

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Samuel Spencer, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

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

Chan Gurney, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board (re-appointment);

Harmar D. Denny, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, vice Donald W. Nyrop, resigned; and

John C. Doerfer, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received April 1, 1953:

#### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

George M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Lester L. Cecil, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Ohio, vice Robert R. Nevin, deceased.

#### IN THE ARMY

Gen. James Alward Van Fleet, O3847, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Rev. Idris W. Jones, associate minister, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful Father, we would begin the discussions and decisions of this day in the spirit of worship and thanksgiving.

We thank Thee for the Members of the House of Representatives. Their decisions affect the destiny of so many human lives. Keep them true, therefore, to the noblest insights Thou hast taught them through the many experiences of life.

Truly do we need Thy guidance and Thy help, our Father. May no unworthy motives move us this day. May we so plan, speak, and act that when we come to the close of the day, in the quiet of our rooms, each one of us may sense the word of the Lord: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

This is our prayer for today, in the spirit of Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### SUBMERGED LANDS BILL

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to recommit the bill H. R. 4198, the so-called tidelands bill.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CELLER moves to recommit H. R. 4198 to the Judiciary Committee of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 106, nays 283, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—106

Addonizio	George	Moulder
Albert	Gordon	Multer
Andersen,	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
H. Carl	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Aspinall	Gregory	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bailey	Gross	O'Hara, Ill.
Barrett	Hart	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	O'Neill
Boland	Heseltun	Perkins
Bolling	Holtzman	Post
Buchanan	Howell	Polk
Buckley	Hull	Powell
Burdick	Javits	Price
Canfield	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Case	Jones, Mo.	Prouty
Celler	Karsten, Mo.	Radwan
Chatham	Keating	Reams
Chelf	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Roberts
Crosser	Kelly, N. Y.	Robison, Ky.
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	Rodino
Deaney	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
Dodd	Klein	Rooney
Dollinger	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Donohue	Lane	Secret
Eberhart	Lanham	Sieminski
Edmondson	Lesinski	Spence
Elliott	McCarthy	Staggers
Feighan	McCormack	Sullivan
Fernandez	Machrowicz	Sutton
Fine	Madden	Trimble
Fogarty	Marshall	Watts
Forand	Metcalf	Wier
Frazier	Miller, Kans.	Withrow
Friedel	Mills	Yates
Garmatz	Moss	

NAYS—283

Abbitt	Bolton	Cooley
Abernethy	Oliver P.	Coon
Adair	Bonin	Cooper
Alexander	Bonner	Cotton
Allen, Calif.	Bosch	Cretella
Allen, Ill.	Bow	Crumpacker
Andresen,	Bramblett	Cunningham
August H.	Bray	Curtis, Mass.
Andrews	Brooks, La.	Curtis, Mo.
Angell	Brooks, Tex.	Curtis, Nebr.
Arends	Brown, Ga.	Dague
Auchincloss	Brownson	Davis, Ga.
Ayres	Broyhill	Davis, Wis.
Baker	Budge	Deane
Barden	Burleson	Derounian
Bates	Busbey	Devereux
Battle	Bush	D'Ewart
Beamer	Byrnes, Wis.	Dies
Becker	Camp	Dolliver
Beicher	Campbell	Dondero
Bender	Carlyle	Donovan
Bennett, Fla.	Carrigg	Dox, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Cederberg	Dowdy
Bentley	Chenoweth	Doyle
Bentsen	Chiperfield	Durham
Berry	Church	Ellsworth
Betts	Clardy	Engle
Bishop	Clevenger	Fallon
Boggs	Cole, Mo.	Fenton
Bolton,	Cole, N. Y.	Fino
Frances P.	Colmer	Fisher

Ford	Krueger	St. George
Forrester	Laird	Saylor
Fountain	Landrum	Schenck
Frelinghuysen	Lantaff	Scherer
Gamble	Latham	Scott
Gary	LeCompte	Scrivner
Gathings	Long	Scudder
Gavin	Lovre	Seely-Brown
Gentry	Lucas	Selden
Golden	Lyle	Shafer
Goodwin	McConnell	Sheehan
Graham	McDonough	Short
Grant	McGregor	Siford
Gubser	McMillan	Sikes
Gwinn	McVey	Simpson, Ill.
Hagen, Calif.	Mack, Wash.	Simpson, Pa.
Hagen, Minn.	Mahon	Small
Hale	Mailliard	Smith, Kans.
Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Miss.
Hand	Mason	Smith, Va.
Harden	Matthews	Smith, Wis.
Hardy	Merrill	Springer
Harris	Miller, Md.	Stauffer
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Nebr.	Steed
Harrison, Va.	Miller, N. Y.	Stringfellow
Harrison, Wyo.	Morano	Taber
Harvey	Morrison	Talle
Hays, Ark.	Mumma	Teague
Hébert	Murray	Thomas
Herlong	Neal	Thompson, La.
Hess	Nelson	Thompson, La.
Hiestand	Nicholson	Mich.
Hill	Norrell	Thompson, Tex.
Hillelson	Oakman	Thornberry
Hillings	O'Hara, Minn.	Tollefson
Hinshaw	Osmer	Utt
Hoeven	Ostertag	Van Pelt
Hoffman, Ill.	Passman	Van Zandt
Hoffman, Mich.	Patman	Velde
Holmes	Patterson	Vorrs
Holt	Pelly	Vursell
Hope	Philbin	Wainwright
Horan	Phillips	Walter
Hosmer	Pilcher	Wampler
Hruska	Pillion	Warburton
Hunter	Poage	Weichel
Hyde	Poff	Westland
Ikard	Poulson	Wharton
Jackson	Preston	Wheeler
James	Rains	Whitten
Jarman	Ray	Wickersham
Jenkins	Rayburn	Widnall
Jensen	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Johnson	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, Miss.
Jonas, Ill.	Rees, Kans.	Williams, N. Y.
Jonas, N. C.	Regan	Willis
Jones, N. C.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wilson, Calif.
Kean	Riehlman	Wilson, Ind.
Kearns	Riley	Wilson, Tex.
Kersten, Wis.	Rivers	Wolcott
Kilburn	Robeson, Va.	Wolverton
Kilday	Rogers, Fla.	Yorty
King, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.	Young
King, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.	Younger
Knox	Sadlak	

NOT VOTING—42

Boykin	Evins	Mollohan
Brown, Ohio	Fulton	Morgan
Byrd	Haley	Norblad
Byrne, Pa.	Heller	Patten
Cannon	Holifield	Rabaut
Carnahan	Judd	Reece, Tenn.
Condon	Kearney	Richards
Corbett	McCulloch	Shelley
Coudert	McIntire	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Mack, Ill.	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Magnuson	Vinson
Dempsey	Meador	Winstead
Dingell	Morrow	Withers
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Calif.	Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Withers for, with Mr. Sheppard against.  
Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Condon for, with Mr. Richards against.  
Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Cannon for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Byrd for, with Mr. Taylor against.  
Mr. Dawson of Utah for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Coudert against.  
Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Haley against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Morrow against.  
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

#### Until further notice:

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Miller of California.  
Mr. Corbett with Mr. Evins.  
Mr. Meader with Mr. Dempsey.  
Mr. Norblad with Mr. Winstead.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 285, nays 108, not voting 33, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 22]

##### YEAS—285

Abbt	Davis, Ga.	Jensen
Abernethy	Davis, Wis.	Johnson
Adair	Deane	Jonas, Ill.
Alexander	Derounian	Jonas, N. C.
Allen, Calif.	Devereux	Jones, N. C.
Allen, Ill.	D'Ewart	Kean
Andersen	Dies	Kearns
August H.	Dolliver	Kersten, Wis.
Andrews	Dondero	Kilburn
Angell	Donohue	Kilday
Arends	Donovan	King, Calif.
Auchincloss	Dorn, N. Y.	King, Pa.
Ayres	Dowdy	Knox
Baker	Doyle	Krueger
Barden	Durham	Laird
Bates	Edmondson	Landrum
Battle	Ellsworth	Lantaff
Beamer	Engle	Latham
Becker	Fallon	LeCompte
Belcher	Fenton	Long
Bender	Fisher	Lovre
Bennett, Fla.	Ford	Lucas
Bennett, Mich.	Forrester	Lyle
Bentley	Fountain	McConnell
Bentsen	Frelinghuysen	McDonough
Berry	Gamble	McGregor
Betts	Gary	McMillan
Bishop	Gathings	McMack, Wash.
Boggs	Gavin	Mahon
Bolton	Gentry	Maillard
Frances P.	Golden	Martin, Iowa
Bolton	Goodwin	Mason
Oliver P.	Graham	Matthews
Bonin	Grant	Merrill
Bonner	Gubser	Miller, Md.
Bosch	Gwinn	Miller, Nebr.
Bow	Hagen, Calif.	Miller, N. Y.
Boykin	Hagen, Minn.	Morano
Bramblett	Hale	Morrison
Bray	Halleck	Mumma
Brooks, La.	Hand	Murray
Brooks, Tex.	Harden	Neal
Brown, Ga.	Hardy	Nelson
Brownson	Harris	Nicholson
Broyhill	Harrison, Nebr.	Norrell
Burleson	Harrison, Va.	Oakman
Busbey	Harrison, Wyo.	O'Hara, Minn.
Bush	Harvey	Osmers
Byrnes Wis.	Hays, Ark.	Ostertag
Camp	Hebert	Passman
Campbell	Herlong	Patman
Carlyle	Hess	Patterson
Carrigg	Hiestand	Pelly
Cederberg	Hill	Philbin
Chenoweth	Hillelson	Phillips
Chiperfield	Hillings	Pilcher
Church	Hinshaw	Pillion
Clardy	Hoeven	Poage
Clevenger	Hoffman, Ill.	Poff
Cole, Mo.	Hoffman, Mich.	Poulson
Cole, N. Y.	Holmes	Preston
Colmer	Holt	Priest
Cooley	Hope	Rains
Coon	Horan	Ray
Cooper	Hosmer	Rayburn
Cotton	Hruska	Reed, Ill.
Cretella	Hunter	Reed, N. Y.
Crumpacker	Hyde	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Ikard	Regan
Curtis, Mass.	Jackson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Curtis, Mo.	James	Riehlman
Curtis, Nebr.	Jarman	Riley
Dague	Jenkins	Rivers

Robeson, Va.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Sadiak  
St. George  
Saylor  
Schenck  
Scherer  
Scott  
Scrivner  
Scudder  
Seely-Brown  
Selden  
Shafer  
Sheehan  
Short  
Shuford  
Sikes  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Small  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Miss.

Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wis.  
Springer  
Stauffer  
Steed  
Stringfellow  
Taber  
Talle  
Teague  
Thomas  
Thompson, La.  
Thompson, Mich.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Utt  
Van Pelt  
Van Zandt  
Velde  
Vorys  
Vursell  
Wainwright  
Walter

Wampler  
Warburton  
Welchel  
Westland  
Wharton  
Wheeler  
Whitten  
Wickersham  
Widnall  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, Miss.  
Williams, N. Y.  
Willis  
Wilson, Calif.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Wilson, Tex.  
Winstead  
Wolcott  
Wolverton  
Yorby  
Young  
Younger

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Heller against.  
Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Mack of Illinois against.

#### Until further notice:

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Miller of California.  
Mr. Corbett with Mr. Dempsey.  
Mr. Norblad with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. LAIRD and Mr. DONOVAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### EASTER RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 2, 1953, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 13, 1953.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### PROGRAM WEEK OF APRIL 13

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] what we may expect in the week of April 13 on our return, if the gentleman knows that far in advance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I might say that I am glad to respond to the request of the gentleman from Texas, because many Members if they know today can arrange their affairs accordingly.

#### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS APRIL 13 AND APRIL 14

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, first of all I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call the Consent Calendar on Monday, April 13, and the Private Calendar on Tuesday, April 14.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Monday, April 13, is District day and if there are any bills ready out of that committee they will be called on that day, and the Consent Calendar will be called following the consideration of District of Columbia business.

Tuesday, April 14: The Private Calendar, and then on Tuesday and Wednesday we propose to call up House Resolution 3840, which extends the Farm Labor Act, and then a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency, House Resolution 4004, having to do with certain reports made by banks to the Comptroller of the Currency. We are very hopeful that the Interior Department appropriation bill can be filed on Tuesday. If we can get unanimous consent; that is, if

#### NAYS—108

Addonizio  
Albert  
Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Aspinall  
Bailey  
Barrett  
Biatnik  
Boland  
Bolling  
Buchanan  
Buckley  
Burdick  
Canfield  
Case  
Celler  
Chatham  
Chelf  
Chudoff  
Cresser  
Dawson, Ill.  
Delaney  
Dodd  
Dollinger  
Eberhart  
Elliott  
Evins  
Feighan  
Fernandez  
Fine  
Fino  
Fogarty  
Forand  
Frazier  
Friedel  
Garmatz  
George

#### NOT VOTING—38

Brown, Ohio  
Budge  
Byrd  
Byrne, Pa.  
Cannon  
Carnahan  
Condon  
Corbett  
Coudert  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dawson, Utah  
Dempsey  
Dingell  
Dorn, S. C.  
Fulton  
Haley  
Heller  
Hollifield  
Judd  
Kearney  
McCulloch  
McIntire  
Mack, Ill.  
Magnuson  
Morrow  
Miller, Calif.

Moss  
Moulder  
Multer  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, Mich.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
Perkins  
Post  
Polk  
Powell  
Price  
Prouty  
Radwan  
Reams  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Roberts  
Robison, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Secret  
Sieminski  
Spence  
Staggers  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Trimble  
Watts  
Wier  
Withrow  
Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Withers against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Richards for, with Mr. Condon against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Cannon against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Byrd against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Dawson of Utah against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. Haley for, with Mr. Patten against.

Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Magnuson against.

Mr. Morrow for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania against.



there were no objections, we could begin general debate on Wednesday; and, if not Wednesday, we would hope to take up the bill on Thursday.

Beyond that, so far as I know, there is no program for the week. Should something further develop, we would let the office of the Members know so that they might have the information.

#### NATURALIZATION OF PERSONS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4233) to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this not the bill that is identical with the law as it existed during the war with the exception that it applies only to aliens who are legally and lawfully in the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a correct statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this also covers those who are in the service, aliens, who have permanent or temporary visas?

Mr. GRAHAM. Correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman advise the House whether or not this affects the wife of an alien who may become an American citizen?

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not affect the wife.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Walter bill will permit the prompt naturalization of those aliens who have served honorably in our Armed Forces during the war in Korea. It is similar to a statute in effect during World War II. A minimum of 30 days' service is required and naturalization can be had in the field.

A like measure sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania was passed by the House in the last Congress. I, too, was sponsor of a bill at that time, and I reintroduced the measure on the opening day of the 83d Congress.

On February 4, 1952, I made the following remarks in the House:

Mr. Speaker, I first saw the need of this legislation in August 1950, and I then introduced a bill to provide expeditious citizenship in the field for aliens fighting in our Armed Forces.

There had been called to my attention a case which most dramatically emphasized the importance of restoring to law that provision which had been law during World War II but had expired. It was the case of Roger Duquesne, a young Belgian, who had saved

the life of an Air Force captain in my district. The latter had been shot down over Belgium, and this lad not only provided him with sanctuary but arranged for him to escape from Nazi forces seeking his capture and eventually to get back to American lines.

Roger had two great ambitions in life: One was to emigrate to the United States and see again his Air Force captain, and the other was to acquire American citizenship. He came to Paterson, N. J., and found that the captain, David Schwartz, was with the Armed Forces in Tokyo. The captain's mother-in-law, Mrs. William Nichols, of 308 Paxton Street, Paterson, became a mother to this lad. In a very short time he reported to the recruiting office in Paterson to sign up with our Armed Forces, and he was led to believe that his joining the Army automatically made him a citizen. It was not until he was in Korea that he discovered that this was not so. Mrs. Nichols was greatly concerned and reported the facts to me, and my introduction of the bill followed. Last year Roger Duquesne was reported missing in action in Pusan and nothing has been heard of him since.

Mrs. Nichols and Captain Schwartz are prayerful that he may be found to be a prisoner of war. Reports from Korea are anything but optimistic. However, I, too, am hoping that he will be found, and if he is, he will be thrilled to hear that the Congress has voted to make his citizenship possible. If it is discovered that he is definitely a casualty of this war, I want it to be recorded in the war history that Roger Duquesne fought for the land and the people he loved, and that in almost every letter he wrote to his Paterson home he stressed his ever-increasing desire to be known as a full-fledged American citizen.

All I can now add to this statement is this: Roger Duquesne has been awarded the Silver Star certificate which has been directed to his foster mother. He is still listed as missing in action.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in passing this bill today, we are following the historic attitude of this body in showing consideration for aliens who respond patriotically to the needs of their adopted country, by serving in the Armed Forces of the United States when the Nation is in peril. I feel we should grant these concessions in order to facilitate their naturalization as citizens of the country they have served so patriotically and honorably.

As evidence of my concern in this connection, I introduced a bill in the 80th Congress to facilitate the naturalization of our brothers of foreign birth who served in the military or naval forces of our country in World War II. This bill became law in June 1948. Under this law certain requirements of the naturalization laws are waived, such as declaration of intention, period of residence within the country, and educational tests.

No one, I believe, will seriously challenge the contention that these same privileges should be extended to participants and veterans of the Korean conflict. The aliens, few in number, who choose to identify themselves with the ideals and principles for which this Nation struggles, are entitled to special con-

sideration in their efforts to become United States citizens.

Proper safeguards are provided in the bill before us, in that affidavits of two credible citizens attesting to personal acquaintance with, and the good moral character of, the applicant and his attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States are required, together with convincing proof from military or naval forces of his honorable service. No dishonorably discharged soldier can qualify.

