leave cannot be had, but after and when he is taken into custody, conditional parole can be given. This means in effect that the seamen in a certain number of days will be released and allowed to ship out. A few cases of this have already been seen. Conditional parole, not bond, could be applied as a rule for bona fide seamen. This section would then give the seamen a chance without deportation. The big question is, of course, if seamen allowed departure will be detained on ship on next arrival, in line with deported seamen. The case told about the seamen on the *Elin Hope* seems to indicate this.

"Section 243 (c): This section gives the shipowner stricter financial responsibility for a period of 5 years for any alien seaman left behind in the United States. In the same section 243 (g) we find that issuing of immigration visas can be discontinued for countries that will not accept any of their citizens deported from the United States.

"CHAPTER 6, SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO ALIEN CREWMEN

"Section 251: This section compels all ships to give information about alien crew members on arrival and departure. If a seaman has landed illegally, this has to be reported. It seems to be according to the old law except maybe that the Attorney General is authorized to prescribe by regulations when a ship shall be deemed to be arriving or departing from the United States.

"Section 252: This section is an important one for alien seamen. If an inspector finds that the seamen are bona fide and with valid papers, he may in his discretion grant a conditional permit to land—

"(1) for a period of time not exceeding 29 days during the time the vessel is in port, if the inspector is convinced that the seaman intends to depart on the same ship.

"(2) 29 days, if the inspector is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart within this period on any other vessel or aircraft."

This permit can be revoked at any time if an inspector finds that the seaman is not bona fide or intends to stay ashore longer than permitted. If a seaman wilfully remains in the United States in excess of allowed time, he can be fined $500—or imprisoned for not more than 6 months or both.

This section is applied so differently in various ports and by various inspectors that it should be changed, either by regulations from the Attorney General or amendment. Permit to land while on the same ship seems to be the easiest one. If this is denied by the inspector, it seems to be no easy way to appeal for the seaman. This should be corrected as a few seamen are detained only because they are unable to understand the language or answer correctly. Those may be affected that earlier were given conditional parole. The questions asked about the moral attitude have been especially questioned by the stewardesses.

1. It therefore seems that it should be easier rules for shore leave (D1).

2. Discharge seems to be impossible because seamen applying for D2 are seldom given that for various reasons:

(a) If shipping is slow, not allowed to sign off.

(b) D1 (shore leave) cannot be changed to D2 (discharge) in any later port of arrival in the United States.

(c) D2 or discharge denied if the seaman cannot name the other vessel on which he will leave the country.

(d) If given D2 (discharge) the various inspectors give different time ashore. Anything up to 29 days. The seamen having been in service up to 20 months on the same ship can be given 10 days, while another after a short service can be given 29 days right away.

(e) Although we are told by the Swedish consulate general in New York that the State Department claims that no extension can be given for seamen with D2, whatever time ashore they have, seamen given less than 29 days have been given extension in New York, if they pay $10—but not more than 29 days. It seems that after the 29 days have elapsed they will be taken into custody, whereafter they can be released on bond or granted conditional parole. A smooth running of the Norwegian ships will be very hard if the above should be followed, and, of course, it means hardship for our seamen. Application of the law therefore ought to be eased up. We suggest:

(1) Easier applicaton of the law for bona fide seamen for shore leave and discharge.

(2) Twenty-nine days should be given as a rule in all cases where discharge was permitted.

(3) D1 (shore leave) should be allowed changed to D2 (discharge) in all ports.

(4) Extension should be granted even after 29 days if the seaman can prove through his consular office, shipping office or union that he has done everything possible to reship, and has been registered for that purpose. No payment for extension should be taken from the seamen.

(5) A bona fide seaman granted conditional parole should not be detained on board on next arrival.

(6) A bona fide seaman detained on ship or taken into custody should be given an easy way to appeal his case in the same port.

(7) It seems to be the application of the law that sick or injured seamen will not be allowed D2 (discharge). We have cases where seamen are taken into custody while under doctor's care. Hospitalization is allowed but not treatment outside the hospital, or convalescence. The only way out of it seems to be that sick or injured seamen on arrival be allowed discharge as before and also if he takes sick or is injured after the first port. His shore leave should of course be 29 days and necessary days to reship after he is fit for duty.

"Section 253: This section covers certain diseases mentioned in 255 and seamen afflicted will be placed in hospital designated by the immigration inspector. Any ship should be allowed to repatriate their seamen even if afflicted with the mentioned diseases.

"Section 254: Seems to be that a ship has duty to detain all seamen until questioned by an inspector and granted shore leave. If not, the ship will be fined.

"Section 255: Covers certain diseases of seamen employed on passenger vessels. Like section 253, they will be hospitalized at the expense of the ship, but the ship can also be given a fine of $50 under certain circumstances. Ships do not employ seamen with those diseases because we always and for anyone signing on any ship have strict rules for medical examinations. If a seaman should take ill after his payoff, our passenger ships have both hospitals, nurses, and doctors on board, and should be allowed to repatriate those afflicted.

"Section 256: According to this section any ship that signs off a seaman without permission from the immigration, can be fined up to $1,000. This section, therefore, must be seen together with sections 252 and 258. According to application of earlier law, a ship was allowed to sign off seamen without special permit, as long as they notified the immigration on departures. Now permit has to be given before discharge, or the ship will be fined. As the ship in all cases has financial responsibility, it seems that notification on departure would be sufficient.

"Section 257: This is stricter regulations than before. As this covers only intention to break immigration rules, it would be only right to enforce it.

"Section 262: This section seems to cover any alien, including seamen, and compels any seaman ashore 30 days or more to be registered and fingerprinted according to Alien Registration Act of 1940. It seems, therefore, that the law can allow more than 29 days ashore. It would be hard for a seaman to comply, because he would have certain duties to report any change of address and so on. We would like to point out that our seamen were fingerprinted during the war, and would have nothing against such a procedure if extension could be granted for a longer period than 29 days, when necessary for shipping foreign. When fingerprinted it would be necessary to explain his duties according to Alien Registration Act of 1940.

"Section 271: This section gives any owner, master, agent, or office a duty to prevent alien from entering the United States in any other port than designated. If sections 252 and 253 are eased this duty will not be too hard to follow. Also see section 256.

"Section 273: This seemed to cover stowaways more than others and gives the ship financial responsibility.

"Section 281: See explanation under section 101 (a) 15d."

Although we understand that enforcement of the act is very strict when it comes to allowing alien seamen discharge in the United States, we would suggest that this be made easier. If a seaman has been on a ship for a certain period of time or wants to change ship for different reasons, it would be a hardship case if D2 were denied. Further, it would not in our opinion stop illegal entries, as some seamen sooner or later would jump ship, instead of signing off legally. If that happened, he would not register for shipping out again, and could not be controlled as easily as those allowed to sign off legally.

All in all it seems that the general purpose of the act can be complied with without inflicting hardship on alien seamen if applied more liberally, and in a way that would give all seamen their traditional and customary freedom of movement, without being forced out with any ship in safe port against their own will.

EXHIBIT B

[Translation from Norwegian by Library of Congress, Nordisk Tidende, February 19, 1953]

NEW MCCARRAN LAW MAY TRANSFORM SICK SEAMEN FROM LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS TO CRIMINALS

(By Odd Halvorsen)

That part of the American McCarran law relating to alien seamen in American ports has proved itself to be impractical and inflexible, it is reported in Norweigian shipping quarters in New York. The law has created "great difficulties for seamen and shipping companies" and, on the whole, has resulted in "very objectionable consequences."

Although, in the beginning, the law was regarded as "literally a threatening collection of earlier regulations in force," and it was believed that in reality a more lenient version would be evolved, the fact is, that despite this belief, some points in the law have been interpreted in a rigorous manner which seems even to "exceed the spirit in which it was framed."