To those who, out of devotion to the country of their adoption, waived their exemption from military service, this bill provides a national policy of facilitating their conversion from the status of alien to that of citizen of the country for which they have evidenced such patriotic devotion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 310 (d) and 318 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, any person, not a citizen, who, after June 24, 1950, and not later than July 1, 1955, has actively served or actively serves, honorably, in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period or periods totaling not less than 30 days and who, having been lawfully admitted to the United States (within the purport of sec. 101 (a) (38) of the Immigration and Nationality Act), shall have been at the time of entering the Armed Forces within such area, may be naturalized on petition filed not later than December 31, 1955, upon compliance with all the requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that—*

(a) he may be naturalized regardless of age;

(b) no period of residence or specified period of physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required: *Provided*, That there shall be included in the petition the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, stating that each such witness personally knows the petitioner to be a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States;

(c) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner;

(d) notwithstanding section 336 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the petitioner may be naturalized immediately if prior to the filing of the petition, the petitioner and the witness shall have appeared before and been examined by a representative of the Service; and

(e) no fee, except that which may be required by State law, shall be charged or collected for making, filing, or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for the final hearing thereon, or for the certificate of naturalization, if issued.

Service in the Armed Forces of the United States may be proved by a duly authenticated copy of the record of the executive or military department having custody of the record of petitioner's service, showing that the petitioner is or was during the period hereinbefore described a member serving actively and honorably in such forces and, if separated from such service, that he was not separated under other than honorable conditions; or may be proved by affidavits, forming part of the petition, of at least two citizens of the United States, members of the Armed Forces of the United States, of the

noncommissioned or warrant officer grade or higher (who may also be the witnesses described in subsec. (b) of this section): *Provided, however,* That no period of service in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be made the basis of a petition for naturalization under this act if the applicant has previously been naturalized on the basis of the same period of service.

SEC. 2. Any person entitled to naturalization under section 1 of this act, who while serving is not within the jurisdiction of any naturalization court, may be naturalized in accordance with applicable provisions of that section without appearing before such court. The petition for naturalization of any such petitioner shall be made and sworn to before, and filed with a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service designated by the Attorney General, which representative is hereby authorized to receive such petition, to conduct hearings thereon, to take testimony concerning any matter touching or in any way affecting the admissibility of such petitioner for naturalization, to call witnesses, to administer oaths, including the oath of the petitioner and his witnesses to the petition and the oath prescribed by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and to grant naturalization and to issue certificates of naturalization: *Provided,* That the record of any proceedings hereunder shall be forwarded to and filed by the clerk of a naturalization court in the district designated by the petitioner and made a part of the record of such court.

SEC. 3. Any person otherwise qualified for naturalization pursuant to section 1 or 2 of this act who is or has been discharged under other than honorable conditions from the Armed Forces of the United States, or is discharged therefrom pursuant to an application for discharge made by him on the ground that he is an alien, or who is a conscientious objector who performs or performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, shall not be entitled to the benefits of such section 1 or 2 of this act: *Provided,* That citizenship granted pursuant to section 1 or 2 of this act may be revoked in accordance with section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act if at any time subsequent to naturalization the person is separated from the Armed Forces of the United States under other than honorable conditions, and such ground for revocation shall be in addition to any other provided by law: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of section 340 (f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, revocation on such ground shall be classified with revocation action based on section 329 (c) of that act. The fact that the naturalized person was separated from the service under other than honorable conditions shall be proved by a duly authenticated certification from the executive or military department under which the person was serving at the time of separation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUBMERGED LANDS BILL

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously oppose the so-called tidelands bill. What I want to say concerning the tidelands oil question can be put briefly,

If for no other reasons than our national security and our national welfare, the Federal Government must keep control of the tidelands properties.

The necessity and the wisdom of this has been recognized by the great majority of responsible, thinking citizens, and by the United States Supreme Court.

It is vitally important to realize that so far as oil is concerned, we rapidly are becoming a have-not nation.

Our continental supplies are dwindling. Consumption of oil is greatly outdistancing production. New oil fields are not being discovered fast enough to keep up with our enormous national demand. We have to import oil to meet our national needs.

Therefore, if our armed services are to be kept strong—if our Navy is going to have the oil it needs for its ships, the Air Force for its planes, the Army for its tanks and trucks and mobile weapons—we not only have to assure the proper, systematic development of the offshore oil lands but we also must recognize the time factor in this development.

For should these properties be turned over to private companies for their own use now, the necessary supplies may not be there when we need them in years to come. Today's defense needs do not have a time limit. They will exist as long as there is a threat to freedom and democracy, and we cannot throw away the security of future generations for the profits of a present few.

Equally, if we are to be strong enough to fight and win in the world of ideas and traditions and beliefs, then we have in these tidelands properties a vast benefit to all the Nation.

Our democracy depends on citizens who are active in government, who are informed, and who can understand events and issues. We have lived through the years when we could see that dictatorship in other countries took hold and grew as tyrants took over education, restricted it more and more, denied it to an ever-growing number of people.

Yet through this very tidelands bill, we can show the world that we oppose tyranny. We believe in people being active in running their government, in being informed, and having the understanding that makes them better participants in the responsibilities of democracy.

If the Navy, for example, is allowed to continue its assigned jurisdiction over the offshore properties, then it can supervise the orderly development of the tidelands, and the income that results can be used to strengthen education.

All over the country, local communities are running into increasing trouble meeting the expenses of educating a rapidly growing school population. Classrooms are overcrowded heavily. Buildings are old, outmoded, and have to be replaced—but there are no funds to build the new buildings, build the needed classrooms.

Teachers in locality after locality still are heavily underpaid. In many cases, they get less in wages than street cleaners; yes, and garbage collectors.

As a matter of fact, 25 States have let it be known they themselves are dis-

satisfied with their old, rundown, unsafe school buildings.

Mr. Speaker, millions and millions of dollars will be gained every year if the tidelands properties are developed along logical conservation lines. This money can and must be used for the education of children in all parts of the country, and to build safer, more adequately staffed schools for them.

The money can and must be used to attract and hold experienced teachers in these now underdeveloped school areas.

Our democracy will be only as strong tomorrow as its citizens who are growing up today.

And those citizens—today's children—all have the right to an education and to the same educational opportunities. The youngsters growing up in any one of the many States that will be benefited by these funds has as much right to a good public school education as the boy or girl who lives in a State that needs no such additional help at all.

The wealth of America's natural resources belongs to all the people. Not just the people of 1 State, or 2 or 3, but the people of all 48.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to make a national tragedy of tidelands. We have the ability to look ahead to our needs. We have the knowledge and the resources to plan to meet them now.

Oil for security and education means a lot more to the United States than oil for haphazard exploitation. We must not permit either a big deal or a big steal.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

MARCH 31, 1953.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to authority granted by section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did, on January 16, 1953, elect the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, and the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, to be members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to serve with the following other House Members who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: DANIEL A. REED, of New York; JERE COOPER, of Tennessee; and JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan.

Respectfully yours,

DANIEL A. REED,  
Chairman.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee To Investigate the Justice Department may have permission to sit this afternoon after 3 o'clock during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.



## CANCER EDUCATION DAY

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution which I hope promptly will receive the approval of this House, and then of the Senate.

The resolution sets aside throughout the United States of America and its Territories, a day to be known as Cancer Education Day, which is to be designated as March 20 each year, and authorizes and requests the President of the United States to make appropriate proclamation to that effect.

I have had the opportunity by personal observation to realize how important it is, in seeking to combat by medical science the ravages made upon our people by the disease of cancer, to have the facts about cancer and its detection and its early treatment more widely known than they are. I do not pretend that this can be achieved merely by the issuing of a proclamation by the President of the United States; but such a proclamation, as provided for in my resolution, would arouse all of the people of this country to the serious challenge of cancer.

For leadership in a great program of education, the American Cancer Society, through the generous help of the American people by their donations and contributions, is particularly well qualified, mobilizing and unifying for this task, the human and scientific resources of the medical profession, of our colleges and universities and research centers, and bringing to it too the knowledge and the techniques by which can be passed on to every American the things they need to know to save themselves from pain and suffering and death. For of every 2 deaths from cancer, it has been authoritatively stated that 1 could have been averted or prevented, by proper treatment started early enough.

It is not the purpose of this resolution to take the place of Public Resolution 82, adopted by the 75th Congress and approved March 28, 1938. It is intended to help concentrate on one day, to be known throughout the country as Cancer Education Day, the attention which all of us properly and effectively can give to protecting health and saving lives by emphasizing the importance of education of the individual citizen about cancer.

## GEN. J. LAWTON COLLINS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Members of the House will read with interest and approval a letter from one of America's ablest soldiers, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, to another who also holds the great esteem,

appreciation, and affection of his countrymen, Gen. James A. Van Fleet. It was read by General Collins during the impressive ceremonies marking the retirement of Florida's distinguished son and outstanding soldier.

MARCH 23, 1953.

Gen. JAMES A. VAN FLEET.

DEAR VAN: Although I know you are well aware of my high regard for you, I want to make a matter of record some small measure of my lasting appreciation for your many contributions to the advancement of the Army and the security of the Nation. For nearly 38 years you have devoted yourself to your profession with a fidelity and singleness of purpose in keeping with the highest traditions of the service. Now that you are about to retire, I join with your host of friends and comrades in arms in paying well-deserved tribute to you and to the distinguished record you have built.

The restricted space of a letter such as this is obviously far too small for me to attempt to list all of your accomplishments. I would be remiss, however, if I did not mention at least a few of the positions of responsibility which you have filled so capably. The history of World War II in Europe is replete with accounts of your personal gallantry and inspiring leadership.

On D-day I was proud to have your regiment lead the assault of the VII Corps on Utah Beach. I shall never forget our meeting on the outskirts of Ste. Mere-Eglise on D-1 and our subsequent ride through town to Matt Ridgway's CP near the Merderet River. Your driving energy and personal leadership were largely responsible for the linkup in Ste. Mere-Eglise with the 82d Airborne Division. You continued to demonstrate the same fine leadership throughout the Cherbourg campaign.

Subsequently, the 90th Division, under your command, played the major role in the capture of Metz, and led the Third Army in the counteroffensive in the Bulge. It was entirely fitting, therefore, that you should have commanded III Corps during the drive across Germany to the Austrian Alps. Nor did the end of hostilities in Europe put a stop to your distinguished achievements. In Greece, your forceful initiative and splendid grasp of tactical and strategic concepts played a decisive part in crushing the Communist forces there.

I can think of no finer climax to your long and honorable career than you furnished as commanding general of the great United States Eighth Army in Korea. Under your guidance, it became a splendid United Nations battle team with invincible spirit and a battlewise competence which has made it an inspiration to all in the fight against Communist aggression. In addition, through your vigorous training efforts, a new military potential has emerged in the Army of the Republic of Korea. This new army, largely through your efforts, is now taking its rightful place in the defenses of the free world.

Throughout your entire career, you have exemplified the highest form of courage, selfless patriotism, and tireless devotion to duty. When I congratulate you on the distinguished record you have built, I do so firm in the conviction that I speak for every member of the Army, as well as for all freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Let me say, "Well done," and add the hope that your future will be bright with the fullness of happiness and good fortune you have so surely earned.

Faithfully yours,

JOE COLLINS.

## BOSTON POST BROADCAST

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege and honor recently of appearing on the NBC radio program conducted by the Boston Post under the able direction of John Kelso, its Washington correspondent, with my esteemed friend and colleague, Congressman WILLIAM BATES.

Because of considerable interest exhibited by many listeners in the matters discussed over the program, I feel it is appropriate briefly to review some of the problems discussed and specific questions answered.

There seems to be much interest in the recent testimony of General Van Fleet before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. In response to specific questions, I responded that the matter would undoubtedly be carefully explored by a congressional committee. I also alluded to the fact that while the general had referred definitely to certain ammunition shortages, he had testified that there was sufficient ammunition for the type of war we were fighting in Korea—namely a war of more or less watchful waiting and stalemate. General Van Fleet further stated that if he had been given the green light at policy level in March 1951 that, in his opinion, we could have gained a decisive victory.

I stated that as I construed the matter there was absolutely no possible justification for shortage of ammunition, artillery, equipment, food and clothing, planes, tanks, or any other necessary weapons for Korea. The Congress has made ample provision for fully arming our forces and for fully equipping them and that it is entirely indefensible that we should have had shortages of any kind. I made it very clear that so far as the Congress is concerned we want and intend our boys who are making such bitter sacrifices for the Nation to have the best of everything they need to carry on this bloody battle.

I also made the point that this is the first American war that I know of in which we have not fought with the idea of gaining victory and that the time has long since passed to reevaluate our entire position in Korea and to insist that other member nations of the United Nations should make much more substantial and more equitable contributions to the actual fighting required by this desperate war to check Communist aggression and protect the free world.

I also commented on the recent A-bomb explosion in Yucca, Nev., which I deemed had a twofold importance: First, it marks another step in our development of the A-bomb, the secrets of which were stolen from our Government by the dastardly work of traitors. This made it possible for the Soviet, once in possession of the formulas, by following the ordinary paths of scientific discovery, to create fissionable material and ultimately the bomb itself.

I alluded to the fact that some people do not believe the Soviet has yet exploded a bomb but my personal belief is that the Soviet already has a small quantity of these devastating bombs.

The explosion at Yucca, as I said, illustrated the headway we are making in this field and I indicated my view that we were well in front of any other nation in perfecting this terrible weapon.

I indicated my view that we have more bombs and more powerful bombs than the Soviet has at this particular time and that we have the power to deliver them and that, in my opinion, that has been the greatest force in deterring aggression upon other parts of the free world or upon this Nation. If diplomatic policy had kept pace with scientific progress, we probably would not now be faced with the menacing prospect that confronts us.

I deem that the explosion at Yucca has again brought forcibly into the minds of the American people the urgency of civil defense. It would be most unwise to arouse or alarm the American people or get them into a state of hysteria at the prospect of attacks upon our cities, although that has been done and is still being done by some in an effort to justify appeasement and compromise with the great Red conspiracy.

But I honestly believe that at local, State and National levels we should intensify and extend our work in civil defense, particularly in the educational and instructive phases as well as in mobilization of resources and trained personnel.

In such a short broadcast, of course, it was not possible to cover many questions currently concerning our people. The progress of our defense against air attack evokes considerable public interest. Military experts largely agree that there is no such thing as complete defense to an air attack. Efficient units may be able to block and intercept enemy aircraft and shoot some of them down. They may be able to apprehend a number of them at a fairly good distance from the continental mainland, but it should be remembered that planes travel very fast these days, and they can cover great distances in a short space of time. Even when they are discovered on a radar screen or by ground observers there is not much time left for our defensive aircraft and antiaircraft power to get ready to meet the attack. The fact that a certain percentage of attacking planes are likely to get through makes civil defense all the more obvious.

Let me state that, in reverse, that would also be true of any American planes making retaliatory attacks—a certain percentage would undoubtedly get through. That is something we should keep in mind. From some quarters we hear a lot about the strength of the Soviet, its manpower, its large number of trained divisions, its multitude of tanks, its powerful air force. But we do not hear so much talk from these quarters about our own strength once we are girded for battle. I am not contending that we are fully prepared for every eventuality, or that we have achieved all necessary armed strength to meet possible world developments. But we have certain definite assets that should be recognized.

We have the atomic bomb and the striking power to carry it.

We have the greatest Navy in the world.

We have a radar screen to apprehend planes and ships and we are steadily extending its coverage.

We have guided missiles and all the latest developments in military science.

What is more—and this is extremely important—we have great industrial productive capacity—far beyond that of the Soviets.

There are weaknesses in our military setup to be sure, but we are moving to eliminate them. It should be noted that the Soviet also has some glaring weaknesses. It is lacking in many of the things we have—impressive industrial know-how, advanced scientific research and development even though it has harnessed some of the German skills and has made some distinctive contributions of its own.

But I doubt very much that the Soviet is ready or anxious to start a war at this time. It will wage war only when the military, the economic, and the psychological timetables are reached, and that will not be, in my opinion, until they have achieved overwhelming armed strength and perhaps through further infiltration and consolidation considerably more political support. No matter how unfavorable the world situation appears, we should never abate our sincere and vigorous efforts for peace.

Another question I had intended to discuss if time permitted was the prospect of cutting military appropriations.

Practically everyone is agreed that economy and efficiency in the Federal Government are desirable aims necessary to keep American industry dynamic and progressive, necessary to maintain our high standards of living. It would be impossible to estimate accurately the baneful and dangerous effects of current heavy taxation. To a great extent we have become a tax-ridden people, not only in the Nation but in the States and localities as well. High taxes constitute a great threat to the American free way of life and we should frankly face that fact. Stifled initiative and low living standards caused by heavy taxation could be and will be, if continued long enough, destructive of the business and industrial vigor of the Nation and a severe blow to the national prosperity.

When we are dealing with military expenditures, however, it is very difficult to apply ordinary principles and standards of economy. One thing is paramount—we must have military defense, we must provide for the protection of the country, we must afford our gallant boys in Korea and in every other theater where they are unselfishly serving the Nation every most generous support.

The question is: Are the American people getting their \$50 billion worth out of annual military expenditures. Is there waste and extravagance in the military that we can eliminate? Is the taxpayers' money being wasted on some activities? I would not presume to give a categorical answer to these questions, yet it is my opinion that there are unquestionably places in the various branches of our armed services where measures of economy and efficiency may well be effected. But hasty action of curtailment should be scrupulously avoided. Careful surveys and studies

should be made to determine where and how these economies can be secured, before actual cutbacks are made.

It is true that, at present, there are huge unexpended balances to the credit of the armed services as well as huge uncommitted balances in some of these accounts. That does not mean, however, that these huge sums will not be spent, or will not be needed, because defense, vital and necessary as it is, is extremely costly and frequently various huge items must be provided over a period of years to meet certain heavy requirements. Naval air carriers may cost a hundred million dollars apiece in the light of current inflated prices before they are constructed and fully equipped, heavy bombers four, five or even six million dollars apiece and so on with practically everything we need by way of equipment and weapons. When one considers our critical needs in the air, one realizes the very heavy costs entailed to provide adequate numbers of these essential units of our great striking force, yet, that is only one illustration of huge, essential defense costs.

Whether unification of the Armed Forces has made for economy and efficiency is decidedly questionable. I am doubtful that unification has measured up to the hopes of its strong advocates. With deepest apprehension those of us particularly interested in the armed services have observed various echelons of administration in the Defense Department building up into what now undoubtedly is the mightiest and perhaps the most unwieldy, as well as the most expensive, bureaucracy that the world has ever known. The problem of unscrambling and disentangling this administrative labyrinth or at least molding it into a compact coordinated efficient overall unit certainly should receive early consideration from the Congress.

Let me refer again to the danger and injudiciousness of cutting vital activities of the armed services without the most careful, painstaking care, reflection and study. Sometime prior to Korea you will recall that the then head of the Department of Defense slashed several billion dollars from authorized expenditures without consulting the Congress. As it turned out, these cuts had to be promptly restored and even greater expenditures authorized to meet the urgent requirements of radically changing world conditions. That very recent experience should serve as a warning against indiscriminate curtailment. I want to see America fully and abundantly prepared to defend herself, prepared to meet commitments, prepared to command respect among all nations, prepared to face every contingency with courage and effectiveness.

While I believe that there are areas in which economies can be effected in the armed services, I am firmly of the opinion that before drastic retrenchment is made there should be careful studies and surveys to insure that, in seeking worthwhile economy, vital and crippling damage is not done to the overall efficiency of our fighting forces. For these reasons I would urge extreme care and caution in instituting and effectuating cutbacks in the armed services at this time.



It would be perhaps superfluous to emphasize to Members of Congress the gravity of our present situation in the world, the gravity of the period through which we are passing, the gravity of the problems facing us today. Regardless of the outcome of Korean peace negotiations, or the Korean war itself, these problems will remain with us for some time to come. If the Soviets are desirous of achieving the peace and will indicate their sincerity of purpose by tangible acts, rather than by mere declarations, then perhaps we can hope for the settlement of these great and pressing problems. Perhaps in that event our leadership can suggest not only a general conference to settle questions still remaining from World War II and other questions that have developed since that time, but also to propose and work for the principles of general and universal disarmament and control of atomic energy predicated upon mutual inspection. We must always remain receptive to any sincere, genuine plea or effort for peace. We must ever be willing to take the initiative where circumstances appear feasible to promote peace based on justice.

Although we are living perhaps in the most dangerous period of our national existence when we are beset not only by external but by internal problems, it is a time particularly for faith, for courage, for firm determination by a united American people—a time for us to recognize the need for building strength, not only strength of arms for our own defense, but strength in our great productive economy and that spiritual, moral strength and fortitude on the part of the American people which has played so great a part in shaping the freedom we enjoy and will be, must be, in this crisis, the redeeming force under God to maintain our heritage.

If we persevere in this strength of purpose, in this strength of the spirit, in this faith in the Almighty and in ourselves, we need not fear the Soviet Union, the worldwide Communist conspiracy, the subversive termites in our midst, or any other enemy, foreign or domestic, because our strength and our high purpose will keep and preserve America as a great free land, and we will hence be best fitted and best inspired to secure just and lasting world peace.

#### EQUALITY FOR ALL—NOT CONSIDERATION FOR A FEW

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to extend the excess-profits tax for 1 year. I, for one, am taking definite and affirmative action to help the many millions of people in this country who are being betrayed and ignored by the present administration. The Republicans rode into power on their promises of reduced taxes and a balanced budget. The people were fooled and deliberately deceived. Once

again we are convinced that the Republican Party never had any intention of helping the poor, or the low-wage earners. Once again, we witness the Republicans, either by failure to act or by positive assistance, giving private industry and the big-money interests and the rich all the consideration and the breaks, while the lot of the little man becomes increasingly more difficult and despairing.

The Republican platform promised both to balance the budget and cut taxes. When the President delivered his state of the Union message, he stressed only a balanced budget—a change of heart had occurred that soon.

The bill to reduce personal income taxes is not permitted to come before us for action, as the President maintains that the budget must be cut before taxes are reduced. The Treasury Department has announced that it is flatly opposed to tax cuts of any kind until the administration has a clearer picture of the budget outlook. It flatly opposes any reduction of excise taxes. It has been charged that this failure by the administration to carry out its pledge as to taxes is unfair, dishonest and getting office under false pretenses.

We find that so far, the Committee on Ways and Means has considered only the individual income-tax reduction measure. It has been stated that this has been the first time in more than 20 years when public hearings were not held at some time or other when a major tax bill was considered; that the committee did not have at least the Treasury Department views on such a bill or that the budget estimates of the administration were not available. And now this tax measure to help all the people is stymied. We do not know when Congress will have the opportunity to act upon it, as the Republican leadership will not allow it to come before us.

No action is being taken to cut or eliminate excise taxes, which include admissions tax, taxes on appliances, necessities such as electric light bulbs, telephone facilities, and other commodities important to the well-being and comfort of the people.

Plenty is being done to help big business, for already they have the assurance that the excess-profits tax law will be allowed to expire on June 30, 1953. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has stated that the excess-profits tax must terminate as scheduled. This will mean a revenue loss of \$2 billion per year. This assures still higher profits for those already capitalizing on the war crisis and the defense billions we are spending. Many millions of people who are going without necessities in order to meet high taxes will strongly object if no tax cut is allowed them while corporations are exempt from paying excess-profits taxes on their huge war and defense gains.

I am calling for an extension of the excess-profits tax. I refuse to give relief to big corporations and millionaires when no relief is in sight for the millions of taxpayers who were promised a tax cut.

It did not take the Republican Legislature of New York State long to get the

drift of this situation. They put through a 15-percent rent increase recently because they knew that the landlords would be able to keep the profits. Up to now there was no real campaign in New York State to further increase rents, but with the Republicans in power in Washington, they knew they could count on reaping—and keeping—high profits.

A recent appraisal of the Eisenhower administration was that "the most positive thing about it may seem to be its negativism." That is putting it too kindly. This very negativism has served the purpose which, apparently, the Republicans had in mind all along, for it is the very lack of action which is helping the big-business man and allowing the poor one to be further bogged down by an unbearable taxload and increased living prices.

In these critical days we cannot afford the reversals, ineptness, and bungling, which we have suffered for the past 60 days. Constructive action as to tax reduction, expenditures, overall economic planning, and forthright commitments which can be counted on, are our just due. If this country is to survive, we cannot waste any more time or undermine the confidence of the American people. Instead of the indecision and confusion which have been the order of the day, we need courage, fairness to the people, and honesty on the part of the administration.

Tax relief is far off. At the same time, other burdens of our people have become much heavier. On March 17, 1953, the Office of Price Stabilization announced the end of all price controls. Price Chief Joseph Freehill estimates that the ending of controls will mean price increases of about \$3 billion this year, \$1 billion coming from consumers, \$1 billion in defense costs, and \$1 billion in higher business and industrial costs. On March 18, 1953, Dun & Bradstreet reported wholesale food prices in the previous week jumped 14 cents, the sharpest rise since the week after the Korean war started in 1950. Coffee prices which have been sky-high right along, are being raised 2 to 4 cents per pound. Bakers are demanding higher prices for bread. Price hikes have been announced on materials used to build homes, farm equipment, essential commodities. Clothing prices will go up. The steel industry is planning to raise many prices in the near future. Inflation is again on the upgrade; the people are faced with higher living costs on every hand.

With all this evidence before it, the administration is resisting more controls than it seeks. It does not even want a standby law to control prices and wages, but would accept a simple 90-day freeze bill if Congress believes it could not pass legislation quickly enough in event of an emergency. This indifference on the part of the administration to the present threat of inflation is unbelievable. It does prove, however, that the attitude is to let the ordinary citizen struggle along as best he can under a staggering load of taxes plus even greater living costs.

Will we never learn? When we found ourselves at war in 1941, prices and wages

soared sky high before the Government could control them. By the time action could be taken, much economic damage had been done and our people were the victims of the profiteers. When the Korea situation arose in 1950, the same thing happened and we witnessed frightening inflation and more undue hardship for the people. Twice in 10 years we have seen the terrible effects of failure to have a necessary controls law ready for use in a war emergency. And we are in a war emergency now. Bernard Baruch told the Senate that we should enact a complete economic-controls law now on a standby basis, for immediate use. He said that failure to do so at once would put a premium on selfishness and that "To wait is to die." Other economists bear him out. The international situation continues critical. The time consumed in preparing, enacting, and implementing legislation is of such duration that we cannot risk the chance the administration would have us take. A strong standby controls law is required.

The administration's attitude as to rent control is equally ruthless. They say that rent control should be extended until September 30, 1953, for those communities still under Federal rent control; that this would give them a chance to pass their own control laws. Only critical defense areas would have the protection of Federal rent control.

Limited controls now affect 14 million Americans in a dozen big cities and 1,400 communities. The housing shortage is still critical. This means that millions of tenants will be victimized by profiteering landlords if the administration's plan goes through. A 5-month extension of Federal rent control is no good—Federal rent control must be extended for at least 2 years. The States have not taken over the responsibility of protecting tenants; few State legislatures have overridden the objections of the real estate interests. They cannot be counted upon for help now. Should the administration plan go through, we know that at its expiration, rents will skyrocket again, and in this instance also, it would take too much time for Congress to act to save the people from gouging and profiteering landlords, and to keep roofs over their heads. According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, rents in decontrolled cities climbed from 17 to 35 percent in the past 2 years, while the boost for low-rent apartments ranged from 29 percent to over 50 percent. What more proof do we need that Federal rent control is necessary?

I have fought for the continuation of price and rent controls. Past history, present indications, and our critical times, prove their necessity. In the light of these serious problems, the stupid attitude of the administration must be overcome, and Congress must act to protect the people. We must be foresighted, not indifferent or careless in these vital matters.

The people are not being helped on the tax question; in addition, they are being injured by the lack of controls which are so necessary to our economy and our security. Their hardships are increasing daily. My aim will be to give them the assistance they must have, to

lighten their tax burden, and to see that there is equality for all—not consideration for a few.

#### DR. M. G. BURNSIDE

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the leaders of the Republican Party made the solemn promise during the campaign that they would always seek the top talent available for the jobs in Washington.

Such a job, Mr. Speaker, was filled until recently by Dr. M. G. "Burnie" Burnside, in the National Security Agency. The work was of a top-secret nature, so much so that Dr. Burnside was under oath never to discuss it with anyone, not even his family. Then, quite suddenly, Dr. Burnside was dismissed.

Why? The Agency informed him in his separation notice his work had been satisfactory. He had been cleared after a thorough check by all the security agencies. The reason, it is now apparent, was politics. Republicans there were greatly disturbed that Dr. Burnside, a former West Virginia Congressman who served two terms, had gotten a job in the new administration. They were hungry for patronage and said so in many news items published in the West Virginia papers. For this reason they wanted Dr. Burnside out of his job, despite the fact he was working in crucial and secret defense work in the National Security Agency.

They got their way—unfortunately. Republican sources—a Republican Congressman, to be exact—announced that Dr. Burnside would be removed from his job many hours before the actual notice was given.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think politics should enter into a secret and technical agency such as the one here. It hurts the agency. It hurts the many thousands who are employed in such jobs. Does this mean all of them are liable to be axed if a few squads of angry Republicans happen to decide to jump on them?

This situation must be remedied, Mr. Chairman. Such a policy can only harm and weaken our Nation.

#### OFFSHORE OIL AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, now that the offshore oil problem has been settled in the House, a little reflection might be of some benefit to taxpayers throughout the country.

We have an enormous debt due largely to the war and defense problems. The interest on this debt is a burden to the taxpayers. The present administration had promised before the election that it would reduce the taxes and abolish waste in the Government. To the taxpayers the action today should be of paramount concern. The House has voted to give a great source of wealth to four States, taking it from the people of the country—the taxpayers.

As pointed out yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], the revenue from these oil properties would go a long way toward paying the national debt; and he might also have said it would make it possible to reduce taxes considerably. So we have an administration proposing on the one hand to relieve the taxpayers and at the same time giving away a great source of national revenue.

I hope that the taxpayers in my own State of Pennsylvania realize what was done today. I cannot think of anything recently that will so injure them and the people of this country as does this legislation. Here is a great source of wealth that over the years would be of immense benefit to all of our people, and yet it has fallen under the pressure of certain interests in four States. The taxpayers are again forgotten. The outlook is that we will continue to pay high taxes for many years to come, for the one clear opportunity this administration had to offer relief has been abandoned in the interest of a few.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Monday, April 13, to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN reserved all points of order on the bill.

#### DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 195 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of S. 1110, an act to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the con-



clusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and I now yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the appointment of a Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The bill that will be under consideration after the adoption of this rule is a Senate bill, but the House amendments as reported make certain changes. There are three of them of particular importance.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Section 102 of the National Security Act establishes the Central Intelligence Agency and authorizes the appointment of a Director by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director may be a civilian or a commissioned officer.

There is no existing provision of law establishing a Deputy Director with statutory authority to act for the Director or to perform such functions as the Director may assign to him.

The administrative authority exists for a Deputy Director but there is no statutory basis for it. No certain functions of a Deputy Director are clearly existing in the present law. The proposed law would create the office of Deputy Director and would authorize the President to appoint such Deputy Director by and with the advice and consent of the Senate from among civilians or commissioned officers, similar to the basic law pertaining to the Director himself.

Although Deputy Directors have been appointed under the Executive Pay Act of 1949, there is no provision of law which would permit a commissioned officer or retired officer to be appointed to this position. As a matter of fact, there is a definite prohibition in the basic law which would prohibit any commissioned officer or retired officer from holding any other civilian office. The definitions of the functions of a Deputy Director are such that it would undoubtedly be held to be a civil office.

Up until the appointment of the present Director, Mr. Allen Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has always been a military officer; the Deputy Director has been a civilian since 1950.

The Central Intelligence Agency is most desirous of obtaining this legislation and has gone on record as in favor of the bill as amended by the House committee.

It is the intention of the President to appoint an Air Force lieutenant general to this position as soon as the law is enacted.

The pay of the Director and the Deputy Director is covered by the Executive Pay Act of 1949. The pay of the Deputy Director is fixed at \$14,800. The pay of a lieutenant general is \$14,900. This

bill provides that the Central Intelligence Agency shall reimburse that branch of the military service which may supply a Deputy Director. The Central Intelligence Agency, however, is to make the actual payment. If the pay of the military person so serving shall be less than \$14,800, the Central Intelligence Agency is required by this bill to make up the difference. So that if you had a major general serving here at \$14,400, the Central Intelligence Agency would make up the \$400 difference annually. Since the pay of a lieutenant general is greater than that of the Deputy Director, there is no necessity for additional reimbursement.

The House committee thought there were three points which ought to be covered, and that were not covered in the Senate bill, so that the House committee has provided that the Director and the Deputy Director, if either of them shall be a military person, shall have an additional number in grade if they are military personnel; second, that in both cases the Agency will reimburse the executive department; and, third, at no time can both the Director and Deputy Director be military personnel.

The reason for the additional number in grade is simply this: No service supplying a lieutenant general will benefit in that service from the designation of such person as a Deputy Director, for the simple reason that the bill goes on to provide that the appointee shall have no duty or responsibility to that service while acting as Deputy Director, and shall be free of any direction or control from that service. For that reason the service in this case will have lost during the time of tenure the service of one of its lieutenant generals. The number of lieutenant generals permitted to the Air Force is 19. At the present time, I understand, the Committee on Armed Services is considering the question of the number of high-staff officers, flag officers, and officers there should be in various ranks; and it is, therefore, thought best, as I understand it, pending this review that no service should be penalized by the loss of one of its officers to the Central Intelligence Agency. That is why the Air Force will be permitted to retain 19 lieutenant generals. If, however, this officer should return to the Air Force, the most junior lieutenant general on the list would drop back to major general. So that you are not increasing the number of general officers in the Air Force or in any other service, if someone should be appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that basically is pretty much what is done here, as we understand it.

I will be glad to yield to anyone who has any questions, if there are any questions at this time, before I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

If there are no questions, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has given a very authoritative and explicit explanation of the bill. It came to the Committee on Rules with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Armed Services, and it was voted out by the Committee on Rules unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AREND). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1110) to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1110, with Mr. COLE of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the bill S. 1110 is a relatively simple but extremely important bill. It is necessary because without enactment of this legislation it will be impossible to designate an officer of the armed services as a Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Up until the appointment of Mr. Allan Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has always been a military man. You will recall Admiral Hillenkoetter and Gen. Walter Bedell Smith as Directors. The deputies, up until the Executive Pay Act of 1949, were also commissioned officers of the Armed Forces. But when the Executive Pay Act of 1949 was passed, the lawyers contend that it created the statutory office of Deputy Director, at least to the extent that no officer of the Armed Forces could be appointed to that position because of other laws which preclude a commissioned officer of the Army and Air Force from being appointed to, or holding, a civilian office.

From 1950, and until recently, the position of Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has been filled by a civilian.