The seamen frankly say that at present when a Norwegian seaman falls ill in New York he is transformed from a "law-abiding citizen to a criminal."

It is further stated, "even when a man has a valid doctor's certificate that he is incapable of working and consequently, for the time being, cannot accept employment, he is hunted as though he were an outlaw by plainclothes American policemen." The police stage raids on seamen at odds with the McCarran law because of sickness or other conditions over which they have no control.

Plainclothes policemen have also posted themselves outside of 115 Broad Street, New York, and have seized seamen who were on their way in or out of the Norwegian general consulate for the purpose of seeking counsel and assistance.

After the arrest the next step is Ellis Island and internment. Here there is little to do but hope for help from outside. The seaman is immediatey isolated in a cell or building.

A number of sick seamen who have been interned on Ellis Island say that the doctor's examination has been superficial and that no consideration is given to sickness or to the care that is required.

The relatively optimistic reception given the McCarran law at the beginning of the year in some Norwegian shipping circles was due to the fact that up to that time only the bare routine part of the law had been enforced. No Norwegian seaman had any difficulty in obtaining permission for shore leave.

The seamen themselves were also optimistic. They believed the law was rather ridiculous but they also said that they could understand why the Americans wished to exercise control.

More recent circumstances, however, have considerably decreased this optimism.

Most of the difficulties have their origin in the sharp difference which exists at present between shore-leave and discharge permits given by the American immigration authorities.

The well-known D1 stamp is a guaranty that the crewman is permitted shore leave up to 29 days while his ship is in port. He is further duty bound to leave port with the same ship.

Crewmen with these regulated shore-leave permits are often in a very difficult position. If they become sick and cannot leave port with the same ship (or, for example, are

hospitalized) they have automatically broken the McCarran law.

The sharp difference between a D1 and a D2—permission to pay off—can create the problems which arise in this case: A ship travels from South America to New Orleans, La., and the crew is provided with D1. It is probable that one or more of them will want to be paid off when the ship arrives in New York. In the meantime, however, in New Orleans they cannot request a D2 and neither can they decline to accept a D1. When they come to New York they cannot, in accordance with present practice, change the shore-leave permit to a discharge permit.

On rare occasions—and, as far as can be determined, quite voluntarily—it has happened that a D1 has been changed to a D2. Technically this is possible and it is difficult to understand why it is refused in so many cases.

Meanwhile the captain of this ship from South America may have signed on new crewmen in New York. But the crewmen with the D1's cannot be paid off and the captain cannot muster those newly hired unless he leaves with an extra crew.

Even if a person is declared a bona fide seaman and all technical details seem to be in order, it does not necessarily follow that he will get a D2 if he desires to be paid off. It seems that the immigration inspectors have supervision over all Norwegian seamen in the country and that they take cognizance of all of them in their treatment of each application for being paid off.

Thus the unhampered mustering process has been considerably restricted as will be apparent from this and earlier cited examples.

With a certain grim humor it has been stated here in New York that as far as we know the best way to get a discharge accepted has been to guarantee a seaman's stay on land and to buy a return ticket home for him. Or a seaman may do it himself, if he is the one who wishes a discharge.

Also, according to the McCarran law a seaman who is granted a discharge permit may count on a stay of 29 days ashore. In practice, however, as a rule, permits for shorter periods are given, usually for 10 days. If the seaman has not been hired in the course of these 10 days, it is possible to request an extension of the permit. For this he must pay a fee of $10. Theoretically he may also be required to pay a fee of $20 during his shore leave.

The 29 days' stay is now much more strictly enforced than previously. A seaman may be discharged the 1st of the month. On the 20th he may hire out again but his ship may not arrive before the 3d of the next month. On the 29th he is taken to Ellis Island and he is not given his freedom until his ship arrives.

Under present conditions there does not seem to be any possibility of escaping internment on Ellis Island after 29 days ashore.

Two internment incidents have created an especially strong resentment among the seamen who are now ashore in New York.

The first concerns two seaman, Trygve Kornerud and Skule Stein Flathaug, both of whom came to New York from Colombia on Saturday, January 10, on the motor transport *Wilchief*. New York was the first American port of entry.

On arrival they both felt ill and wished to see a doctor. Meanwhile there was no possibility of being paid off and the papers of each were stamped "D1."

The same morning Kornerud was declared sick at the Norwegian health office and was given permission to visit a specialist. The same afternoon Flathaug also was sent to a specialist who declared him sick.

Later they presented themselves at one of the immigration offices, Flathaug after his ship had left port—a fact which he also pointed out. Both of them were told to come back again when they had recovered, presumably to obtain a "D2."

After the declaration of sickness both were under a doctor's care. Flathaug, moreover, was in a hospital for several days. Both had been declared sick when they were arrested outside of the general consulate on the 19th or 20th of January. Plainclothes policemen inquired about their papers. They had a "D1" and their ship had left.

They were brought to the immigration office where they were examined. Then they were sent to Ellis Island. Kornerud pointed out that he was under special medical treatment but no attention was paid to this fact and he was placed in a prison cell together with 50 others.

When they were released several days later, it was because the general consulate had taken action. They were notified that they were to leave the country before the middle of February. Kornerud, who had continued to be sick, left January 27 for Norway for further treatment.

The second case concerns Kristian Larsen on the *Taurus*. He was suffering from a rupture and on January 28 was declared sick at the Norwegian doctor's office.

In order to provide himself with a formal statement of his condition he went, together with a representative of the ship's agent, to the immigration office, 70 Columbus Avenue, in Manhattan. He had with him a letter from the agent and in this letter it was clearly stated that Larsen was to return home on the *Stavangerfjord*, February 24 (his first opportunity for departure, since the *Stavangerfjord* had left New York the day before, and the *Osloffjord* was employed for cruises). At that time the *Taurus* was still in port but it was to leave the same day.

Larsen was arrested and sent to Ellis Island.

Three days later he was released after he had signed an order of conditional parole.

A Norwegian shipping official commented on the situation by saying, 'it seems as if the Norwegian representatives—both public and private—here in New York take pride in cooperating with the Americans. Therefore, it is so very difficult to understand the position of the Americans."

The case of Kristian Larsen seems to remove all support for the suggested procedure which the shipping companies' Arbeidsgiverforening (employers' society) sent to ship captains for use in cases of sickness.

According to this plan the captain is required to request shore leave permission for a doctor's visit, or hospital treatment if necessary, on behalf of the sick seaman. The immigration inspector issues a conditional shore leave permit and the seaman receives a copy. This does not give him the right to remain ashore as an ambulatory patient and merely indicates that the immigration inspector has made the inspection.

The captain also is responsible, it is further stated, for providing that the seaman is immediately given a written certification by the ship's agent which states his condition and which he must always carry with him. The declaration is written in triplicate and includes indisputable information that shore leave was requested on the arrival of the ship, and that the decision was made by the inspector. It must also be shown that the seaman is not discharged. When he is well, he must turn to the consulate for further assistance.

Another consequence of the McCarran law is that seamen often take the first job that presents itself, in order to avoid the consequences which are involved in overstaying shore leave.

In the period February 2–10, 15 men took jobs which were below their qualifications: mechanic, cabin boy; seaman, apprentice seaman; oiler, mess boy; boatswain, mess boy; mechanic, mess boy; mechanic, oiler; ordinary seaman, apprentice seaman; carpenter, oiler; mechanic, oiler; ordinary seaman, mess boy; seaman, galley boy; ordinary seaman, mess boy; carpenter, reserve man; first macinist, third machinist; and mechanic, machine boy.

In January there were four more similar cases.

EXHIBIT C

[From the New Leader]

WHO IS FIGHTING THE MCCARRAN ACT?—FOES OF THE IMMIGRATION LAW ARE NOW BEING FALSELY SMEARED AS "PRO-COMMUNIST"

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator from Minnesota)

Political controversy has reached a new low when supporters of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Exclusion Act are content to defend their position merely by stating that Communists oppose the law. Whatever differences—and they have been serious—I have had with Senator MCCARRAN, I have no doubt that he is a sincere anti-Communist as he sees it. But he has done his cause great damage by choosing to pin the Communist label irresponsibly on those who differ with him in vital areas of legislation. Such irresponsibility gravely damages the cause of serious, effective anticommunism.

The Senate passed the McCarran-Walter Act over the President's veto by the narrow margin of two votes. Those of us who opposed the bill debated it extensively and presented detailed analyses of its undesirable provisions. Senator MCCARRAN ignored our arguments, refused to discuss the bill on the merits, and instead was satisfied to show in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Daily Worker and the Communist Party didn't like him or his bill. More recently, he has been distributing under his frank hundreds of thousands of copies of an irresponsible article by Herbert G. Moore in a magazine called the National Republic. This article states that the McCarran Act is a good law because the Communists denounced it and because a substitute measure was prepared by friends of Communists. This logic is strange, indeed; by the same reasoning, Senator MCCARRAN and his friends would have to support germ warfare, Trotskyism, and lynching, which Communists also denounce.

Fixing our national policies by supporting whatever the Daily Worker denounces is a dangerous practice, whether used by liberals or by conservatives. Thus, I recall vividly that many liberals attacked Senator TAFT on the grounds that his votes on foreign affairs matched those of Vito Marcantonio. That, too, was unjust. To attack and defeat communism, we cannot automatically accept everything they happen to oppose, nor can we reject any decent proposals simply because Communists find it tactically wise to support them. To be freemen, we must think for ourselves.

The record shows that the McCarran-Walter Act shuts the doors of America in the faces of thousands of refugees and would-be refugees from communism who, if they were admitted to our land, would prove formidable fighters for democracy. We find that section 212 (a) (10) of that act excludes from our shores any immigrant from a Communist country if the Communist police give him a sufficiently bad police record. In other words, our State and Justice Departments are obligated to follow the decisions of the Communist MVD; a man who is hounded by Communist police becomes a criminal to American immigration authorities. It is therefore quite possible that when the Communists attack the McCarran-Walter Act, they are actually trying to make sure that millions of patriotic Americans will support this act. Certainly, the act is a potent weapon for stirring up anti-American feeling all over the world, wherever the impact of its exclusionist policies is being felt.

In opposing the McCarran Act, Senate liberals offered two substitute measures: the

Lehman-Humphrey bill (known as the short bill) and the Humphrey-Lehman bill (known as the long bill.) Senator McCarran and the National Republic claim the short bill was written by friends of Communists. Now the record shows that this bill consisted of 8 sections, 4 of which were substantially identical with provisions of the McCarran-Walter bill and none of which let down any existing bars against subversives or criminals.

As a matter of fact, Senator McCarran also complained that the draftsmen of the long bill had stolen his ideas. In several instances, the substitute legislation was so clearly a better technical drafting job than the McCarran-Walter bill that, at the end of the debate, Senator McCarran accepted 21 amendments taken from the Humphrey-Lehman drafts.

Insofar as our bill contained provisions not covered by the McCarran-Walter bill, these provisions were strongly anti-Communist. They would have given a preference—within the fixed maximum of our immigration quota, which was not changed—to refugees from Iron Curtain lands, to scientists needed in defense industries, and to relatives of American citizens, regardless of country or origin. Also, the short bill would have curbed the powers of immigration officers by establishing the Attorney General's Board of Immigration Appeals on a statutory basis. Finally, the bill would have given quota-exempt status to foreigners who enlist in the United States Army and to children, orphaned by totalitarian warfare and extermination campaigns, who are adopted by American families. Each of these proposals is diametrically opposed to Communist interests. How they could have helped communism Senator McCarran never tells us. Instead, his act's defenders circulate the charge that alternative bills were drafted by friends of Communists.

What are the facts? The Lehman-Humphrey bill was introduced on October 20, 1951, by a bipartisan group of Senators, comprising Senators Hendrickson, Ives, Langer, Morse, Benton, Douglas, Gillette, Humphrey, Kefauver, Kilgore, Lehman, Magnuson, Moody, Murray, and Pastore. Several of these Senators had taken the lead in exposing Communist agents at home and abroad; others had made fine records in advancing countermeasures against communism in the field of foreign relations. The bill these Senators introduced was drafted by the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the United States Senate, a regular agency of the Federal Government established to give technical assistance to all Senators in drafting legislation.

We also discussed the problem with experts. One of these experts—whom the National Republic tries to smear—is Felix S. Cohen (a frequent New Leader contributor—Editor). One of the country's outstanding experts in legislative drafting, and a former law-school professor on that subject, his services in drafting or interpreting legislation had been commanded by such organizations as the International Rescue Committee, the Federal Council of Churches, the National Board of the YWCA, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Lutheran Council, the Unitarian Service Committee, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Church World Service.

Mr. Cohen's role in the Lehman-Humphrey immigration bill was to give the sort of technical assistance an experienced legislative draftsman can give, after the objectives of a bill have been fixed, to make sure that these objectives are not thwarted by ambiguous wording or by failure to consider all the technicalities of existing law.

Now I would like to discuss, for a moment, Mr. Cohen's record in fighting communism—not because he needs defending, but to show the type of man whom the McCarran-Walter act's defenders are calling names. In recent years, three outstanding steps have been taken against communism: (1) the exposure of covert Communist agents at home, who exercised a great and malevolent influence during the Red decade; (2) the program of economic assistance to anti-Communist peoples abroad, and (3) the Voice of America. In each of these measures, Felix S. Cohen played a large part.

Consider, first, the long flight for adequate measures to expose the agents of communism. In 1940 a group of anti-Communist lawyers, including Mr. Cohen, were deeply concerned at indications of State Department incompetence in handling Communist agents. Congress had passed, in 1938, the Foreign Agent Registration Act, designed to throw the pitiless spotlight of publicity upon secret Communist agents. Enforcement of the act was entrusted to the State Department. How that trust had miscarried was revealed in the report prepared by Felix S. Cohen, released on June 13, 1941, and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 14, 1941, by Congressman Jerry Voorhis of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The following excerpts show the thrust of this report:

"An objective analysis of the operations of the Foreign Agent Registration Act must convince any unprejudiced observer that the act has been rendered a dead letter, of no practical importance in exposing the propaganda activities it was designed to expose. * * * Chief responsibility * * * must be laid at the door of the State Department. * * *

"An examination of the State Department files does not reveal the names of any of the Communist leaders in this country. Yet the Communist Party's organizational manual says: 'The decisions of the executive committee of the Communist International are binding for all parties belonging to the Comintern, and must be promptly carried out.' * * *

"Apparently no efforts have been made by the Department to use the press, radio, and other channels in accordance with the intent of the framers of the act. * * * The regulations issued by the State Department for the enforcement of the act make it inevitable that the information that Congress wanted is not collected. This result is reached by exempting the most dangerous propagandists from the requirements of the act, by omitting from the registration forms all questions relating to details of the agent's propaganda activities, and by inserting a series of loopholes which have the effect of facilitating evasion of the purposes of the act" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 13, pp. A4417–A4419).

In line with these criticisms, Congress, by the McKellar-Sumners Act of 1942, transferred responsibility for administering the laws relating to registration from the Secretary of State to the Attorney General, and otherwise tightened up most of the loopholes to which Mr. Cohen's study had called attention.

Another step in our resistance to world communism was the Marshall plan. (Let it be recalled at this point that Senator McCarran himself repeatedly voted against appropriations for mutual security, and against military aid to Greece and Turkey.) Felix S. Cohen, then Associate Solicitor of the Interior Department and Chairman of its Board of Appeals, was one of the members of the interdepartmental committee that drafted the original Marhall-plan legislation. He later helped draft legislation sponsored by Senator MUNDT, extending the principles of this plan to India.