However, it now appears highly desirable to permit the appointment of a commissioned officer as Deputy Director. It is felt that this Agency, working so closely with the Armed Forces, should have one military man in a high position in the Agency. The collection and dissemination of information dealing with our national security must of necessity involve the Armed Forces. Thus, this bill, as reported by the House Committee on Armed Services, amends the basic law with respect to the Central Intelligence Agency, establishes the statutory office of Deputy Director, and designates the duties, restrictions, privileges, and protection surrounding the office of Deputy Director.

Now there are three things in this bill that you all should know:

First, and in my opinion of paramount importance, the bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services prevents commissioned officers from occupying the positions of Director and Deputy Director simultaneously. In other words, at no time in the future will it be possible for both the Director and Deputy Director to be commissioned officers. They both may be civilians, but they both may not be officers of the Armed Forces. We think this is sound and that it carries out the traditional concept of civilian control in all phases of our military structure. The bill as it passed the Senate did not contain this prohibition.

Now, the next thing this bill does is to permit the Director or the Deputy Director, if either is a commissioned officer, to be more or less an additional number in grade. That is, if the Director is a commissioned officer, the limit on the number of general officers in the Armed Forces, now contained in Public Law 7, may be exceeded by one so long as this officer occupies the position of Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The same is true under the proposed legislation if the Deputy Director occupies the position as a commissioned officer.

Now, the Committee on Armed Services is quite aware of this problem of the numbers of high ranking officers on active duty. We are conducting very extensive hearings on this question, so you can be sure that it was given careful consideration. We came to the conclusion that it is not only desirable but also necessary to permit an officer, occupying the office of Director or Deputy Director, to be an additional number in grade.

It must be remembered that if an officer of the Armed Forces possesses the peculiar talent required for the type of work involved in the Central Intelligence Agency, that the President should feel free to designate such an officer to the position of Director or Deputy Director without having to penalize the service from which he takes this officer. It so happens that the President desires to appoint an Air Force lieutenant general to the position of Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. This officer is now occupying a very important position as Director of the Joint Staff under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As a lieutenant general he now counts as 1 of the 19 lieutenant generals which the Air Force is permitted to have on active duty. But when he becomes Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency it would hardly be fair to prohibit the Air Force from promoting a major general to fill the vacancy created by having a lieutenant general become Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. After all, this man, whoever he may be, now or in the future, is occupying a position of importance to the Nation as a whole and not to any single service.

Now the bill, as it passed the Senate, did not contain language which would have permitted the Director, if a commissioned officer, to be "in addition to the number and percentages otherwise authorized and appropriated for the armed service of which he is a mem-

ber." Had the bill been allowed to pass in this manner, we would be in the inconsistent position of saying that if a commissioned officer were appointed as Director, he would be charged against the grade limitations for the service which supplied the Director, but not so if the commissioned officer were appointed Deputy Director. We removed that inconsistency by saying that either the Director or Deputy Director if a commissioned officer could be an additional number in grade. Bear in mind, however, that at no time can both the Director and Deputy Director be commissioned officers.

There is another part of this bill which should be carefully explained. Under existing law the Director, if a commissioned officer, is paid by the service of which he is a member. The Central Intelligence Agency does not reimburse the military department. But the bill, as it passed the Senate, provided that the Deputy Director, though paid by the service of which he is a member, would be reimbursed by the Central Intelligence Agency. Here again an inconsistency would have been created had we enacted into law the bill as it passed the Senate. So we removed that inconsistency by saying that in the event the Director or Deputy Director is a commissioned officer, the military department which supplies the Director or Deputy Director would be reimbursed by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Now, one final point: the salaries of the Director and Deputy Director. You will note that the bill, as amended by our committee, repeals the language dealing with the salary of the Director. This provision of the National Security Act is, of course, out of date. The salary was established in 1947 at \$14,000 per year, but the Executive Pay Act of 1949 in section 2 establishes the salary of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency at \$16,000 per year. That same act, in section 6 (a), established the salary of \$14,800 per year for the office of Deputy Director. It was that act which brought about the necessity for this legislation because that created the statutory office of Deputy Director, at least in the minds of the lawyers.

Now, the law with respect to the Directors says that an officer of the Armed Forces occupying the position of Director shall receive the full pay and allowances of his grade and, in addition, shall receive the difference between the pay of the statutory office and his full pay and allowances. The legislation before the House today does the same thing for the Deputy Director. Here is what that means:

Let us take a major general.

Supposing a major general of the Army is appointed Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. His pay, if he is married and not occupying Government quarters, amounts to \$14,483.44 per year. As Director he would be entitled to a total compensation of \$16,000. This means that he would continue to draw \$14,483.44 from the service of which he is a member, and, in addition, would receive \$1,516.56 per year from the Central Intelligence Agency. Now, if he were a Deputy Director he would continue to

draw \$14,483.44 per year from the service of which he is a member, and since the salary of the Deputy Director is set at \$14,800, he would also draw \$316.56 per year from the Central Intelligence Agency.

Now, the lieutenant general who will occupy the position of Deputy Director, if this bill is enacted into law, will not draw any pay from the Central Intelligence Agency because his pay and allowances from the Air Force amount to \$14,983.44 per year, which is \$183.44 more than the salary established for the office of Deputy Director.

That is the bill in a nutshell. I might say that Mr. Dulles, for whom we all have the highest regard, is most anxious to have this legislation because the Central Intelligence Agency is functioning right now without a Deputy Director. While Mr. Dulles is admirably qualified for the important position he holds, he cannot do the job alone. He has been working 18 hours a day and we must give help immediately.

I want you to notice in particular that we have surrounded the office of Director and Deputy Director with many provisions designed to free a military officer, if he is the Director or Deputy Director, from supervision or control from the higher echelons, and from responsibility for, or direction of, lower echelons, in the Military Establishment. In other words, we protect the officer's rights and privileges but we are also careful to make sure that he is under no one's control except the President, the National Security Council, and the Director.

Let me say in closing that I would be less than frank if I did not state that in the past our military intelligence, in my opinion, has been the weakest link in our chain of national defense. There might be several good reasons for that. One is we are not an old nation steeped in political machinations and religious intrigues with their bitter rivalries and petty jealousies that have existed between countries of the Old World, nor have we as a people been so suspicious perhaps of the motives of other nations or people.

Another reason is that Congress has not devoted the study nor voted the funds for this Agency that it so richly deserves. It has been an orphan child and we need to exercise greater supervision, care, and support over its welfare.

To be perfectly frank, we are comparatively an infant country, and this is more or less a pioneer field for us. We must honestly confess that in the wars gone by other great powers, such as Russia, Germany, and Britain, possessed a superior Intelligence to our own, but I am happy to report to the Members of this House, in which I think all members of our armed services will agree, that we have made tremendous strides and progress in two world wars and in the present conflict in Korea. Much advance has been made under Admiral Hillenkoetter, under Gen. Bedell Smith; certainly a great job was done by "Wild Bill" Donovan in World War II in OSS; and I might, without revealing any secrets, say that he is being consulted by the present able Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and I predict with



the passage of this legislation we will go a long way to strengthen our psychological warfare and strategy, but most important of all, to strengthen that department of defense in which we have been weakest in the past.

There is, Mr. Chairman, no more important and no more sensitive agency in Government today than the Central Intelligence Agency. The positions of Director and Deputy Director should be occupied by the best-qualified men in the United States. This legislation will permit the Central Intelligence Agency to have a Deputy Director in which the Director and the President have the highest confidence. I hope it will be passed unanimously by the House, as it was unanimously reported by the House Armed Services Committee after thorough consideration, and which was approved unanimously by your Committee on Rules.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am happy to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. To me, one of the important provisions in the bill is to be found on page 4. I should like to read it for the purpose of getting it in the RECORD:

He shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof.

I want to compliment the gentleman upon that provision in this bill, and I should like to say further that I hope it operates more effectively than did a similar provision in the Unification Act which supposedly protected Admiral Denfeld's right to come before the House Armed Services Committee of his own volition and testify. We all know what happened to Admiral Denfeld in that case. I hope this provision works more effectively in the protection of this Director and the Deputy Director.

Mr. SHORT. I am very much in sympathy with the views expressed by the gentleman from Iowa, and know that he has always fought to keep the military under civilian control. I appreciate the statement that he has just made.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am happy to yield to my very able colleague from New York, who really is more responsible, I think, for the revised House version of this legislation than any other member of our committee. He is an outstanding lawyer, and we wrote the bill, I think, to carry out the intentions or the views that the gentleman from New York had in mind.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is very generous, as usual, with his references and his remarks. But since he has indicated a part which I played in the proposal now before the House, I should like to make certain that there is no misinterpretation placed upon a certain portion of this bill. I direct your attention to the paragraph on page 5, beginning at line 5, with reference to the pay which an individual receives in

serving as either a Director or Deputy Director, if that individual is a military man. The bill says that he is entitled to receive, reading from line 15, "the military pay and allowances—active or retired, as the case may be, including personal money allowances."

My question is whether the reference to personal money allowance is an allowance in addition to military pay and allowance which the individual would receive.

Mr. SHORT. Only the personal allowance for the particular rank or grade that he is occupying at the time.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the point. Is it a personal money allowance that goes to the individual because of the rank or grade he holds?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Rather than the billet he holds?

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. So that at no time is it intended by the committee or can it be construed in the future that an individual who may at the time, prior to his appointment, fill a billet which carries a personal money request because of the billet, automatically be entitled to that?

Mr. SHORT. He would not be entitled to that, and I am glad the gentleman from New York is getting that in the RECORD to make the intent perfectly clear. For example, we voted, as I recall, \$5,000 expense allowance to a military officer, if appointed to the United Nations. If in the future, at some near or distant time, that member of the United Nations were called down to act as Director or Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, he would not be entitled to draw that \$5,000.

Mr. COLE of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, as has already been said, this bill came out of the House Committee on Armed Services with no opposition. We are all in accord with one single purpose, to strengthen the Central Intelligence Agency. We wanted to do everything possible to give it the standing, authority, and efficiency which the people of the United States have a right to expect of this most important agency.

Because of the fact there is no fight on this bill or any portion of it at the present time normally I would not even raise my voice here and take the further time of this body in discussing the bill. It has been ably presented by my colleague, the chairman of our committee, who has developed a number of points. But I think it is so important to the safety of the United States that we have a good central intelligence that I want to emphasize one point, and this one point is the sole, actuating purpose of the membership of our committee in making these changes and reporting this measure to the House of Representatives.

The Central Intelligence is not an organization that can ballyhoo its exploits or its achievement; but when failures occur, somehow or other without great publicity we learn there has been a failure on the part of Central Intelligence to accumulate the proper information. In no phase of government is knowledge

so important; in no phase of government is knowledge power to the extent it is with the Central Intelligence. By the proper handling of its affairs, by having the proper knowledge of what is going on in the world, this agency can help us win wars, of course; but I think even more than that, by proper handling of its affairs, proper efficiency, and proper activity, the Central Intelligence Agency can keep this Nation out of major wars and out of major differences and out of major disagreements with other nations, and keep us well along the road of peace which is the path our people are so anxious to pursue. So I was glad that it became my humble part to participate in helping to draft this measure.

There is one feature that I want to discuss very briefly. In this measure, S. 1110, as amended, we provide in section 102:

That at no time shall the two positions of the Director and Deputy Director be occupied simultaneously by commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status.

I should like to have the record show that this stipulation does not preclude a reserve officer from being used in either one of these capacities and being classified as a civilian. We refer in this paragraph to an officer, whether on active or retired status, but we do not say that this includes the reserve officer. We have so many reserve officers and so many reserves in the Military Establishment, and we are building up the reserves to such a point, that it is well that the record show that a reserve officer may be called from a civilian activity and not be chargeable in the filling of this position "as an active or retired officer" in the Military Establishment.

I think in working this out we give elasticity to the filling of these positions, and it is proper that we do. We have had good men in charge of this agency in the past. In each instance to date we have had only military men in charge. Now we have a civilian in charge of the Agency.

This is a relatively new agency. I have heard a lot of condemnation of the failure of our intelligence to properly function. I do not think we should be too severe on this agency, and I have said so before. It is a relatively new agency. It was established, I think, in 1947. The Congress must give it the support which we should give an important agency if it is to function to the top degree. I think it is coming along fine. I was glad to hear our chairman extend words of praise for the progress the organization has made. We certainly want to help to produce greater efficiency in the Central Intelligence Agency in the future than we have had in the past.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to inquire about the number of civilians in the Agency compared to the military, if that is permissible, because complaints have come to me.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We cannot go into that for the reason that this is such a highly classified proposition that even when something happens, as

we saw yesterday in the paper, concerning the death of someone who was with the Central Intelligence Agency, you cannot safely go into it publicly and disclose what position the man might have had. If we do that, you would be giving information to an enemy who has his agents unfortunately all around us here, and who will use the information thus innocently given for the purpose of hurting our Government and our people.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I know that to be true and I do not want to get into a field that should not be disclosed, but I must say that I have had a number of complaints from top civilians who have been let out of the Central Intelligence Agency so that someone in the officer class could replace them. I am wondering if that argues to the benefit of the CIA, or should we keep some of these top civilians in these places, and not turn them over entirely to the military.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is difficult to get into an investigation, as the gentleman knows. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to advise the gentleman from Louisiana that there is evidence of action, which the gentleman from Nebraska was talking about, in the case of the national security agency, and it is my purpose in the 30-minute special order that I have following the conclusion of the regular business today, to lay some of those facts bare.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say to the gentleman that I will listen with much interest to his remarks, as I always do. I give him credit for being a student and an exponent of our public education system of the United States, and I am going to listen to his remarks.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I think when the story of the Inchon invasion is told in all of its aspects, the Central Intelligence Agency will come in for great credit. As everyone knows, it was a hazardous plan, brilliantly executed, and if Colonel Quinn is ever allowed to discuss the part that the Central Intelligence Agency played in planning that significant invasion, I think all our worries about its efficiency on that score will vanish.

One other observation, if I may. I hope that the staff colleges in the Armed Forces will make it plain to the future commanders of our corps and Army units that this organization can be of great help to them. In staff colleges, I think, just as we have become oriented with G-5 in military government, we should hammer home the vital role that the Central Intelligence Agency has in aiding of the front-line soldier as well as the folks back home. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I presume the committee, in its wisdom, has seen the merit of placing a civilian as top agency head, recognizing perhaps that

if it was to be all military, there might be a tendency for this branch of the service to get into avenues which should be strictly civilian. I have not heard an explanation of why it has been designated that a civilian should head up the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This bill follows the practice of the preceding period in that respect. They always had authority to use a civilian. Heretofore, they have used military men. At the present time we have a civilian. I hope the time will come, and that it will not be too far distant, when the Central Intelligence Agency will be looked upon and respected as we respect the FBI for a good job well done. I will say this: When the Deputy Director, who I understand is now being held in mind, is put into this position—by the way, he is an able air officer—I think he will add much to the efficiency and high standard of this agency and will receive the gentleman's approval when he gets there.

Mr. SHORT. If I might interpolate at that point, I would like to say to our friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, that heretofore both the director and the deputy director have been military men.

Under the bill as passed and sent over to us from the Senate they both could still be military men; but under the House bill which is substituted for the Senate bill we make it possible for both the Director and Deputy Director to be civilians, but at no time can there be two military men in peace or in war; one must be a civilian, because we want to keep civilian control.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with that; I am heartily in favor of the bill, but I think many people in America have a dread that the military, as in some other countries, may unless we take some steps to curb the things that have been going on in the past, control the civilians to an extent which is not good for a republic such as our country.

Mr. SHORT. Knowing me as the gentleman from Nebraska does, he knows how I feel on that score.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 15 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am enthusiastically for this bill. The committee, in my opinion, has done a very constructive piece of work in the amendments to the bill as it passed the Senate, which I think strengthens the situation and strengthens the higher echelon of the CIA, and that means strengthening the entire organization. I had something to do with drafting the law establishing this agency, and I am very glad to see this bill amending it, because as I have said I think it is a strengthening influence.

I think we can all agree that the men who have headed the CIA in the past are outstanding men. Both have been referred to by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services. I think we can also all agree that the present head of the CIA, Mr. Dulles, is probably one of the ablest men of today. While I do not know him personally, I have met him a few times and

he is a man who has impressed me very favorably. He impresses me as a man of vision, a man of great ability, a man of courage, and he impressed me especially as a man of commonsense, something that is of vital importance in connection with any position, but particularly a position of responsibility. I know that the President and Mr. Dulles, Chief of CIA, are very anxious that this bill pass before the Easter recess in order that they can get their organization established. In view of this, I want to congratulate the committee not only for the amendments but also on bringing the bill up for consideration before Easter, enabling the other body if in its wisdom it does so, to concur in the House amendments and send the bill to the President for his signature, and then for the President to send his nominations to the Senate.

There are a few observations I should like to make which relate to the general subject and on important matters which are current today in the minds of the people of the world.

Recently Mr. Stalin, the head of the Soviet Union died, and we see the fight for power which is going on in the Soviet Union. There is no doubt in my mind but what there is a fight going on in the Soviet Union between three individuals, and probably it will result in the supremacy of one of two, either Malenkov or Beria, a struggle for control.

After the death of Stalin we see various suggestions made, such as the release of 10 prisoners the British requested many months ago, the release of 4 or 5 Americans requested by our country by the Chinese Communist Government, then the offer for the exchange of wounded prisoners, and then the possible opening up of the exchange of other prisoners; then we read about the amnesty granted by Malenkov to certain persons in jail in the Soviet Union for things that would not be crimes in the United States or any other free country. The latter is probably a smokescreen for purges in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain.

I view all of these things with caution; I do not think our people should build up too great hopes as a result of these operations. It seems to me that so far as the exchange of wounded prisoners is concerned, that that can be arrived at very quickly; certainly the exchange of other prisoners which has been intimated should not take a long time. Expressing my own opinion, it seems to me there should not be any prolonged negotiations in respect to these two subjects by our Government; either they are going to be done or they are not going to be done, and that should not take a long time. I will agree that it is right for our Government to explore any possibility. One of the main purposes of diplomacy, as I understand, is where differences exist between two or more countries to try to narrow down the area of differences as much as possible. So anything that will reduce the area of difference is a proper thing for our Government to look into and to explore and to enter into; and if there is a chance of the area being reduced, to make the necessary efforts. It does seem to me in these two fields, particularly in the field of ex-



change of wounded prisoners, that that can be done very quickly, and if the Soviet Union is making its offer in good faith, they will promptly and immediately enter into satisfactory arrangements in relation to that matter, and if they are sincere in relation to the broader subject of exchange of prisoners, with the long months of negotiations that have already taken place it should not take very long for that issue to be settled.

I agree with what has been released in relation to agreements with the French Government that the settlement of the South Korea situation is not the only thing that concerns us, that Indo-China and other countries, not only in the Far East, in the Middle East and the Near East, but throughout the world, are involved because this is a global situation.

If the leaders of the Soviet Union are sincere, they can arrive at a solution, and we can create a situation that is compatible where the countries of the free world and the countries of the Communist world can live at least in a compatible relationship with one another; but we cannot do so as long as the Communists adhere to the dialectic or doctrinaire aspects of communism.

I did not intend to make these remarks, but I think this is an appropriate time to make this statement and to caution my colleagues and the people of the country not to build up too great hope. Our Government should explore but we should be cautious and in a sense approach them with a feeling of skepticism. We should remember that the leadership of the Communist Party and the ideology known as international communism employs any means to obtain its end.

One of these is expediency. If it is expedient for them to enter into a relationship with other countries that seems to take the road of peace or to open up the hope of that road being traveled, they will do so. Then when they have consolidated themselves, or when the period of expediency has expired, they will veer off the road of peace and take another road. We have to realize that materialistic or atheistic communism has no accountability. The leaders follow the policy of might is right. There is only one thing they recognize and that is power.

I think we should proceed with caution, I think we should view these happenings with extreme reservations. When I see the leaders of the Soviet Union permit priests, ministers and rabbis enter the Soviet Union and its satellites and perform their duty as ambassadors of God to those who are members of their creed, then I will see some sign on the part of the Communist leaders of a primary nature, of a real departure from dialectic or doctrinaire communism. That might lead to some real hope.

The thing we should do, as I see it, is to explore but not to weaken ourselves, not to let our hopes influence us to such an extent that we feel we can weaken America. This is the time to explore all opportunities, but to be skeptical and, above all, we should maintain our strength because the only thing that the

Communists respect is what they fear. The only thing that the Communists fear is power greater than they possess.

So, in conclusion, I want to congratulate the committee for reporting out this bill, the passage of which, in my opinion, will strengthen the ability of the CIA to serve our country and thereby enable that valuable agency to make greater contributions to the strength and the preservation of America and to future peace.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I must take a few seconds to thank the minority whip, the former majority leader, for three things he stated.

First, I appreciate very much his kind references to the House Committee on the Armed Services that has acted expeditiously on this important piece of legislation. I admit without debate and confess with pride that we have a great committee. But without the sympathetic understanding of Members of the House and their admirable cooperation we could accomplish little.

Second, I share with him the high confidence in and great respect for Mr. Allan Dulles, whom I predict will do much to build up, strengthen, and improve this vital agency.

Third, I wish to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for the solemn warning that he has issued to this House and to the American people today. Let us hope for the best and prepare for the worst. Let us speak softly but carry a big stick; continue to trust God but keep our powder dry, because when it has been announced by great leaders of the Soviet Union that they will resort to trickery, artifice, and every other device of deception in order to achieve their aim or goal, believing that the end justifies any means, certainly we should move with the greatest caution and with a remarkable degree of skepticism. They do understand force, they respect strength, and they have only contempt for weakness; and, regardless of the outcome of these truce talks or proposed truce talks, let us remember for years to come that America must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. Let us not let down our guard, relax our efforts, but ever be alert and awake to the dangers, not only from without but from within our own country. I appreciate the remarks that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has made.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, it seems appropriate in discussing S. 1110, a bill authorizing the appointment of a deputy director of the Central Intelligence Agency, that I bring to the attention of the Armed Services Committee and the Congress a situation which in my opinion needs to be examined.

In the committee hearings on the bill under discussion, it was pointed out that the Armed Services Committee should hold an executive session and explore the progress that the Central Intelligence Agency has made since its creation under the National Security Act of 1947. Insofar as the Congress was father of this particular agency, it was pointed out to the committee that Congress should look

into its operation to see whether or not it is doing the job for which it was intended. From some experiences which I will relate to you, I concur heartily in this stand.

As a member of the Select Committee to Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre in the 82d Congress, we held hearings wherein we questioned former members of G-2 Army Intelligence in an effort to locate the missing Van Vliet report on the Katyn Massacre. During this testimony we naturally sought to find out if there were any pro-Russian or Communist influences in the Intelligence Agency and to ascertain whether or not such influences could have been responsible for the disappearance of the Van Vliet report.

From the testimony, there is no question that during World War II there was in G-2 a very distinct pro-Russian influence. In fact, General Bissell, as a matter of policy, sought to have pro-Russian people in G-2 for the purpose of obtaining both sides to all questions. It was further brought out in the testimony that some of the people formerly in G-2 believed that these pro-Russians or Russian sympathizers entered the employ of the Central Intelligence Agency when that Agency was created in 1947. If that is the case, have these pro-Russians been weeded out from the CIA, or are they still there?

Last year, in Germany, our investigator for the Katyn Committee and one of the members of the committee sought to take depositions of witnesses with reference to the Katyn Forest massacre. They wanted to get a voice recording of their testimony. Unfortunately, the facilities were not available and the investigator appealed to the German authorities, specifically, to a gentleman who was the equivalent to the head of our FBI. However, the Germans did not have the facilities for so recording the testimony, whereupon our investigator suggested that they call upon our CIA branch in Germany, to ascertain whether they had the necessary equipment. To this the men connected with the German investigative agency objected in no uncertain terms and stated to our investigator that he should not bother with these CIA men because the CIA was infiltrated by Communists.

There have been, during the past several years, quite a number of incidents mentioned in the newspapers that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] mentioned yesterday, to the effect that former members of our intelligence corps have been apprehended in "leaking" or stealing secret documents. Whether these men were members of Army Intelligence or of the Central Intelligence Agency is not very clear as the newspaper reports are not very specific.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I did not mean to infer that there was anything wrong at all. I merely used that as an illustration of the fact that it was difficult to explore causes and reasons and backgrounds and employment with the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I realize that.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I did not mean to indicate there was something wrong. I do not know.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I point out that in the newspaper reports there occasionally are stories that documents are stolen or misplaced. As you read the newspapers you have difficulty in know whether the persons involved are from the Central Intelligence Agency or Army Intelligence. It is rather obscure.

It would seem to me that a duty evolves upon the members of the Armed Services Committee to check and find out whether or not the Central Intelligence Agency has taken all possible precautions against subversion from within.

During the course of this check, the Armed Services Committee should take into account the adequacy of the CIA as it is presently operating. You do not have to take my word for it, but you can take the comment of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, who, in an address at Washington University, in St. Louis, June 6, 1950, according to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, said:

We are arming against one foe—Russia. Our Central Intelligence Agency should be sufficiently accurate and informative to tell us what we require. Let's not have guesses—let's get the facts. I have some reservations regarding this Agency.

Time does not permit me to give more facts and figures, but I feel, from the standpoint of our national interest, that the Congress, which set up the Central Intelligence Agency, should explore the progress that it has made to date.

In my estimation, one of the most important things for the Congress to find out is whether the Central Intelligence Agency is serving its purposes as chief intelligence department of the Government, or is serving merely as an arm of the executive branch to carry out its orders. If you gentlemen will refer to the testimony before the Katyn Committee of Gen. Clayton Bissell, who was head of G-2 Army Intelligence during 1945, you will find that he is one of the few men who were shown the actual Yalta Agreement. He stated to the committee that his interpretation of the Yalta Agreement was that it disposed of Poland completely and stated what the United States was going to do. General Bissell went on to say that—

Now, that is the policy of the United States enunciated by the President in wartime, the Commander in Chief, and that is an order to me.

I am shown it when it is secret to everybody but a very small handful, and I am supposed to have sense enough to know that, when the President signs something in wartime as the Commander in Chief, that is it.

Now, I am not asked for any views. I am not asked for my comments.

The purpose was to get Russia to fight and help us in the Japanese war instead of letting us exhaust ourselves and then having them turn on us.

Thereupon General Bissell was asked if the action he took was done in order to implement the foreign policy of the people above him and he stated:

I was doing this because it had on it the signature of the Commander in Chief. I wasn't doing it because he was the President and a politician. I was doing it because he was the Commander in Chief under our Constitution, and I am working for him under

oath to do everything I can to further his policies.

If you gentlemen will remember, this same Agency during the next few months advised the President to do everything he could to bring Russia into the war because they estimated that Japan would fight on for another 18 months. As history has revealed, Japan had been negotiating with Russia 6 months prior to this time for peace and wanted to get out of the war, yet, our exalted Intelligence Agency was completely wrong and was giving the President poor advice.

It would seem to me that the suggestion to the committee is very well taken and some sort of an official review should be made of the Central Intelligence Agency to see that they are working efficiently and that they have sufficient security safeguards for keeping Communists and anti-Americans out of the Agency.

Time does not permit me to here point out the unorthodox intelligence policy of appointing men in the intelligence agencies who have very little experience. At some other time I hope to detail how the Army shifts men into intelligence work who have very little background in the intelligence field but are so placed more or less as a tour of duty. Certainly this is a practice which is unbusinesslike and unintelligent. Only people who have the background and experience to correctly evaluate information should be placed in intelligence work, and assignments in that field should not be merely on the basis of a tour of duty.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy that the gentleman is making the statement that he is making today. We have heard these criticisms and certain charges and no doubt some of them are true. As the chairman tried to make plain in his original statement, this is certainly not a perfect organization. It has been weak in the past. But let me assure my friend from Illinois that although the Committee on Armed Services is not holding public hearings on these matters, that does not mean we are not keeping in close contact with what is going on. We are being more fully informed now than we have been during any other time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the minority whip.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my purpose was not to inject myself into the question here except to call to the attention of my friends that the Committee on Government Operations, of course, is very jealous of its jurisdiction, and we have a chairman who is very jealous. I just want to have the chairman know that when I am on the floor I express myself in defense of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the committee amendment as an original bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That subsections (a) and (b) of

section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence who shall be the head thereof, and with a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence who shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Director during his absence or disability. The Director and the Deputy Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status, or from among individuals in civilian life: *Provided, however,* That at no time shall the two positions of the Director and Deputy Director be occupied simultaneously by commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status.

"(b) (1) If a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director, or Deputy Director, then—

"(A) in the performance of his duties as Director, or Deputy Director, he shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and

"(B) he shall not possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director or Deputy Director) with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit, or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), the appointment to the office of Director, or Deputy Director, of a commissioned officer of the armed services, and his acceptance of and service in such office, shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Any such commissioned officer shall, while serving in the office of Director, or Deputy Director, continue to hold rank and grade not lower than that in which serving at the time of his appointment and to receive the military pay and allowances (active or retired, as the case may be, including personal money allowance) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service for which the appropriate department shall be reimbursed from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Central Intelligence Agency. He also shall be paid by the Central Intelligence Agency from such funds an annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which the compensation established for such position exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

"(3) The rank or grade of any such commissioned officer shall, during the period in which such commissioned officer occupies the office of Director of Central Intelligence, or Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, be in addition to the numbers and percentages otherwise authorized and appropriated for the armed service of which he is a member."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the committee amendment?



The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1110) to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence Agency pursuant to House Resolution 195, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the House from April 3, 1953, to April 13, 1953.

#### THE LATE DANIEL NEFF SLEP

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED REVISION OF McCARRAN IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been felt by many people since its enactment that the McCarran Immigration Act was unfair, unjust, and discriminatory to prospective immigrants from southern Europe and Middle East countries. Personally, I have long ques-

tioned the justice and equity of the national origins clause of our basic immigration laws because I have believed that under the operation of this clause and the laws and regulations by which it is enforced, that Italy, Greece, Armenia, Lebanon, Turkey, as well as Poland and Lithuania were not accorded proper quotas. The operation of these laws has been harsh in its effect on many splendid American citizens whose origin is in southern European and near eastern countries. These citizens are having considerable difficulty in assisting very close relatives to join them in the United States.

Overall world quotas, that is to say all quota numbers authorized by existing law, amount to about 155,000 persons. Of these about 126,000 are allocated to northern and western European countries, leaving only about 29,000 to be distributed to Italy, Greece, Poland, Lithuania, Syria, Armenia, Lebanon, Israel, and, in fact, the remaining countries of the world. Some of these nations are behind the Iron Curtain and their citizens at home cannot now use their quotas though escapees continue to swell the quota waiting lists and use some of these quota numbers.

I wish to emphasize that of the 126,000 quota numbers available for the most part to northern and western European countries, little more than half these numbers authorized by existing law have been used in recent years. Last year only about 66,000 quota numbers were used by this area. In fact, official State Department figures show that there were 59,881 unused quota numbers from these countries last year.

When the McCarran bill was pending in the House efforts, in which I joined, were made to permit these unused quota numbers to be allocated to southern European and remaining countries. However, this amendment was not carried.

Since the evidence discloses that very many splendid and patriotic American citizens of Italian, Greek, Polish, Jewish, Lithuanian, Armenian, Syrian, Lebanese, and other descents, anxious to be united with their loved ones overseas, are interested in securing appropriate changes in existing law that would liberalize current restrictions and permit some of their relatives to come to the United States and since I am convinced that their pleas and claims are just and in the interest of many loyal American citizens as well as the Nation itself, I am preparing an amendment to our immigration laws which would, if enacted, allow the unused quotas of all countries to be allocated on an equitable proportional basis to other countries with oversubscribed quota waiting lists.

While I realize that this measure would drastically revise the operation of the national origins clause, it is my conviction that it would work substantial justice to many thousands of worthy American citizens whose close relatives are now caught in the web of current discriminatory quotas and would have otherwise to wait for many years before getting an opportunity to join their loved ones in the United States, if indeed they could ever come to this country.

Let me make it clear that this measure does not in any way increase the present overall quota totals but merely equitably redistributes the unused quotas so that substantial justice can be done to a large number of fine American citizens and their relatives. Each year, thousands of quota numbers are lost through the lack of applicants in certain countries and it is this unused portion which my bill seeks to reallocate to other countries the following year when new quota numbers become available.

In my opinion, this legislation is not unfair to any of the other countries not now using their full quotas, because it contains a provision enabling such countries to regain their quotas, now irretrievably lost under the present law if not used during the quota year, whenever experience for 1 year shows that they are desirous of using them in full. Present prospects are that these countries will not use their quotas in the foreseeable future and this plan would thus deal more equitably with all nations.

Should the occasion ever arise, however, and this appears quite remote at present, those countries benefiting from the unused quota system I propose would repay, whenever necessary over a 5-year period, the countries from which additional quota numbers have been received.

As part of my remarks, I desire to include the following chart, showing the quota totals for all countries. Shown are the new quotas made available by the McCarran Act and the old totals established by law previous to the enactment of this act. Also illustrated are the numbers of quotas actually used and unused, as of the last fiscal year.

The material follows:

Immigration quota chart

	New quota	Old quota	Used <sup>1</sup>	Unused
<b>NORTHERN AND WESTERN EUROPE</b>				
Belgium.....	1,297	1,304	1,288	116
Denmark.....	1,175	1,181	All	None
France.....	3,069	3,086	All	None
Germany.....	25,814	25,957	All	None
Great Britain.....	65,361	65,721	21,873	43,848
Ireland (Free State).....	17,756	17,853	4,035	13,818
Luxembourg.....	100	100	94	6
Netherlands.....	3,136	3,153	All	None
Norway.....	2,364	2,377	All	None
Sweden.....	3,295	3,314	1,431	1,883
Switzerland.....	1,698	1,707	1,497	210
Total.....	125,065	125,753	65,872	59,881
<b>OTHER COUNTRIES</b>				
Afghanistan.....	100	100	5	95
Albania.....	100	100	100	None
Andorra.....	100	100	None	100
Arabian Peninsula.....	100	100	91	9
Australia.....	100	100	100	None
Austria.....	1,405	1,413	1,413	None
Bhutan.....	100	100	None	100
Bulgaria.....	100	100	100	None
Burma.....	100	None	None	None
Cambodia.....	100	None	None	None
Cameroon (British).....	100	100	None	100
Cameroon (French).....	100	100	1	99
Ceylon.....	100	None	None	None

<sup>1</sup> These figures do not represent actual new admissions into the United States. Many of these quota numbers were made available to persons already in this country whose immigration status was adjusted by the Congress through private or omnibus immigration bills.

<sup>2</sup> New countries brought under the quota system by the McCarran Act. Statistics on the quota use will not be available for some time.