Another major step taken by the United States against communism was the organization of a sound campaign of psychological warfare, symbolized by the Voice of America. A report edited by Felix Cohen, Combating Totalitarian Propaganda, sounded what was probably the first call for an effective American propaganda compaign against totalitarianism. This was in June 1941.

In 1943, Mr. Cohen coauthored a more detailed study demonstrating the need for a Voice of America. This study pointed out that vast sums were being spent on Communist propaganda warfare directed against our democracy, operating through a vast solar system of organizations dominated by totalitarian loyalty and discipline, and that the Federal Government was blocked by a series of obsolete statutes from replying.

Five years later, Congress authorized the organization of an effective counterpropaganda campaign against world communism. Senator LEHMAN and I voted with Senator MUNDT to secure adequate appropriations for the Voice of America and other agencies of this anti-Communist campaign; Senator McCARRAN opposed these efforts.

In addition, Felix S. Cohen helped lead the anti-Communist forces in the National Lawyers Guild during the early years of that organization. When the Soviet Union invaded Finland in 1939, he drafted and secured guild adoption of a resolution condemning the Soviet aggression, notwithstanding the opposition of guild leaders Harry Sacher, Louis McCabe, Carol Weiss King, and Mortimer Riemer. A few months later, Mr. Cohen, former Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle, Jr., and other distinguished officials and judges in the guild challenged candidates for guild office to record their opposition to communism. When this challenge was rejected, they resigned en masse from the guild.

Another fine American whom the National Republic must presumably regard as pro-Communist is Monsignor O'Grady, who was one of the stalwart opponents of the McCarran Act throughout its legislative history. Ordained in Dublin, Monsignor O'Grady came to the United States in 1912 and studied at Catholic University. He has been dean of Catholic University's School of Social Work, the organizer of Catholic Charities in Washington, and general secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities for 31 years. We are proud to have been associated with him in our effort to pass a humane immigration act. I was interested, incidentally, to read excerpts from a recent speech he made in Rome, in which he said that the McCarran Act was driving many Italians into Communist ranks.

Whatever one may think of the merits or demerits of the McCarran-Walter Act—and reasonable men may differ on that—there is no reason to identify opposition to the act as Communist-inspired. Indiscriminate attacks upon men who have been pioneers in the campaign to expose Communist propaganda can only serve to betray America. Those Americans who recklessly cry "Communist" whenever anybody disagrees with them are making it easier than ever for the Communists to isolate America from its friends throughout the world and to paralyze us internally with a network of mutual suspicions.

EXHIBIT D

[From the Washington Star of February 22, 1953]

IMMIGRATION—MANY CHURCH GROUPS ARE SEEKING A LAW MORE LENIENT THAN THE McCARRAN ACT

(By Caspar Nannes)

The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, which has stirred up a hornet's nest in many quarters, is facing the stern opposition of some of the Nation's most influential church groups.

Since it took effect last December 24, charges of discrimination, bigotry, and injustice have been leveled against the act. But it has been as vehemently defended.

President Eisenhower has added to the debate by urging Congress to review the legislation and by remarking that it contains injustices and, in fact, discriminates.

There is, among church people, widespread agreement that the present law has improved past legislation in many respects, such as unifying the confused mass of immigration law. They are now, according to Miss Sarah Weadick of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, "for the first time, all in one place."

SOME BARRIERS LOWERED

The act has removed existing racial barriers to admissibility and citizenship, though not as completely as many would like. It has, also for the first time, set up a system of selective immigration whereby 50 percent of all quotas is for qualified immigrants having "higher education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability" whose presence here would benefit the country.

These and other provisions, including removal of sex discriminatory rules, have provided defenders with strong arguments.

The major point of revisionists' objections centers around retention of the quota system, in use since 1924. Quotas are assigned to various countries in proportion to the number of people of that racial stock living here in 1920. As a result two-thirds of all quota numbers are given to Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany, with few using the former two. This lopsided system is further attacked because no provision is made so natives of countries having sharply limited and oversubscribed quotas could fill unused quotas.

At present, under the immigration formula of one-tenth of 1 percent of our country's population, as determined by the most recent census, 154,657 persons may enter the United States. The previous quota ratio was one-sixth of 1 percent, which would admit 251,162 immigrants.

MANY STATEMENTS ISSUED

During the past 6 months various church bodies, at regular meeting, have issued statements on the law. The latest came this month from the 4-million-member National Lutheran Council. This group expressed satisfaction at General Eisenhower's request for a review of existing immigration legislation and called on Congress to adopt a just and workable substitute for the national-origins quota system.

A similar statement was approved by the National Council of Churches last December at Denver, Colo. The American Baptist Convention passed a resolution urging Congress to revise the law so it would be more in keeping with our democratic tradition, providing for a flexibility in making adjustments between national quotas and removing all discriminatory provisions based upon considerations of race, color, or sex.

The Disciples of Christ approved a more or less similar motion. The triennial General Convention of the Episcopal Church last September also called for a review of the policy on immigration.

The Baltimore Annual Conference, the Methodist Church, last June asked for a veto of the law and called on Congress to enact a measure which will uphold the principles and ideals of democracy and Christian citizenship and avoid unfair discrimination.

Bruce M. Mohler, director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference Bureau of Immigration, recently reviewed the Catholic Church's long-standing opposition to the 1920 quota policy as unfair, unscientific, and highly discriminatory.

Jewish religious bodies have practically unanimously urged that the present law be completely rewritten. Six major national Jewish organizations issued a statement to this effect on January 1.

Warnings that the new immigration law imperils previous American standards have come from many Washington church leaders. Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam charges the good in the McCarran-Walter immigration and nationality law is submerged in bad philosophy, archaic provisions and un-American procedures. It should be repealed and a new law enacted with flexible quota system, without discrimination based upon race, color, or sex, with American procedures for fair hearings and appeals in deportation proceedings.

Dr. Joseph M. Dawson, executive director, Baptist joint committee on public affairs, stated a majority of southern Baptists agree with most other church groups in wishing long-range legislation removing discriminatory provisions.

PRESBYTERIAN OPINION

The Reverend Howard F. Gebhart, chairman of the Social Education and Action Committee, Washington City Presbytery, said, "I'm quite sure that I speak the voice of the Presbytery in holding for a broader immigration program for our Nation than that presently prescribed by law." The Reverend William J. Lineback, general secretary, Capital Area Christian Missionary Society (Disciples of Christ), declared American immigration policy "ought not to be a static thing, nor one characterized as exclusive or unfairly favoring one nation over another," and urged that unused quotas each year be "pooled" among other nations.

A warning that "many Italians, on the basis of complete disillusionment in regard to our immigration legislation may vote for the Communists in the next election" was voiced by Msgr. John O'Grady, general secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, in Rome last month.

On the other hand, the National Association of Evangelicals has asserted "it is generally thought by evangelical circles here that the 3 years' hard work of the House and Senate Immigration Committees, has produced a decidedly improved bill and one that would probably meet the approval of the majority of loyal United States citizens."

Miss Weadick pointed out that while opponents have been protesting the national-origins formula none of them has "ever suggested a substitute. It would seem, therefore, that any wide, open-door policy is not going to get very far unless some definite, spelled-out substitute for the national-origins plan is submitted to the congressional committees."

The Reverend De Loss M. Scott, pastor of the National Tabernacle here, said, "If ever we needed legislation to protect our country from an influx of undesirable aliens who are opposed to our American policy and way of life, it is now. However, it is possible that in barring such we may, at the same time, bar those who are desirable and of inestimable value for our land of America. In the light of this it would seem that a further careful study with possible revisions at certain points, would be of value to all concerned."

It is natural that disagreements will arise on such a sensitive measure as the immigration law. But with general good will on all sides, rather than much of the acerbity that has marked past discussions, a law containing the best American ideals to fit the difficult problem should be achieved.