Immigration quota chart—Continued

	New quota	Old quota	Used	Unused
OTHER COUNTRIES— Continued				
China (white).....	100	100	100	None
Chinese.....	105	105	105	None
Czechoslovakia.....	2,859	2,874	2,874	None
Danzig.....	100	100	100	None
Egypt.....	100	100	100	None
Estonia.....	115	116	116	None
Ethiopia.....	100	100	4	96
Finland.....	566	569	569	None
Greece.....	308	310	310	None
Hungary.....	865	869	869	None
Iceland.....	100	100	95	5
India.....	100	100	100	None
Indonesia.....	100	None	None	None
Iran.....	100	100	100	None
Iraq.....	100	100	100	None
Israel.....	100	100	100	None
Italy.....	5,645	5,677	5,677	None
Japan.....	185	100	92	8
Jordan.....	100	100	87	13
Korea.....	100	None	None	None
Laos.....	100	None	None	None
Latvia.....	235	236	236	None
Lebanon.....	100	100	100	None
Liberia.....	100	100	14	86
Libya.....	100	None	None	None
Liechtenstein.....	100	100	3	97
Lithuania.....	384	386	386	None
Monaco.....	100	100	8	92
Morocco.....	100	100	78	22
Muscato.....	100	100	None	100
Nauru.....	100	100	None	100
Nepal.....	100	100	None	100
New Guinea.....	100	100	None	100
New Zealand.....	100	100	100	None
Palestine.....	100	100	100	None
Pacific Islands.....	100	None	None	None
Pakistan.....	100	None	None	None
Philippines.....	100	100	100	None
Poland.....	6,488	6,524	6,524	None
Portugal.....	438	440	440	None
Ruanda Urundi.....	100	100	None	100
Rumania.....	289	291	291	None
Samoa.....	100	100	1	99
San Marino.....	100	100	100	None
Saudi Arabia.....	100	100	1	99
Somaland.....	100	None	None	None
South West Africa.....	100	100	None	100
Spain.....	250	252	252	None
Syria.....	100	100	100	None
Tanganyika.....	100	100	None	100
Thailand.....	100	100	2	98
Togoland.....	100	100	None	100
British.....	100	100	None	100
French.....	100	100	None	100
Trieste.....	100	100	100	None
Turkey.....	225	226	226	None
U. S. S. R.....	2,697	2,798	2,798	None
Union of South Africa.....	100	100	100	None
Vietnam.....	100	None	None	None
Yap.....	100	100	3	97
Yemen.....	100	None	None	None
Yugoslavia.....	933	938	938	None
Total.....	29,592	28,524	26,309	2,215

\* New countries brought under the quota system by the McCarran Act. Statistics on the quota use will not be available for some time.

NOTE.—Countries in the Western Hemisphere do not come under the quota system.

#### DR. MAURICE BURNSIDE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in the more than 150 years of our existence as a Nation, the world has been amazed at the great experiment of a free people in the development of the democratic idea of government. We have made great strides in the field of the arts and sciences. We have passed rapidly from the horse-and-buggy days to the iron age, the electrical age, and we are presently ushering in the atomic age.

It is strange indeed in face of these great accomplishments, that we have stood still in the field of political ethics. When a former Member of the Congress can be driven out of public life in order to satisfy the whims of a few designing

politicians, we have turned back the clock of political thinking more than 100 years to the day when the late Senator Macy coined the phrase, "To the victors belong the spoils."

In this connection, I want to tell my colleagues the story of Dr. Maurice Burnside, who served my State of West Virginia with distinction in the 81st and 82d Congresses. Dr. Burnside, a native of South Carolina, after graduating from high school, enrolled at the Citadel in Charleston, where he was a member of the ROTC and studied military science. This was further implemented by training at Fortress Monroe and at Camp Eustis, Va. At Furman University, Greenville, S. C., he earned a bachelor of science degree with an added 2 years training in law.

Dr. Burnside holds a master's degree from the University of Texas, at Austin, where he majored in Latin American relations and international law. His greatest accomplishment was his ability to win his doctor's degree from Duke University at Durham, N. C. In the field of political science, he majored in public administration and international law.

Early November 1952, Dr. Burnside submitted Form 57 to Civil Service Commission. On December 11, 1952, he received a letter dated December 10, 1952, stating his application had been acceptable under the terms of the examining circular for the level of position comparable to his minimum salary requirements—GS-13. Civil-service number assigned: 445079, which rated the title "administrative officer."

Officials of National Security Agency were notified of Dr. Burnside's qualifications and he was asked to submit Form 57 to the Agency. Form 57 of Dr. Burnside was circulated by Personnel Division of National Security Agency among top officials.

Training Division Chief of National Security Agency called Dr. Burnside immediately to come for interview. A few days later personnel officers called him for interview. Personnel Division ordered preliminary investigation for position in top-secret agency. The preliminary investigation was satisfactory. Since there was immediate need for the position to be filled, they ordered prompt investigations for character, security, and training.

Dr. Burnside was called to report for physical examination at Pentagon. Favorable report resulted and he was called to duty at National Security Agency, February 6, 1953. He completed 5 weeks' training period and ordered to be sworn in under loyalty oath March 13, 1953.

During his training period Dr. Burnside was subjected to investigation by all security agencies and before taking his oath was subject to a lie-detector test.

As soon as word reached West Virginia that Dr. Burnside had been given a responsible position with the Government, Republican politicians immediately started protesting.

The first overt act came on March 7, when Harry Hoffman, political editor of the Charleston Gazette, called from Charleston, W. Va., at 5:30 p. m., to secure detailed information regarding Dr.

Burnside's employment with Defense Department. Security regulations restrained Dr. Burnside at that time from divulging information.

The following day, March 8, the Charleston Gazette carried front-page story outlining Republican complaints on Dr. Burnside having Government job.

The following are excerpts from the Gazette article:

M. G. Burnside, only West Virginia Democratic Congressman defeated for reelection last November, has popped up in a mystery job with the United States Department of Defense under the new Republican administration in Washington.

Burnside, former political science professor at Marshall College in Huntington, confirmed to the Gazette yesterday that he has been working for little more than a month at a responsible position in the Defense Department but "it is against the law for me to tell you what it is."

He said it is in the critical division of the Department but assured that "it is not a political job" but one obtained "purely on merit on the basis of my training and experience".

It is known, however, that rumors of Burnside's success in landing on the Government payroll after his political defeat have stirred a tempest among West Virginia Republicans, particularly those in the Fourth District, where Burnside was rejected last November after serving two terms in Congress.

They also have led to the filing of a formal protest with Wesley Roberts, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Robert H. C. Kay, Charleston attorney and general counsel for the Republican State committee, said yesterday he had written Roberts objecting to the appointment of a reputed Democrat by the Republican administration.

Republican National Committeeman Walter S. Hallanan wired Roberts that "it has been a profound shock to Republicans of West Virginia" to learn that Burnside has been appointed to a Defense Department position, adding, "How this happened is an enigma to me and it has certainly raised a furore in our State."

He asked Roberts to give him any information available as to how this could have happened.

Kay wrote Roberts that "to put it mildly, the Republicans in the (Fourth) District and the Democrats who voted to unseat former Congressman Burnside are up in arms over the situation. They cannot understand—and, as a matter of fact, neither can I—why this reputed Congressman should be taken in by this administration and given a position of trust and confidence in the Defense Department."

The GOP attorney said the Burnside appointment hurts our political chances in West Virginia and declared that it cannot be laid to or shielded by, the civil-service law.

"It is an affirmative action of this administration and nothing else," wrote Kay, and "no benign interpretation or charitable consideration can blunt or dull the keen disappointment of the Republicans in the Fourth Congressional District."

He asked the national chairman for prompt and decisive action to remedy this situation.

The protest of National Committeeman Walter S. Hallanan and Attorney Robert Kay, of the Republican State Committee, was followed on March 11 by newspaper release from Congressman WILL E. NEAL, of the Fourth West Virginia District, that his office was investigating the appointment of Dr. Burnside to a position in the Defense Department. Congressman NEAL's statement which ap-



peared in the Huntington Herald-Dispatch on March 11, 1953, stated:

I have received approximately 50 protests concerning the appointment of Dr. Burnside.

The appointment amazes me. So far as I know it is the only appointment of a defeated Democratic Congressman to a position in this Republican Administration.

Dr. NEAL said his office is working through the office of National Committeeman Wesley Roberts and certain executive departments to find out who is responsible for Dr. Burnside's appointment.

Their frantic efforts to get the details of the position held by Dr. Burnside led them to engage in considerable harassment of Dr. Burnside's wife and 13-year-old daughter by repeated telephone calls from the office of Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of National Defense, Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens, and National Republican Committee Chairman Wesley Roberts.

They wanted to know the nature of Dr. Burnside's employment, his security telephone number in the Defense Department. This kept up for a period of at least 2 weeks and resulted in the announcement by National Committeeman Hallanan of a newspaper dispatch under date of March 25, in total disregard of security regulations, which included the nature of the National Security Administration work of coding and decoding secret messages. A newspaper release also carried details of Dr. Burnside's grade, his salary and the name of the head of his agency.

Dr. Burnside's appointment appears to have created confusion among the Republican leaders in West Virginia and led to considerable panning of the present National Republican administration. They seem to have lost sight of the fact that Dr. Burnside's appointment was strictly civil service and made on merit to a top civil-service security job. The record fails to disclose that the Eisenhower administration knew of Dr. Burnside's appointment until these partisan party protests were made. This is evidenced by the fact that Secretary of Defense Wilson did not even know of the appointment.

These Republican politicians got immediate action. Later in the day on March 25, they released a newspaper dispatch from Washington for publication in West Virginia newspapers announcing Dr. Burnside's dismissal. In this newspaper release, Congressman NEAL said he had been reliably informed that Dr. Burnside had been released after the Eisenhower administration had bowed to complaints of Republicans in the Fourth District and the State. The ruthlessness of these designing politicians led them to release the information concerning Dr. Burnside's dismissal before he had even been notified by the Defense Department that he was being discharged.

Dr. Burnside's formal notice of discharge was received on March 26 in the form of the following communication:

DR. MAURICE G. BURNSIDE,  
Alexandria, Va.

DEAR DR. BURNSIDE: This is to inform you that your appointment with the National Security Agency will be terminated in ac-

cordance with authority contained in civil service rule VI, section 6.1 (f), Federal Personnel Manual, chapter Z1, page 229, dated February 1, 1949. Your last day of duty will be March 27, 1953.

This termination is necessary because of an internal reorganization and has no bearing on your work performance, which has been satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM O. AREY,

Acting Chief, Civilian Personnel Branch.

Again, the ruthlessness of the action taken against Dr. Burnside is evidenced by the fact that the above notice contained the information that his services would terminate 1 day following the receipt of his notice of discharge.

I have in my hand here a copy of the National Security Agency Civilian Employee Handbook of 1952, and desire to quote from page 2, which states as follows:

Your appointment is permanent so long as you perform your job satisfactorily and remain loyal to the interests of the Agency and to the United States.

In this connection, your attention is called to the last paragraph of the formal notice of dismissal which says:

This termination is necessary because of an internal reorganization and has no bearing on your work performance which has been satisfactory.

Only last evening did Dr. Burnside decide to release a statement for the press. His statement follows:

I was removed from a purely technical Federal civil-service post without regard to due process or merit and solely to obey the whims and demands of Republican party leaders of West Virginia. The position is not involved in the making of any Government policy.

When I entered upon this employment, because of its secret and sensitive nature, I assumed obligations which preclude me from discussing my work. At the time I received my removal notice, I was again required to assume certain pledges regarding my silence.

I went into this work by invitation. My qualifications had nothing to do with my service in Congress or any activities in politics. I considered it an opportunity to serve my country in a most important and vital field.

What has happened to me of itself is not important. But it is a very shocking thing to realize that high Government officials have permitted petty Republican politicians of West Virginia to invade the work of one of the most secret and important, if not the most important, section of our defense program. This agency is doing a wonderful job. It is manned entirely by technical people, none of whom were selected for the remotest political reason. The very lives, not to mention the opportunity to succeed in their work, of many loyal governmental workers in this agency have been endangered by this political meddling into the agency. Work that had been kept secret for many years has now been made known to everyone, including our country's enemies.

I deeply regret that political reprisal against me individually has been invoked at such a price.

Now that Dr. Burnside has issued this forthright evidence of the manner in which he has been unjustly treated, may I remind you, my colleagues, that I offer this defense of the gentleman from West Virginia, in the hope that it will serve as a warning to the Congress and the people of the United States to be on guard against the strong pos-

sibility that this is the opening gun of a campaign on the part of other patronage-hungry and designing politicians to emasculate and in time destroy our civil-service system.

The leader of this first assault on our well established system of protection of our Government employees is today and has been for the past quarter century the Republican boss in West Virginia. May I remind my colleagues that West Virginia was once a strong Republican State, but since the advent of this man as party boss they have not elected a single Republican governor or other State officer. And they will not elect another Republican governor should he remain the party boss in West Virginia for another quarter century.

This gentleman was out of step with the present Republican national leadership at the Chicago convention in 1952. Imagine my surprise when I read in the press some days ago that he is being prominently mentioned as the new Republican national chairman. It is the considered view of the gentleman from West Virginia, now addressing you, that should this happen, I am sure, he would be no improvement over the outgoing chairman who was forced to resign as their party leader because of his 10-percent activities in his native State.

Nor do I lay all the blame for this raid on the civil-service system at the door of the West Virginia political machine. I have here a news release of a special interview with the Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks, by a Washington Post staff writer, dated March 29, and I quote:

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks implied yesterday that some civil-service workers were Trojan horses left behind to try and hamper, hoodwink, and wreck the new administration.

One is forced to wonder whether this Massachusetts millionaire has some personal political debts to pay or he is fronting for such political groups as the one from West Virginia.

Again, may I quote, "To the victors belong the spoils." The spoils collected as they have been in the case of Dr. Burnside may well be a boomerang to the victors. Such action cannot go unnoticed by the good, solid, thinking citizens of my State or other States of the Union who have an ingrained sense of fair play and common decency.

MR. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

MR. MCCORMACK. I was terribly surprised and shocked when I heard of the circumstances surrounding the case of our former colleague from West Virginia, because of several reasons: First, he was hired because of his ability and there is no question that he was fired because he is a Democrat. There is no question about any political recommendations being involved in this. He was sent for, and, as he said in his statement issued last night, his invitation was based upon his qualifications. They were very carefully looked into, and he was appointed as a result.

It is most unfortunate that a matter such as this, in connection with this very

secret agency of our country, should become known to the enemy and to the world, and that means the enemy that is in existence. It can very easily detect the kind of work that is being done by this secret agency of government by reason of Mr. Hallanan and others in their frenzied desire to get the neck of a former Member of Congress who happens to be a Democrat and who, because of his qualifications, was employed in an agency of the Government under a Republican administration.

I cannot believe that President Eisenhower knew about this. I know that most of our colleagues in the House on the Republican side knew nothing about it. So any remarks I make are confined, and I know the remarks of my friend are confined, to those who are responsible. On the other hand, if a situation like this is permitted to continue they are carrying a responsibility of a broadening nature.

We hear a lot about bipartisan support. We Democrats are only too anxious to give bipartisan support, but you are not going to get it by saying no Democrats, no matter how well qualified, need apply.

At the end of President Truman's administration, out of 22 Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of the Defense Department, 15 were Republicans. In order to have bipartisan support, there has to be in the field of foreign affairs and national defense evidence of a desire for bipartisan support. Here we have a strictly nonpolitical position, and, in plain language, a man being fired because he is a Democrat. During the last 20 years, a number of our Republican colleagues, due to the misfortunes of their political campaigns and elections, have been defeated and failed of reelection. Some of them came to former Speaker RAYBURN and to me, and asked us to do what we could for them in relation to appointments calling for nomination by the President and confirmation by the other body and in other positions. We have consistently throughout the years done everything we possibly could to help them. I am not going to say any more except that I am sure in the mind of any decent person, whether Democrat or Republican, that with the facts in this case, whether their thoughts can be expressed publicly or not, there is severe condemnation of those persons responsible for firing a man simply because he is a Democrat; in this case a highly qualified man simply because he is a Democrat.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is a pleasure to yield to my colleague from the Fifth District of West Virginia, the gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. KEE].

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed to learn of the unfortunate manner in which a former Member of this House was summarily dismissed from a top security job last week. I further regret the method in which such dismissal was announced. I refer to former Congressman M. G. Burnside, of West Virginia, who was doing highly technical work in the nonpolicymaking branch of the Security Agency of our Defense Department. I am advised that

the first notice Dr. Burnside received of his dismissal was through a newspaper release published on the morning of March 26, 1953. A newspaper reporter from West Virginia called Mrs. Burnside at her home and told her of her husband's dismissal. The announcement had been made by a Republican Member of Congress and was released with the added statement that the action was made to satisfy West Virginia Republican Party leaders who were protesting Dr. Burnside's appointment, even though his appointment was made through regular civil-service channels.

Is this a proper manner in which to protect our civil-service employees?

Is this a proper way to protect our security agencies?

Are they to become the playthings of party politicians?

Are all security officers to be selected on the sole basis of party affiliation?

I had always thought that our defense secret agencies were free to select their personnel for the qualifications they possessed for their work.

Are we to have only Republican generals in the Pentagon department and draft only Republican boys?

I fail to see how the Republican Party, or the Secretary of Defense—who, I understand, ordered this action—can hold the confidence of the people of the United States with such political maneuvering.

Our civil service is a sacred thing to the men and women of America, our security agencies even more so. Can the men and women who work so hard and conscientiously in these often dangerous posts feel the safety they are entitled to when a thing like this is permitted to happen?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Representative from the Second West Virginia District, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my protest to the handling of the case of former Congressman Burnside who had been employed by this Government of ours in a position which was a highly responsible one. I understand when he got the job there was no political pressure of any kind put on to get it. I know I did not ask anybody to give him the job, and I do not believe any other Member of the West Virginia delegation did. He was given a job because he was qualified for it. Back in our State there has been a great deal of publicity given to the fact that this administration can reach down into the civil-service ranks and take a man out of there and say, "We do not want you because you are a Democrat." Now that seems to be the policy of this new administration. If it is, and if that is going to be the policy, Lord help them when they begin to hire other men for other responsible jobs that they need to fill. I do not blame anyone or I would not blame any person for saying, "No, I do not want to take a job under you. I might be there 1 day, 2 days, or 3 days." The minority leader said just a moment ago that 15 of the Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Defense were Republicans at the close of the Truman administration. That was amazing to me.