EXHIBIT E

[From America magazine of February 21, 1953]

CATHOLIC VIEWS ON OUR IMMIGRATION LAW

(By Clement S. Mihanovich)

The McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act, passed by Congress last July over the veto of President Truman, has been subject to close scrutiny and sharp criticism by Catholics in the United States.

In order to promote a deeper understanding of the McCarran-Walter Act, to secure something of a unified opinion toward it among Catholics and to find out what should be recommended to overcome its deficiencies and correct its errors, the writer conducted a 2-day institute on immigration in St. Louis, October 23–24, 1952. The institute, held under the auspices of St. Louis University, was sponsored by Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter, of St. Louis. Msgr. John O'Grady gave me guidance and full support. Over 50 immigration experts, mostly Catholic, were present for the institute. The conclusions of this institute may, in a broad sense, be characterized as typical Catholic views on immigration. However, the writer does not wish to convey the impression that the views he expresses here are necessarily shared by all Catholics. Opinions are bound to vary on such a subject.

The institute objected to and criticized, among others, the following provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act (Public Law 414; S. 2550, H. R. 5678):

1. Assigning 50 percent of the quotas to those of high education, technical training, specialized experiences, etc. (sec. 203 (a) (1)).

2. Eliminating college and university professors from the class of quota-exempt immigrants (sec. 101 (a) (26) (F)).

3. Drastically curtailing the admission of colored persons (sec. 202 (c) (1)).

4. Establishing a special inferior status for persons of Asiatic extraction, including Filipinos (sec. 202 (b)).

5. Requiring American consuls to follow decisions of courts of foreign nations in excluding immigrants from admission to the United States (sec. 212 (a) (10)).

6. Requiring rigid tests for admission of skilled or unskilled workers (sec. 212 (a) (14)).

7. Barring all immigrants who, in the opinion of a consular officer, are "likely at any time to become public charges" (sec. 212 (a) (15)).

8. Allowing immigration by members of totalitarian groups who reformed before entry (sec. 212 (a) (28) (1)), while requiring deportation of those who reform after entry (sec. 241 (a) (6)).

9. Abolishing existing statutes of limitation in deportation cases. Allowing deportation for alleged acts 50 years past (sec. 242).

10. Making all grounds of deportation retroactive (sec. 241 (d)).

11. Authorizing deportation of immigrants who are mistakenly classified as "public charges" (sec. 241 (a) (8)).

12. Requiring deportation of immigrants who become addicted to the use of narcotic drugs after entry (sec. 241 (a) (11)).

13. Practically eliminating judicial review of deportation cases in many instances (sec. 241).

14. Abolishing the confidential character of social-security files (sec. 290 (c)).

15. Subjecting the acquisition of citizenship to a series of new requirements retroactively covering the entire life of the applicant (secs. 313, 316, 318).

16. The interrogation of any citizen if an immigration official believes him to be an alien (sec. 287 (a) (1)).

17. The termination of the right of American citizens to be immune from search or official interrogation without a warrant (sec. 287 (c)).

18. Institutional denaturalization proceedings against any naturalized citizen at the instigation of any private informer who files a proper affidavit, for acts which were not grounds for denaturalization when the naturalized citizen acquired citizenship. (Sec. 340 (a)).

19. The abolition, in certain cases, of the right of an American citizen to court review if his citizenship is challenged by a consul or other officer (sec. 340 (c)).

20. Allowing extremely restricted and minimum quotas for various Asiatic countries while subjecting persons born in the Western Hemisphere to "ancestry" quotas (sec. 202 (b)).

These are only the major objections that we have to the act. As can be readily seen, all these provisions would subject over 10 million foreign-born Americans to special

police controls operating without regard to due process as hitherto defined. Furthermore, naturalized citizens and immigrants will be subject to such subjective and ambiguous standards as "the satisfaction of the Attorney General," "the opinion of the Attorney General," etc., as well as to the arbitrary powers granted to consular and immigration officers.

These objections and many others were studied by our institute on immigration. Upon the completion of the institute a number of recommendations were presented to the attending members, who unanimously agreed on the necessity of revision or eradication of all the above provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act.

The writer himself believes that there are many provisions in the act that must be removed or changed if we are to keep our constitutional integrity and if we are to convince the peoples of the world that we are a truly democratic nation. Among many changes that the writer recommends are the following:

1. In many of its provisions, as stated above, the McCarran-Walter Act modifies or eliminates existing judicial decisions. This must be corrected to conform to traditional and established practice and to prevent the possibility, which actually exists under the act, of denaturalizing an American citizen upon notice of less than 1 day.

2. When determinations are to be made in regard to the act they should be made on the basis of facts and not upon the opinions of minor officials.

3. The prospective immigrants should not be subjected to the requirement of duplicate examinations by two different agencies. Under the act, the case of a prospective immigrant is examined first by the State Department (consular official) and then again by the Department of Justice (Immigration and Naturalization Service). This duplicate examination is a waste of time and taxpayers' money, in addition to being something of an indignity imposed upon the applicant.

4. A statutory board should be provided to handle appeals from all official decisions on visas, passports, and other immigration matters. There is no adequate appeal under the act from many immigration decisions, such as consular decisions or denials of visas.

5. The Nationality Act of 1940 sharply limits the right of a naturalized citizen to live abroad without loss of American citizenship, although no such limitation was placed upon native-born citizens.

6. The Immigration and Nationality Act continues the provisions of the Internal Security Act (1950) concerning membership in subversive organizations. In these provisions the act again discriminates against naturalized citizens.

7. The basis of immigration in the United States should not be one of racial discrimination. The writer agrees with James Finucane, associate secretary of the National Conference for Prevention of War, that, for the immediate future, at least, we should merge the national-origins quota principle with two other principles—(a) the size of the population of the country from which the intended immigrant comes and (b) its need for immigration. Something of a complicated mathematical formula will result, but justice would be more nearly approached than it is now. In this formula we must not forget the problem of the expellees. Neither must we forget the hundreds of thousands of children fathered by American soldiers in Germany, France, Japan, etc. Our approach to these problems should be a Christian one, based on both justice and charity.

A formula such as the one presented above would go far to erase racial, religious, and ethnic discriminations that now exist in our immigration laws. Any such formula must have as its guiding stars the three following principles: (a) The history of our country; (b) Christian and American concepts of democracy; (c) the role our country plays in the world today.

In summary, it may be stated that the writer, as well as all who attended the St. Louis Institute on Immigration, agreed upon the following:

1. All were for a positive pro-immigrant philosophy and objected to present anti-alien philosophy.

2. All opposed parts of Public Law 414; none completely approved it.

3. All called for definite and drastic changes in Public Law 414.

4. All based their opposition to Public Law 414 on Christian ethics, American foreign policy, good economics, and the Constitution of the United States.

5. All agreed that the present national-origins quota system should be eliminated.

6. All agreed that college and university professors should be admitted on a non-quota basis.

7. All agreed that non-used quotas should be pooled, especially if the national origins quota system could not be eliminated.

8. All opposed the present undue preference given to skilled labor in immigration quotas.

9. All condemned the undue power given to American consular officials abroad.

10. All agreed that quotas should be based on the 1950 census composition of our population instead of the 1920 census used in the act.

11. All agreed that the present deportation provisions should be at least tempered, if not abolished, except for fraud or illegal entry.

12. All agreed that the present distinctions in Public Law 414 between native-born and naturalized citizens should be eliminated.

13. All agreed to advocate the reinstatement of the statutes of limitation.

It would be no exaggeration to state that a liberal and fair immigration law can do more to win for the United States the good will of the peoples of the world than most of our past and present global-aid programs, on which we have spent tens of billions of dollars.