Did anybody ask to have them fired because of politics? They were evidently doing their job. I know, and you know, that former President Roosevelt tried to get the best men available, even in his Cabinet, to do the job, and to make it bipartisan. I have been reliably informed of a man who was released just a day or so ago, Dr. A. V. Astin, from the Bureau of Standards, who is a Republican. They thought he was a Democrat. They wanted that job or that position for somebody else. He was first appointed under a Republican administration and then he was elevated to the job as Director of the Bureau of Standards by the Democratic administration. They did not ask him whether he was a Democrat or Republican. He was qualified for the job. I am just wondering—we are waging a war and we do not know how it is going to spread and what the results may be. But do you think the mothers all over this land are going to ask if he is a Republican who is down here in Washington doing a job or doing these little jobs that need to be done, or whether he is a Democrat? They want to know whether a man is qualified, and whether he can do the job. Dr. Burnside was qualified—well qualified—I understand. It was a non-policy job covered by civil service, and yet they reached down because some professional politicians said we want to get him out of there. They did get him out of there. They did not ask about his qualifications, and whether he could do the job. I say it is highly regrettable that this has come up.

I wish to say only that I hope the administration will reconsider on this and say that if Dr. Burnside was qualified for the job that he shall be reappointed, and I also hope that the administration does not continue to pursue this policy. Like my colleague from the Third Congressional District of West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], I say that to the victors belong the spoils so far as they relate to the top policymaking positions, but when you invade civil service for political spoils, whether it be done by a Republican or Democratic administration, we are breaking down our system of government and certainly of bipartisan government and not making use of the best brains that we have in the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who so wishes may have permission to extend his remarks on this subject at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to believe that any responsible official in the present administration knew the facts in this Burnside matter as related by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Since the qualifications for the position held by Dr. Burnside are unknown to me I cannot comment on his capability to perform in that position. However, I have known Dr. Burnside rather inti-



mately during my period of service in the House. We served together on the Expenditures Committee and he was a valuable member of the subcommittee of which I was chairman.

Dr. Burnside was one of our most conscientious members. He is a very serious-minded and sincere individual, exhibiting always intense devotion to duty.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the other day I noticed a cartoon by the great cartoonist of the Washington Post, Mr. Herbert Block, better known as Herblock. It showed a man being collared and walked over to a plank, which stretched out into emptiness from a Government building. The caption went something like this: "Oh, Oh, It Looks Like They've Found Another Democrat."

Such a situation has been only too true to life, as many who have fallen from policymaking jobs well know. Yet, in the case of Dr. M. G. Burnside, we have a new kind of situation.

Dr. Burnside worked until recently with the National Security Agency in a highly secret job. As many of you know here, Dr. Burnside was here in the House for two terms as a Representative from West Virginia. He took the job offered him by the National Security Agency a short time after his defeat for Congress. He was asked to take it because his education, experience, and background qualified him to take it, and he had FBI clearance to work in top-secret matters.

The fact he was employed in the new administration alarmed the Republicans back in his State, who immediately started yelling for his scalp. Unfortunately, as it has now turned out, they got their way through pressure on Republican leaders and on the Defense Department.

In fact, oddly enough, a Republican Congressman announced that Dr. Burnside would be dismissed many hours before it actually happened.

Is this the proper way to run the Government, Mr. Speaker? Does this not put other such Federal employees in jeopardy of losing their jobs if some ax-grinding politicians get on their trail?

Mr. Speaker, such a situation should not be allowed to exist. It is up to those whom the people have given the responsibility of Government to do something about it.

#### "MR. CONNECTICUT," A TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS S. MURPHY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in Hartford, the capital city of Connecticut, there lives a man who is known throughout the length and breadth of my State as "Mr. Connecticut."

That title has been bestowed upon him by a host of fellow citizens who recognize in him the living embodiment of the virtues, the attributes and the achievements of our great State.

"Mr. Connecticut" is Francis S. Murphy, distinguished editor and publisher of the Hartford Times, who has announced his retirement a few weeks hence after many years as one of the

outstanding personalities of American journalism.

The fact that this great editor and publisher has decided to retire from active newspaper work is a matter of deep regret not only to his coworkers of the press but as well to the people of the State of Connecticut.

He has labored long and fruitfully and the benefits which his work have brought to the city of Hartford and to the entire State will remain and bless countless generations which are to follow.

Fortunately for the community which is served by the Hartford Times, that great newspaper will bear the impact of his personality and his character even in his retirement.

For under his guidance and leadership it may be well said that the Hartford Times has taken its place as one of the truly illustrious newspapers of the United States. It is a paper with a conscience. That conscience is the soul of Francis Murphy.

Those of us who are faithful readers of the Hartford Times know that in its news coverage it at all times lives up to the highest standards of the profession of journalism, and we know too that its editorial opinion is cast in the mold of knowledge, decency, and truth.

There is no newspaper in the entire United States that has carried better the weighty responsibility of the press than has the Hartford Times under the leadership of Francis Murphy.

To have led and to have guided the Hartford Times to the very heights of journalistic eminence would be monument enough to the honor of this distinguished man.

But Francis Murphy has been more than a great newspaper publisher and editor. He has been a foremost civic leader, always striving to make the community in which he serves a better place in which to live.

He has been a man of broad vision who could see beyond the confines of the present and recognize the promise of tomorrow.

When radio was in its infancy and long before it had reached the fullness of its growth and influence, Francis Murphy, through the medium of the Hartford Times, was giving assistance and inspiration to the development of this communications miracle of the 20th century.

Before mass production of radio-receiving sets became a fact of modern American life the Hartford Times, because of Francis Murphy, was teaching its readers how to construct their own sets and how best to utilize them.

The development and expansion of the art of communications through the medium of radio signals in those areas served by the Hartford Times is a story of accomplishment worthy of a permanent page in the history of our era.

But the significance of his promotion of the development of radio lies in the fact that although primarily concerned with an institution devoted to the written word, he was not afraid to advance the new medium of the spoken word.

Thus, in these efforts, he identified himself with those who always push onward, unafraid of competition, and not dismayed by what is new.

He saw and recognized in aviation the world-changing potentialities of modern aeronautics. His interest in this new industry and the energy which he has given to the advancement of its cause brought to Connecticut one of the finest airfields on the Atlantic seaboard.

Bradley Field, which serves the Hartford-Springfield area, is the child of his fruitful and courageous brain. Today at Bradley Field there stands an edifice known as the Murphy terminal, constructed by the State of Connecticut and honored with his name by a grateful citizenry.

He was the first chairman of the State aeronautical commission and he still presides over that body with his characteristic fairness and efficiency.

During the war years he devoted himself tirelessly and unselfishly to the national war effort. The record of his efforts at that time include his chairmanship of the New England Aviation Cadet Committee. His help to the enlistment and recruitment services of the Armed Forces; his sponsorship of the Red Cross, of national relief organizations, and of innumerable patriotic enterprises, was directed toward a successful conclusion of World War II.

In the midst of all this seemingly overwhelming responsibility he found time to serve as a member of the enemy alien review board for the district of Connecticut and brought to that tribunal that same genius for justice tempered with decency which has marked his entire career.

A grateful Nation bestowed on him its highest civilian award when Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, the commanding general of the United States First Army, pinned on his breast, in the name of the President of the United States, the Medal of Merit.

In this remarkably active and extremely productive career, he has also found time to serve as a member of the New England Council, on countless public committees, and in practically every good public cause. To the credit of the public which he serves, let it be noted that his friends and neighbors, on occasions beyond number, honored him with public testimonials; and Trinity College, the flower of learning in Hartford, has placed on his shoulders the mantle of its degree of master of arts.

Francis Murphy springs from those simple, humble, and virtuous origins which have given so much greatness to American life. He stands in the company of those blessed with the companionship of great women. His devoted wife, he will be the first to tell you, has been at once his guiding inspiration and his sustaining strength. As he reaches the rewards of this retirement, he will enjoy the happiness of good parenthood in the loving atmosphere of his grandchildren.

I deem it a privilege and an honor to have been permitted to pay this tribute to Francis Murphy in the Halls of the Congress of the United States. For all of these things, and more, which he has done in his life, I join a vast multitude of American citizens in gratitude to him. He shall always occupy a special place in

the love and affection of Connecticut people.

As he steps across the threshold into the peace and contentment of well-earned retirement, we want him to know that his name has already been placed in the annals of those who are called the nobility of God.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I congratulate my colleague for the very fine and proper statement of tribute he has made to one of Connecticut's great citizens; and I am pleased to advise the gentleman from Connecticut that, as he probably already knows, Francis Murphy is going to retire into the Second Congressional District and become a constituent of mine very soon.

#### VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the Congress will recess for the Easter holidays and many Members will go back to their home districts. It is very desirable that certain information and certain figures be given these representatives regarding appropriations for the Veterans' Administration; past, present, and future appropriations.

I have rarely seen greater misinformation on any single subject. I have been a member of the American Legion myself for more than 27 years, and I have worked actively in my own post on the rehabilitation program of that organization. I am a member of the Disabled American Veterans, DAV, not an honorary nor an associate member, but an active member in my own right. I am a life member of the Regular Veterans' Association, which works actively on rehabilitation.

In previous budgets, under the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and now as chairman myself, I have worked for 7 years on that part of the Federal budget which has to do with appropriations for the veterans. I say with no hesitation that in all those 7 years I have never seen one dollar cut from a requested appropriation for hospitalization for the veterans who were deserving and entitled to such hospitalization; and yet today as the chairman of the subcommittee for the current session I find myself under personal attack; I find the facts completely misrepresented to the public, and I presume that every Member of Congress finds himself in the same position.

The best answer I can suggest to my friends of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, is that we simply place the facts before the American public, and particularly before the intelligent membership of the several veterans' organizations. I come to the floor now for that purpose.

This, Mr. Speaker, is in the nature of a preliminary statement. Over the Easter recess I hope to add to the statement and to document it further. If

any Members find their questions unanswered in this statement I shall be glad to have them submit them to me, either now or at any later time. The facts I state today will I hope clear up a good deal of the argument and place the responsibility exactly where it should be placed.

The subcommittee on which I have had the honor to serve for 7 years—that is, this is the seventh year—has no controversy with anyone in or out of the Congress.

We have had before us this year, as we had in previous years, the representatives of any and all of the veterans' organizations who wished to testify. This year the American Legion, the VFW, the DAV, and the AMVETS all appeared and testified. All made helpful suggestions. I may say that the representatives of the AMVETS made a particularly understanding and helpful statement.

The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], appeared before us and made a number of excellent suggestions. I observe that her resolution—House Resolution 34—giving the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs the authority to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration with a broad view of determining the efficiency of the administration of this agency, has already passed the House and I hope that inspection, as it is designated, will be thorough and unemotional.

Here are some facts, Mr. Speaker, for the Members of the House to take home, as briefly as I can state them today. I shall not make these in an orderly fashion but simply make statements which at times may appear to have no connection, but in themselves will answer some of the statements and questions being raised regarding appropriations for the Veterans' Administration.

I desire to give this background. After World War I the maximum reached by the veteran population of the United States was about 4 million. We were, so to speak, a small and favored group in a nation which has done more for its veterans than any other nation, present or past, in the history of the world. The word "veteran" has always been a magic word, and no distinction has ever been made, in its application, between the veteran who has faced the enemy in combat and the veteran who has been in a training camp for a few weeks, perhaps in a college ROTC and has returned home with no disability whatever, and an improvement in health and outlook. This, with certain reservations which I shall attempt to indicate, is as it should be in a republic where the defense of the country is a privilege and a right and not an obligation imposed upon the male members of that nation by an autocracy.

The situation has changed. Today, there are over 20 million veterans, and we are adding to these rolls today at a present rate of about 900,000 veterans every year. The end is not in sight, although we can still hope.

When we built hospitals, and arranged benefits, for a maximum population of 4,000,000 veterans, it was not necessary for us to impose rigorous regulations

on the conditions—for example, those under which men might be admitted into these hospitals. If there were vacant beds, and there usually were, these might be occupied by any veteran, whether he needed hospitalization for a service-connected injury or whether he had a service-connected injury and wanted hospitalization for some other condition, or whether he was simply a non-service-connected veteran and was there for some physical condition which any one of us might suffer as we grow older in life. The beds were there, the doctors were there and actually this broader field of practice kept doctors in the veterans' service.

In a generation we have had two more wars, including Korea; we have extended the benefits and we have thought up new ones for 20 million veterans, plus 20 million wives and 40 million children, which total approaches one-half the population of the United States, without including the parents or other relatives on either side.

It is no longer a casual problem. The veteran who, with his immediate family, represents half or more of the tax-paying population, is the most interested of any one of us. So, Mr. Speaker, we have today four possible solutions of the problem. Stating them very briefly:

First. We can continue the present liberal interpretation of benefits; we can supply hospitalization to veterans without service-connected disabilities. This will require 200,000 additional beds in less than one generation without any enlargement of the Korean war. This will take us into socialized medicine without our realizing it while we protest that we do not want it and defeat all direct proposals on this floor.

In order to figure the cost to the taxpayer, multiply 200,000 beds by approximately \$20,000 per bed as the cost of building a hospital, and add a billion dollars to the administrative costs of the Veterans' Administration in addition to those we already have.

The World War I veteran, Mr. Speaker, buys one-third, with his present benefit dollar, that he would have bought with a dollar when he was discharged. The World War II veteran buys one-half of the things with his dollar that he could have bought when he enlisted. How much do we want the Korean veteran to get for his dollar?

The first suggestion, therefore, to continue the present program, is untenable.

Second. We can establish classes of veterans. We can say that the veteran who saw combat is in a higher category than the veteran who never left his home State, or that the paratrooper, for example, should be placed in a different category than an ordnance officer, one of which I was in World War I. We have never done this; I hope we will never have to do it.

The third possibility is to revise the classifications and limitations on the types of injury. We intend to do this now, but we do not apply, nor do we apply intelligently in the Veterans' Administration, the regulations already imposed or authorized by the Congress; at least, we do not do it very successfully, perhaps I should say that. A service-connected veteran wounded in the service



is entitled to anything he needs from a grateful Nation; a non-service-connected veteran has limitations imposed on his entitlement to service.

Fourth. Mr. Speaker, as a final possibility, we can economize and provide the best possible administration and administer the Veterans' Administration intelligently.

As far as my committee is concerned—I cannot speak for them; I have no idea how the subcommittee feels about this—but, from comments, I would say that the probable feeling of the majority of the Members of the Congress is a combination of the better interpretation of the limitations we already have and further economy and better administration on the financial side, and the regulatory side of the Veterans' Administration.

Now, to give you some idea, Mr. Speaker, of what this means, in the growth of veterans, I hold a chart in my hand which I doubt if you can see very easily, but the rising graph upon this chart indicates here, as opposed to the pillars which represent the beds available and authorized in the United States, the rising demands for hospital care upon the veterans hospitals by veterans who are not service connected. The Congress authorized 145,000 beds, and the then President of the United States, Mr. Truman, reduced that to 131,000 by Executive order, for reasons which involved both economy and the difficulty of locating and staffing hospitals. There have already been activated 121,000 beds, and we are in the process of building up the remaining 10,000 beds as they are needed. The greatest need runs with NP and TB cases. For the most part, a proper application of the regulations we already have would make the present G. M. and S. beds adequate not only for all veterans who are entitled to hospitalization but to many veterans who are in a field where we wish to give service without necessarily imposing upon them the strictest regulations.

I will explain that last statement briefly by giving you one example. When a veteran reaches, we will say, 60 or 65 years of age, if he is indigent, somebody must care for him, if he is sick. There is a question involving policy which is not for my subcommittee to decide but for the Congress to decide. In some cases it is probably cheaper to care for him in properly arranged veterans hospitals which have beds available than it is to build new State hospitals to care for the aged. However, as a general statement, such hospitalization should properly be given by the local agencies of government.

The next heading, if I were to break this into headings, is the way the Veterans' Administration requests for appropriations come to the Congress. That is the source of much of the misunderstanding which is translated into magazine articles, mimeographed attacks upon the Members of Congress in their own districts, and so forth. The Veterans' Administration request for 1953, having to do with hospitalization is only one part of an item in the budget of the VA under code headings 1000 to 9000, inclusive, and it covers administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary service. In other words, the vet-

eran who writes and says the Congress has cut, or the Congress has refused, an appropriation for hospitals probably means—and probably does not understand—that some request for an appropriation for an entirely different subject appearing under this same code heading has been cut slightly. For example, the entire cut in the Veterans' Administration budget for the present fiscal year was only a net \$31 million as applied against a request of \$895 million, which is a cut of 4.37 percent, not to be applied against the hospital care, dentists, nurses, attendants, and similar service in the hospitals themselves.

I will read you, so you will understand, the following:

Item 1000 is general administration of the Veterans' Administration.

Item 2000 is the contact service.

Item 3000 covers the claims the Veterans' Administration is responsible for.

Item 4000 is the insurance activity of the Veterans' Administration.

Item 5000 has to do with vocational education and rehabilitation under the GI bill of rights.

Item 6000 is the loan guaranty for veterans who are building their homes.

Item 7000 is the readjustment allowance, which has to do with certain readjustments subsequent to World War II, and which is in the process, I would say, of liquidation, no requests having been made for it in the 1954 budget.

Then item 8400 comes as the subsidiary item which has to do with hospitalization, but it includes both the actual activation and operation of a bed, and the administration, and covers the whole area of hospitalization and domiciliary medical care.

Finally, item 9000 is the capital expansion program.