EXHIBIT F

ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION BEFORE THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS, BROOKLYN DIVISION, JANUARY 28, 1953

In May of last year, when the United States Senate was debating the McCarran immigration bill, I received an interesting letter from some old Americans who supported my stand against that bill. They wanted me to know that in opposing Senator MCCARRAN'S bill they had no personal ax to grind. Here is what my old friends had to say:

"We are not immediately threatened by laws to stop immigration and to deport men and women born abroad," they said.

"Sometimes we wish we had established such a law in 1492."

That letter was signed by five American Indian leaders.

I think that these words can be a good reminder to all of us, whether we trace our ancestry to the *Mayflower*, whether we are Sons or Daughters of the American Revolution, or whether we personally stepped ashore in 1900, in 1925, or in 1945 that, in the historical perspective, we are all new Americans. All of us came here as refugees from the Old World, seeking a new home and new opportunity in America. All of us made our contribution to the development of this country.

But ever since the creation of our Republic there have been some people whose position on immigration has been: "Thank God we are here. Now let's bolt the door."

But that view, ladies and gentlemen, is not the prevailing view in America today. It is not the view of the President's Commission on Immigration which recently reported to the country after an exhaustive study of immigration problems. It is not the view of scores of fraternal nationality, patriotic, and religious organizations in America, and it is not the view of our Jewish synagogues and our Protestant and Catholic churches.

This Sunday I read a report in the New York Times of a speech made in Rome by my friend Msgr. John O'Grady speaking of the McCarran Act. He said:

"There is a great danger lest many Italians on the basis of complete disillusionment in regard to our immigration legislation may vote for the Communists in the next election. * * * It is conceivable that by reason of our immigration legislation Italy could go over to the Communists during the next few months."

Monsignor O'Grady, who was one of the stalwart fighters during the last Congress against the McCarran Act, who served on President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, and who tirelessly continued his efforts for more humane and decent immigration legislation consistent with American traditions is living proof of my conviction that the spirit of America, the spirit of our people, and the spirit of our religious traditions rejects the notion that there is room for discrimination and bigotry in our immigration laws.

I likewise want to pay my tribute to the American Jewish Congress and its representatives for the leadership they have taken in this vital area of our public life. When the McCarran bill was before the Judiciary Committee the American Jewish Congress authorized Will Maslow, its general counsel, to testify against the bill.

I want to share with you part of his testimony to the committee. In that statement he clarified the real issues in our immigration legislation. He pointed out that the real defect in the McCarran Act and in our immigration laws to date is that they are based on system of selecting immigrants not on the basis of their capacity but on a wholly irrelevant factor—the place of their birth.

One of the Members of Congress questioned Mr. Maslow and asked him whether the nationality quota system which decides that people should enter the United States on the basis of their place of birth was not in fact a good system because it encouraged those to enter the United States who could easily be assimilated into the United States while it discouraged those who found assimilation difficult. Mr. Maslow replied:

"Now that takes us to what is meant by the term 'assimilation' . . . And I think that what we mean by the term 'assimilation' is that people shall come to this country who are in sympathy with its ideals, who believe in the things which make America America. We do not care particularly whether they eat foreign food. In fact, there may be some value to this country if we vary our national diet, if we have spaghetti and smorgasbord, gefilte fish and suki-yaki. We do not think that those factors detract from assimilation, but we want people in this country who believe in democracy, who believe in representative government, who believe that America's contribution has not been the atom bomb or the television screen, but the words of the Declaration of Independence, and who believe that all men are equal, not merely that all Anglo-Saxons are equal. If we judge assimilation on that basis, then we cannot take a concept based upon place of birth."

That is a spirit which I highly commend. It is a statement which I share.

There is one further observation which I would like to make in this connection. I know that in your activities in behalf of more democratic and humane immigration legislation, you are acting selflessly and not thinking primarily of your own, because there are relatively few Jews left in Europe desiring to come to these shores. I am aware of the unfortunate fact that most of the people

to whom you would have wanted to extend a helping hand, people kept out of this country in the thirties by the national origins principle, are now dead, the victims of the most horrible crime against humanity. The whispering campaign of the bigots that the fight against the McCarran Act is a Jewish fight, designed to bring in more Jews, is, therefore, as untrue and unjustified as are all similar campaigns. In fact, even insofar as the displaced persons legislation was concerned, that was not a Jewish fight. Only 18 percent of all the displaced persons who came into the United States were Jewish. Here again it is clear that to raise the Jewish question is untrue and unjustified. I must say that I was very sorry and shocked to see such a campaign reach the floor of the Congress.

Most of the members of the European Jewish community who survived the Hitler era are resettled now, either in Israel or elsewhere. There are still some Jewish displaced persons left in Europe and there are some who, in the thirties, found refuge in the Far East. There is also the ever-present danger to Jewish communities in Arab countries. Yet, as the facts submitted to the Presidential Commission demonstrated, the world population problems are of much more gigantic proportions, involving many other ethnic and religious groups. From those facts I would gather that not more than 3 percent of the people who constituted the major population problems which were listed were of Jewish origin.

Until a few weeks ago, all of us thought that the problem of rescuing and resettling Jewish survivors had been nearly solved. Your participation in the fight for better immigration legislation was thus unquestionably motivated by the broadest altruistic considerations.

What hardly any of us clearly anticipated during the fight against the McCarran bill was the sudden stepping-up of officially-sponsored anti-Semitism in the Soviet sphere. As of today we still don't know how far that ruthless group in the Kremlin intends to go. But we must face the brutal fact that if it will serve their purposes, the men responsible for Katyn will not bat an eyelash at creating another Auschwitz. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that the number of Jews among escapees from behind the Iron Curtain will suddenly increase in the near future.

It is to enable us to cope with sudden emergencies of this nature and to help us make our contribution to the solution of world population problems, that we oppose the rigid, racist national origins principle. We know, of course, that the United States, standing alone, cannot solve all of the world's ills, in the population field or any other field. We know that in order to preserve the stability of our complex economic system, we must limit immigration in accordance with absorptive capacity.

I have heard the senior Senator from Nevada accuse those of us who opposed his bill of trying to raise the floodgates of America. If he had studied our bill, the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill, he would have found that aside from placing parents of citizens and a few other special groups in the non-quota category, we would have raised quota immigration by the amount of from 150,000 to 250,000 annually. To express it differently, we would increase the immigration ratio from 1 immigrant per year for every 1,000 Americans to 1 immigrant for every 600 Americans. I have great difficulty trying to visualize how 1 alien immigrant can inundate 600 Americans.

I was happy to note that our position was vindicated in the testimony before the President's Commission. Your own organization suggested an increase in quota immigration to 300,000 annually. The Secretary of Labor declared that according to studies undertaken by his Department we can absorb several hundred thousand immigrants every year without placing any burden on our economy. The Secretary of Agriculture, a former acting director of the Bureau of the Census, the late Philip Murray of the CIO, Boris Shishkin of the A. F. of L., and many others took a similar position. And the Commission's recommendation was an increase in quota immigration to 250,000.

You may wonder just how the other side justifies its stand against this weight of authority. The answer can be found in Senate Report 1515 of the 81st Congress, printed back in 1950. That report cites with approval the view that "the economic optimum population of the United States is at least several million less than the present population and may be as low as one hundred million." This philosophy seems to go back 150 years to the teachings of Malthus and Ricardo, to the idea of a fixed number of job opportunities and the suggestion that population must be limited if available economic resources are to satisfy everyone.

Against this pessimism of the neo-Malthusians, we assert our faith in the limitless opportunities of our great democratic society. We do not believe that there are already 60 million too many of us. We believe that with our American spirit of enterprise and through intelligent management of our resources we can attain ever greater heights of economic development for a long time to come.

As you know, since 1924 quota immigration has been limited to 150,000 annually. This number has actually been cut further by the operation of the national-origins principle under which we can expect not more than about 70,000 to enter the country annually. When Senator McCarran introduced his first immigration bill, he included a device to make a substantial further cut in immigration. Each quota was to be split into a number of preference categories for people with special skills, parents of citizens, and so forth. Not only could there be no reassignment of numbers from one quota to another, but there wouldn't have been any reassignment from one preference category to another within the same quota. This proposal might have cut immigration to 20,000 or even less.

In view of the sharp criticism directed against this provision, it was finally dropped from the bill.

But one provision to which the Senator and his followers hung on through all the turmoil and trouble was the national-origins principle.

The national origins-quota system was first placed on our statute books in 1924. Its discriminatory background was at that time freely admitted and in the House majority report we find the following frank language:

"With full recognition of the material progress which we owe to the races from southern and eastern Europe, we are conscious that the continued arrival of great numbers tends to upset our balance of population, to depress our standard of living, and to unduly charge our institutions for the care of the socially inadequate.

"If immigration from southern and eastern Europe may enter the United States on a basis of substantial equality with that admitted from the older sources of supply, it is clear that if any appreciable number of immigrants are allowed to land upon our shores the balance or racial preponderance must in time pass to those elements of the population who reproduce more rapidly on a lower standard of living than those possessing other ideals."

One of the Congressmen supported the bill stated this point even more bluntly:

"Were the immigrants now flooding our shores possessed of the same traits, characteristics, and blood of our forefathers, I would have no concern upon the problem confronting us, because, in the main, they belonged to the same branch of the Aryan race."

But the new immigrants, he declared were of a different kind and were essentially unassimilable.

Let me read you the statement of one of the supporters of the McCarran-Walter bill on this subject, a Congressman, since been retired, from Idaho.

"It seems to me that the question of racial origins—though I am not a follower of Hitler—there is something to it. We cannot tie a stone around its neck and drop it into the middle of the Atlantic just because it worked to the contrary in German. * * * I believe that possibly statistics would show that the Western European races have made the best citizens in America and are more easily made into Americans. In a time of trouble and stress, such as we are going through at this time, it seems to me it is a poor time to increase entry into our country of material that is questionable, when we have a very large proportion of people that we have not yet digested, and who have not yet learned the first principles of American citizenship. If there was some law that could take these people that you even wish to bring here and put them out on the prairies of the West, I maintain they would make good American citizens in a considerably shorter time than if you leave them penned up among the people of their own kind in the large eastern cities where they do not learn to talk English readily. They read their own newspapers. It has been my impression from the short space of time spent in those eastern cities that it takes almost three generations to make a good American citizen. * * *

"I am opposed to (quota pooling), because I am of the opinion it will tend to bring in many aliens whose general characteristics seem to show they do not readily make the best American citizens—"

I think there is no need for me to try to demonstrate for you that racist theories are fallacious and devoid of any scientific foundation. But let us stop for a moment to analyze the argument which is currently more favored, the argument that the new immigrants would change our social fabric or alter our cultural heritage.

As I have said before, the proposal embodied in the Humphrey-Lehman bill, which is now also espoused by the President's Commission, is that we permit the entry of 250,000 quota immigrants annually, one for every 600 of our population in 1950. In one generation, 30 years, we will have admitted 30 aliens for every 600 Americans. The 600 native born will, of course, in the meantime grow to 700 or 800. It seems to be the view of these pessimists that our democratic structure and our social fabric are so weak that the 600 to 800 Americans will give way to the 30 immigrants who will trickle in from all parts of the globe over a period of 30 years. I, for one, believe in the strength of our social system, as I believe in the strength of our economic system. I am sorry to find that my faith in the inherent strength of America is not shared by men who always readily designate themselves as patriots.

When Senator Lehman, and I, and some of our other colleagues first drafted our own immigration bills, we included a compromise formula which was to be substituted for the national origins principle. I first proposed this plan in a bill I introduced in 1949. Under this formula, known as the quota pooling plan, quota numbers not used in any given year, by the nationality to which they were assigned were to become generally available in the following year.

However, on the basis of the recommendations of the President's Commission, I believe the time will soon come when the evils of the national-origins principle will be abolished altogether.

There is, of course, more to the McCarran Immigration Act than a mere reaffirmation of the national-origins principle. What was originally passed off as a mere codification

of existing law actually involved numerous changes in the provisions regulating exclusion, deportation, naturalization, and denaturalization.

When objections were first raised against these provisions, Senator McCarran tried to wave them away lightly. The new law, he claimed, "tightened the security provisions" and prevented the "pollution of the bloodstream of America" with alien criminals.

Now let me say right here that I am just as much opposed to the immigration of subversives and criminals as is Senator McCarran. If you put the McCarran Act and the Humphrey-Lehman bill side by side, you will find that when it comes to excluding subversives and criminals the latter does just as much as the former. But our bill was drafted with care, designed to hit only those people against whom it was actually directed. The McCarran-Walter Act, on the other hand, is a blunderbuss, with broad language and loose phrases which hit many innocent people whom we don't really want to hit.

During the debate on the McCarran Act my colleagues and I went through that bill section by section and subsection by subsection and analyzed the most important parts on the floor of the Senate. I don't want to repeat this performance here tonight. But just to give you some of the flavor of what transpired, I'll mention a few examples. What these examples also show is that even though we lost on the final vote, we were able to make some dent in the law and ameliorate some of the harshest provisions.

One of these provisions, which was in the original McCarran bill, would have made it possible for an alien to be deported for a simple traffic violation if the Attorney General declared him undesirable. That language was so strong that Congressman Walter dropped the clause from the House bill.

Let me give you another example. Under the old law, aliens could be kept out of the United States if they had committed crimes involving moral turpitude. That gave our immigration officers a chance to see whether the alien had committed an act that was a crime by our standards and not by the standards of some foreign dictatorship. But the new law requires exclusion whether or not moral turpitude is involved. We were able to point out that under this new provision a man like Cardinal Mindszenty would be excluded from the United States if he ever were released by the Communists.

Now, I know, of course, that Senator McCarran had no intention to keep Cardinal Mindszenty or anyone in a similar position out of this country. Here was just another example of this blunderbuss technique of lawmaking by which innocent persons are hit while the law tries to aim at the guilty.

I might say that once again we didn't get an adequate response from Senator McCarran. I am glad to say that the State Department in drafting the regulations under the act, followed the lead of the conference report and corrected the wrong. They took the cases which I described in my speeches, cases of people being convicted in totalitarian countries on trumped-up charges and drafted regulations to take care of the problem.

We had one other incident dealing with regulations of the State Department, which vividly reflected the spirit of the McCarran Act. You may remember that the State Department issued orders to all of its consulates throughout the world requiring that all applicants for visas into the United States list whether they are Jewish or not. Most of the country was shocked by this clear indication that the use of the question on the application form for a visa would mean that it would be easier to keep Jews out of the United States. When I vehemently protested this regulation to the State Department I was told by one of the high officials of the Department that he agreed with me, that he knew the practice was wrong, that he knew it might lead to clear evidences of anti-Semitism, but he said, "We must administer the law. This is the clear intent of the McCarran Act. We don't write the act, we can only carry it out." The large number of protests to the State Department, of course, eliminated that regulation, but the example is a vivid demonstration of what we are opposing.

Let me give you a few more illustrations. One case which has recently come to my attention involves a woman against whom a deportation order has recently been issued. She would have been eligible for suspension of deportation under the old law. She is not eligible now and will have to be sent to Italy. She will be accompanied by her husband, a man 52 years of age, born and bred in the United States, who was never outside this country. So that he can stay with his wife, his life's companion, this man will have to break off all his ties in the country of his birth and start life anew in Italy, figure out a new way of earning a livelihood.

What does the McCarran-Walter Act have to say about this kind of situation? The answer can be found, in cold, heartless language, in the Senate report:

"Hardship or even unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child is not sufficient to justify suspension of deportation."

Let us take a look at another situation. After providing in clear-cut fashion for the exclusion and deportation of subversive aliens, all of which provisions are also included in the Humphrey-Lehman bill, the McCarran Act further allows the deportation of persons who have had a purpose to engage in activities prejudicial to the public interest, and a Government official is given the blanket authority to decide this question.

When the Senate discussion reached this section, the late Brien McMahon, who had risen from his sickbed to come to the Senate Chamber for this debate, rose in disbelief and asked to be shown that section. After he had studied it, he declared:

"It seems almost unbelievable to me that anyone could seriously write such a provision into a bill * * * (it) is contrary to every concept I know of in the common law or in our jurisprudence. I have never heard of such a provision in any statute of the United States."

These words, let us remember, were spoken by a man with broad experience in the field of law enforcement, a man who had been Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Criminal Division.

There is another deportation provision which is almost unbelievable. It is section 241 (c) under which an alien who has obtained a divorce from a citizen can under certain circumstances, be deported if "it appears to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he or she has failed or refused to fulfill his or her marital agreement." It seems to me that this constitutes an unprecedented intrusion by the Government into a field which was heretofore considered a matter of purely private concern.

There is one other provision about which I would like to speak tonight. It deals with professors. Under the old law, professors could enter this country as nonquota immigrants once they had met all the other requirements of the immigration law. This privilege, which has enabled us to bring many great minds to this country, has been abolished by the McCarran Act. No logical reason has ever been stated for this action. The defenders of the act have said that professors can still be brought in under a general preference provision for skilled persons. But instead of the simplified procedure which was in effect previously, let us look what is now required if a university wishes to bring in an outstanding foreign scientist.

First, the university has to file an application with the Immigration Service, attaching to it a clearance order from the United States Employment Service certifying that qualified persons are not available in the United States to perform the work in question. Then it has to file a complete and detailed analysis establishing in what manner the services of the professor will be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States. Next there has to be a complete description of the prospective immigrant's higher education, to which there must be attached diplomas, certificates, and affidavits attesting to the professor's qualifications. The petition will have to be acted on by the Immigration Service district director. The district director may then conduct an investigation and if he approves the petition, the consul's office can then place the professor on the preference portion of the quota list. When the professor's name is reached, and all other investigations have been completed, he will be issued his visa.

Our future experience with this new law will show how many semesters in advance a university will have to plan before it employs a foreign professor.

You know that the fight for better immigration legislation did not end when President Truman's veto of the McCarran Act was overridden. The fight is continuing and I am certain that as time goes by an ever greater portion of the American public will become aware of its dangers and inequities. I am happy to join with you in the necessary program to educate the public.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN POSTAL RATES AND CHARGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 49) to investigate certain matters respecting postal rates and charges in handling certain mail matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate resolution 49, as amended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Green	McCarran
Anderson	Griswold	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Beall	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bush	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Capehart	Humphrey	Purtell
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Ives	Russell
Clements	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cooper	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kefauver	Sparkman
Duff	Kennedy	Stennis
Dworshak	Kerr	Symington
Eastland	Kilgore	Taft
Ellender	Knowland	Thye
Ferguson	Kuchel	Tobey
Flanders	Langer	Watkins
Frear	Lehman	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young
Goldwater	Martin	
Gore	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bush in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation with respect to the following matters:

(1) Postal rates and charges in relation to the reasonable cost of handling the several classes of mail matter and special services, with due allowances in each class for the care required, the degree of preferment, priority in handling, and economic value of the services rendered and the public interest served thereby.

(2) The extent to which expenditures now charged to the Post Office Department for the following items should be excluded in considering costs for the several classes of mail matter and special services:

(A) Expenditures for free postal services;

(B) Expenditures in excess of revenues for international postal services;

(C) Expenditures for subsidies for postal services pursuant to law or legislative policy of Congress;

(D) Expenditures in excess of revenues, pursuant to the act of June 5, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), not enumerated in the preceding subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C);

(E) Expenditures for services of any character not otherwise enumerated herein which may be performed for other departments and agencies of the Government; and

(F) Expenditures which may be justified only on a national welfare basis and not primarily as a business function.

(3) Expenditures for the Post Office Department by other Government agencies which should be considered in connection with the cost for the handling of the several classes of mail matter and special services, such as employees' retirement, use of Government buildings, and maintenance services.

(4) The extent, if any, to which Post Office Department expenditures in excess of revenue, for its various services and for the handling of various classes of mail, are justified as being in the public interest.

(5) The costs of handling, transporting, and distributing the several classes of mail, and procedures whereby such costs can be reduced through improvements in methods and equipment.

(6) Other matters relating to the improvement of the postal system.

The committee shall report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1954, the results of its study and investigation under this resolution, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized 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 reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

(b) The committee is authorized to appoint an advisory council of not more than 10 persons which may include representatives of the general public, representative users of the mails, members of accounting, management, and engineering firms, postal experts, representatives of postal employee organizations, and, with special reference to ratemaking in their fields, representatives of public transportation and distribution organizations. The functions of the council shall be to assist the committee in the studies and investigations authorized by this resolution. The council shall meet at such times and places as may be authorized by the committee.

(c) The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn, of Nebraska, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1955.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Harry N. Routzohn, of Ohio, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Richard R. Atkinson to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1953.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Claude Monroe McQuarrie, O12830.
Col. William Lenoir Wilson, O16950, Medical Corps.
Col. Emil Lenzner, O15810.
Col. William Joseph Bradley, O15967.
Col. Ralph Morris Osborne, O16399.
Col. Wallace Hayden Barnes, O16426.
Col. George Edward Martin, O16802.
Col. Philip DeWitt Ginder, O16904.
Col. Louis Theilmann Heath, O18060.
Col. Edwin Rudolph Petzing, O8463.
Col. Charles Harold Royce, O15769.
Col. Paul Maurice Seleen, O16139.
Col. Ralph Copeland Cooper, O17741.
Col. Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662.
Col. Egbert Wesley Van Delden Cowan, O11744, Dental Corps.
Col. Willis Richardson Slaughter, O5296.
Col. William Lawrence Kay, O10349.
Col. Harrison Shaler, O12080.
Col. John Battle Horton, O15150.
Col. Stanhope Brasfield Mason, O17295.
Col. Robert William Porter, Jr., O18048.
Col. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500.
Col. George Andrew Rehm, O12772.
Col. Louis Holmes Ginn, Jr., O17341.
Col. James Stewart Willis, O15607.
Col. Holger Nelson Toftoy, O16422.
Col. Frank Coffin Holbrook, O16654.
Col. Max Sherred Johnson, O16745.
Col. Robert Highman Booth, O18093.
Col. William White Dick, Jr., O18384.
Col. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715.
Col. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223.
Col. Louis Watkins Prentiss, O14672.
Col. Francis Elliot Howard, O16776.
Col. George Edward Lynch, O17715.
Col. Theodore William Parker, O18369.
Col. Charles Edward Hoy, O18556.

NOTE.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE NAVY

Eleanor M. Hahn to be a lieutenant in the Nurse Corps in the Navy.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate March 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

William J. Bray, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1953

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

O God, from whom all noble desires and all good counsels do proceed, rise mercifully with the morning upon our darkened hearts. In this tragic and tangled world we are conscious of our woeful inadequacy to sit in the seats of judgment, to balance the scales of justice and to respond with equity to the myriad calls of human need. In this forum of a people's hope wilt Thou crown the deliberations with spacious thinking and with sympathy for all mankind, multitudes of whom are bound by the shackles of tyranny. Facing questions which confront us and almost confound us, quicken in us, we beseech Thee, every noble impulse and dedicate to Thy glory and for human good our best endeavors; transform every task into a throne of service, and sanctify this new week of labor in the ministry of public affairs with the benediction of Thy approval. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 6, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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