As I said, the Veterans' Administration asked in the budget for the current year—fiscal year 1953—for \$895 million. I will include in the statement at this point the actual quotations from the conference report between the House and the Senate, which stated that no cuts were to be made in the service of doctors, nurses, dentists, and that type of service, to the hospitalized veteran. Conference Report No. 2443, July 2, 1952, to accompany H. R. 8072, in connection with the VA item, said on page 21:

Conferees have approved the full amount of the budget estimate for research, including work in connection with prosthetic appliances, and have further agreed that there should be no reduction in the number of doctors, dentists, nurses, and dieticians.

The report was approved by both House and Senate. The cut, however, was not made by the Veterans' Administration in the way required by the Congress. The cut was a straight percentage cut through every one of these services and activities of the Veterans' Administration.

Even then, I suggest that the cut was not so severe that any reduction in hospital service to service-connected veterans or to veterans with a genuine entitlement need have taken place. It was small compared to the entire amount. In the supplementary bill, which has been the only appropriation bill before us this year, a further request was made for

\$5 million for this particular 8400 item, and all of that money was allowed with no reduction whatever.

There were two reductions made in the supplementary requests, for the Veterans' Administration funds in the second supplemental bill, 1953. The first was a reduction made before it reached the Congress. The original request had been for \$18 million. That was reduced to \$15 million before it reached the Congress.

On February 3 the Director of the Budget asked the individual agencies to freeze the personnel in their agencies so that there might be no expansion of the activities of government until the Bureau of the Budget, under the new administration, had had time to check into this matter of administrative, bureaucratic if you want, personnel.

Therefore, we did remove from the budget almost all of the additional personnel requested for services other than the hospitals. We did not remove any for that type of service. We removed, for example, an additional request for 428 employees in the contact service. The VA had been authorized to have 1,527 employees. They had never built this staff beyond 1,509, yet now the Veterans' Administration was asking for 428 additional.

I wish to interrupt myself to say that that is a controversial subject. It is an area in which economies can well be made. They must be made intelligently, and this Congress has never recommended otherwise. It has said only that where there are contact officers employed by the States, the counties, the cities, and employed by the VFW, the American Legion, the DAV, the AMVETS, and other organizations, the Federal Government should not duplicate those services, that we should only put contact officers into areas where this service could not otherwise be made available, and that we should furnish a sort of clearing house or supervisory service covering the work of all other contact officers.

The hearings, to accompany the appropriation for fiscal year 1954, will disclose testimony from American Legion representatives to the effect that the Pennsylvania department of that organization pays \$170,000 from its own funds each year for such contact service. Other veterans' organizations have contact officers. The committee learns that the DAV has agreed with the attitude of the House Committee on Appropriations that this is an area where Federal expenditures may be cut.

That seems like a very small item to you, but in last year's budget it was over \$7 million. My committee suggested its decrease to about \$1½ million. The House thought otherwise and returned the entire amount. There was still money unspent when the supplementary bill came before us. This should be decided by the legislative committee, but it is a matter of record that the Committee on Appropriations feels here is a place for an exploration for economy.

There are other areas.

Mr. Speaker, my time is moving rather rapidly, and I am going to abbreviate some of these suggestions that I intended

to make. For example, I hold in my hand the issue of Colliers magazine for February 14. I have very high regard both for Colliers and for the Washington representative of Colliers, and I am very much surprised that a magazine of that standing in the United States should have accepted an article of this kind without checking the facts. There was one check made that I know of. The manager of the Washington office called me up and said an article had been submitted to the magazine for publication about the veterans' hospitals. He said that the writer of the article had referred to me personally in it, and had said that although I, as the then ranking minority member of the committee, had approved these so-called severe cuts in the budget for the Veterans' Administration, that at the same time I had insisted upon the building of a veterans' hospital in my own congressional district. He said, and I thanked him for saying it, that that seemed unlike me and he wanted to know what the facts were. I said there was no veterans' hospital in my district, that I had never insisted upon the building of any veterans' hospital which would in any way benefit my district directly or indirectly, and that what the writer referred to, and was obviously in complete ignorance about, was that last year the entire subcommittee approved the building of two NP hospitals, 1 in Cleveland and 1 in the city of Los Angeles, and only chose the latter city because the contract had already been let for the hospital and a loss would have been incurred if it had not been built. I was in favor of building both of them. I was in favor of building the NP hospital in San Francisco and rebuilding the one in Topeka, Kans., and doing something about the situation in Washington. The fields we have not entered fully are the joint fields of TB patients and NP patients, and we must have at the same time a thorough reexploration of the use of veterans' hospitals as now constructed, which will give us beds suitable for veterans who claim they are not being cared for, a statement which is not supported by the facts.

At the time of the passage of the supplementary bill, there were only 70 veterans who had service connections who were not being cared for in veterans' hospitals, and these veterans were not in hospitals by their own choice. A statement was made in the House in my hearing that a hospital in New Jersey had 68 veterans on the waiting list unable to get in, and that the veterans were service connected. Inquiry and an investigation, which I will not take time to read, disclosed that there were 68 such patients, but 52 of them were being taken care of adequately in other hospitals.

I would like to read you—but will not have the time—the official statement of the Veterans' Administration in reply to the article in Collier's magazine. I will quote one or two sentences, and I want you to understand that I take them out of context, not because they change the opinion on the whole, but because I cannot read the entire article now.

Regarding the writer of the Collier's article, I quote:

His opinions are at times open to question, and his conclusions are at places faulty largely because they are based upon inaccurate information.

At another place when the writer speaks of the high turnover of nurses, I now quote the Veterans' Administration comment:

The high turnover in nurses is because they are women rather than any deficiency in the program. Personal affairs accounted for resignations of 2,366, or 71.2 percent, of the nurses who left during the period discussed. They gave as the reasons for leaving: Illness, 128; family illness, 128; marital, 725; marriage 408; pregnancy 714; and personal, 236. Family changes of residence accounted for 345.

And so on. And continuing, the same applies to physicians and other professional staff. There is quite a discussion here of the internal arguments inside the VA, which I will omit, as they are pointless; they are past history now.

The fact that some hospitals are located in congressional districts is replied to pertinently by the Veterans' Administration. I quote:

It is a little difficult to see how hospitals are to be located at all without being in the district of some Congressman.

We have seen that article reprinted in various service magazines, and we have articles antagonistic to the Congress and the Members of the Congress, in the DAV semimonthly magazine, which I regret very much as a DAV member, because the same statement appearing in the recent issue of that magazine is the one the DAV representative, Mr. C. F. Hogan, made before our subcommittee.

We asked Mr. Hogan if having learned what he learned in the committee, if he would not like to change his statement, and show that the Congress was not responsible for the cuts he was discussing and also that these cuts were smaller than his statement showed. It was not changed, however, in the copy which appeared in the DAV bimonthly magazine.

Here are a few suggestions. The first suggestion is that there should be a little better cooperation from the various veterans' organizations. They do not come to the Hill for their facts. I do not know whether my distinguished chairman in the last Congress, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] or other members of the committee who are here have ever had a representative of the various veterans' organizations make any effort to check the facts given them from other sources, with the Appropriations Committee. I can say of my own knowledge this year that no attempt was made to check with us any of these statements which have appeared in various newspapers, magazines, and veterans' house organs.

The second suggestion is that there are excellent areas for economy right in the Veterans' Administration, beyond the figures that we are discussing here as presumed cuts in the budget. For example, when a veteran gets a loan on his house, a generous Nation gives him the amount of the first year's interest upon his loan. It is a gesture of generosity characteristic of the United States; no

other nation would ever think of doing anything like that. But the veteran gets no immediate benefit from that; this money is applied by the lending institution upon the principal of the loan; it reduces the loan to that extent. The only veteran who would ever benefit from it would be the one who lived long enough or owned his house long enough to pay out the entire amount in full and he would, therefore, get a benefit some 20, 30, or 40 years in the future. He takes out of his pocket, at the time when he needs the money, and when we felt we were helping him, the amount of the interest he pays upon the loan for the first year. If he is going to have to do that, why should we make this generous gesture? You say it is a very small item; it is \$64,000,000, Mr. Speaker, and this is money which could better be applied to the needs of the hospitalized veterans.

We send veterans to school; we pay their way and give them a supporting amount of money while they are there, and we require the school to send us a report every month on how the veteran is doing, is he still there, and what kind of marks is he getting. We pay the school \$1.50 for each of these reports. No educational institution does it for its other students. My friend from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] would probably be glad to have \$1.50 for every report to parents he made on every student in his school. If we cut down the number of reports to one on entering, at midyear, and at the end of the year—that is a reduction that could be made—this item alone would save \$5 million. We are looking for economy. There are other items.

I want to call your attention to dental care. You probably have heard that many dentists received in March from the Veterans' Administration a mimeographed notice which looks like this. It is very simple. This is from Wisconsin. It says that—

The enclosed letter informs you that service connection has been granted for a dental condition and that you are eligible for treatment; however, we regret to inform you that as a result of reduced appropriations—

And so forth. Mr. Speaker, it is always reduced appropriations. Even though an agency is getting more money than it got the year before, it still blames reduced appropriations when word goes out to the country that there is something the agency cannot do, especially just before election. We have testimony showing the propaganda sent out by the VA during October 1952.

What are the facts in this case? When this letter was sent out to the dentist saying he had a patient he would like to take care of but there was no money for him, the Veterans' Administration on that same day had unspent in its outpatient fund \$5,158,680, which was adequate to take care of this veteran and a great many others in the remaining 3 months of fiscal year 1953. A larger sum is requested for fiscal 1954.

I have two other items I think are important. The first has to do with non-service-connected hospitalization. There were as of a recent date, I think probably the end of 1952, 35.6 percent of the veterans in the hospitals who



were genuinely service connected and who were receiving treatment for such disabilities. You may not realize it, but there were 11½ percent service-connected veterans who were receiving treatment for something that was not service connected. There were 24.8 percent veterans who had permanent and total disabilities, receiving pensions and because of that could be treated for such service-connected or non-service-connected disabilities. There were 11.4 percent who had no service-connected disability, who were being treated for TB or psychosis or some NP condition. We had a few from the Armed Forces but we had about 17 percent who were in no way service connected at that time.

More important is the fact that in these non-service-connected cases, some of which have a remote connection with service, we have a regulation that a man can only receive treatment for such cases if he is indigent. This is important. He signs an affidavit, subjecting himself to a penalty, either fine or imprisonment.

The statement he makes is very clear. It has been transferred from the back page to the front page, right under his signature. That may help the matter. The Veterans' Administration contends that the final sentence in the act, which says that the affidavit of the veteran shall be taken as evidence of his indigency, does not permit the Veterans' Administration to look back of any single case. The Appropriations Committee does not feel that it cannot look back of cases. A GAO report to our subcommittee indicates, by going into 40 hospitals and taking in each hospital about 1,000 cases, or 40,000 cases in all, putting them in a file and going through this file very quickly, taking only this criterion and no other: This man looks as if he might have an income; he is a lawyer, he is a doctor, he is a professional man of some kind, he has a business in town, it would appear that this man had an income, that out of 500 such cases, the results showed 336 of those cases had incomes of from \$4,000 to \$50,000 a year. Twenty-five cases, possibly duplicating some of the income cases, owned property valued from \$20,000 to \$500,000. These are the "indigents" we are taking care of at the taxpayers' expense in veterans hospitals, who have signed affidavits that they had no means whatever to pay for hospitalization. Incidentally, our law should be amended at once to make it possible for a veteran to pay part of his hospital costs, if he cannot pay the entire amount. The VA hospitals should also be required to ask if the veteran patient carries hospital insurance. You would be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to learn that most of the hospitals do not ask this question, and make no effort to offset their costs with such insurance.

This is a very hasty statement. I want you to have these facts when you go home, when you discuss the problem with the veterans. It is not a question of whether we have appropriated enough. We have always appropriated without hesitation and without limitation for the veterans of the United States. The question is, How much is enough? That is the problem to be discussed in the Veterans' Administration, in the Con-

gress, and at home, on the basis of what is best, not only for the veterans but what is best for the United States and for the people of the United States, more than half of whom are the veterans themselves when it comes to paying taxes. The committee on appropriations asks for economy wherever economy is possible. We ask for a redetermination of policy on several of these regulations, and we ask for a better interpretation and application of the regulations, and if we do that, the tax demand on the people will be reduced and the service to the veterans will be increased steadily, as it always has been.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire, my colleague on the subcommittee.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like, on behalf of some of us who have served through the years with the gentleman from California on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, to express the hope that this information he has given to us today will be widely disseminated and read. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] stands as a living refutation of any idea that the membership of the Committee on Appropriations does not give careful consideration or sympathetic consideration to the needs of the veterans. We have watched him. We know with what anxiety he has worked on this budget and tried to see to it not only that adequate appropriations were made but that they were made in the places where they would be spent for the best interests of the veterans.

I think I am expressing the sentiment of every Member who has been working with the gentleman through the months and years when we commend him not only for what he has done but for the very fair and orderly way he has presented it to the House this afternoon.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. I just found the statement in the testimony of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that I wish to read. Colonel Ijams, formerly administrative officer in the Veterans' Administration, was talking about the duplications presently in existence since the change in policy set up separate offices in each area.

As an illustration—

Said he—

In Baltimore we have two hospitals and one regional office. There is no reason on earth why one finance man, one supply man, and one personnel man cannot adequately serve all three institutions. The same plan of operation, applied to the entire field, would enable you to save a vast amount of money now paid in unnecessary sums.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] then asked him whether in each of these three institutions these three men operated.

Mr. Ijams said:

That is what burns me up. We consolidated positions for years and have operated successfully, and then under the 1945 reorganization it was thrown out the window and we went into this duplication business.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield willingly to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I recall the gentleman's figures, the appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 were something more than \$890 million.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Eight hundred and ninety-five million dollars was requested. Mr. REES of Kansas. And the reduction on the part of the committee was approximately 4 percent.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It was 4.37 percent. Mr. REES of Kansas. Then the committee saw fit to bring the attention of the House to the need for further appropriations recently, and what is the amount of that particular appropriation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I included that in my composite statement. It was \$10 million; \$5 million for the general operation of the Veterans' Administration and \$5 million for hospitalization and domiciliary care.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think one of the things that brought this to our attention was the question of the \$10 million amendment or an amendment submitted to the Committee of the Whole for a \$10-million increase for hospitalization. Can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, the great trouble with that, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, is that it was just a general figure offered on the floor by a Member for whom we have the highest regard, and it was offered not to apply to hospitals but to all of the Veterans' Administration; not specifically to the hospitals, and it was an unconsidered figure. There was no figure that could be arrived at to show how the Veterans' Administration should use \$10 million. They had not asked for that much; they asked for only \$5 million and we gave them that amount.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the \$10 million had been approved, would it have been applied to hospitals?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It would not necessarily have been applied to hospitals, because it was not offered specifically for that. I tried to explain that in analyzing this general budget item.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, the committee has under consideration at the present time the question of appropriations for the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. We expect to hear the Veterans' Administration on May 14 and report our final bill the following week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in connection with this discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. May I commend the gentleman from California on his straightforward and enlightening speech on this subject. No one in the House is more considerate or more interested in the needs of the veterans of this country than he. As the gentleman from New Hampshire stated, the gentleman

from California has worked for and with the veterans for many years.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

There is an important point which I almost overlooked.

We think only of building VA hospitals. We already have, or propose to build, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health hospitals. Many of these have vacant beds. Some private hospitals have vacancies. The VA could and should contract for the use of beds in such hospitals for veterans. When the demands of war are ended, these hospitals will have additional beds and if we have overbuilt veterans' hospitals, these other hospitals will deteriorate. For example, in an inquiry regarding the new VA hospital in Philadelphia, it was disclosed not only that the Navy Hospital there had 300 or more vacant beds, and wanted veteran patients—as do other military or Public Health hospitals I could name—but the Navy Hospital is in danger of having a reduced rating given it by the American Medical Association, because it does not have enough patients, or a sufficient spread in the types of cases cared for.

#### LUMP-SUM LEAVE PAYMENTS TO GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has just concluded hearings on a matter which has aroused wide public interest. This is the question of the large lump-sum leave payments recently made to Cabinet officers and other high officials of the Truman administration when they left the Government.

The hearings which our committee held were on legislation which will prevent such excessive lump-sum leave payments to high Government officials in the future. This legislation would not deprive career Government employees of annual and sick leave to which they are entitled.

For the information of the Members of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD my opening statement at the hearings with respect to these excessive lump-sum leave payments to high officials and also with respect to the annual and sick leave of career Federal employees.

The statement is as follows:

This public hearing is being held on H. R. 4039. This legislation will exclude from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, officials in the executive branch of the Government specified in Public Law 359, 81st Congress, the act which established the rates of pay of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent offices. This includes Presidential assistants and top level Presidential appointments.

This bill, when enacted into law, will prevent any such payments to department and agency heads in large sums as has been recently disclosed by the Comptroller General's report to the Appropriations Committee. This report pointed out that many retiring department and agency heads of the

last administration received in excess of \$5,000 in accumulated annual leave. In fact, one high official received over \$12,000 in a lump sum for accumulated annual leave.

I have asked the Comptroller General to conduct such investigations as are necessary to determine whether or not there was misrepresentation in the certifications of officials calling for such large lump sum payments for accumulated annual leave.

My attention also has been directed to the fact that many postmasters have accumulated large amounts of annual leave. I have pointed out this problem to the Postmaster General and asked that he take affirmative action to reduce the amount of accrued annual leave of postmasters. This has been estimated to be about a \$30 million liability against the Post Office Department at the present time.

To demonstrate to what extent the accumulation of annual leave can be carried, I have pointed to the former postmaster at New York City who resigned recently while his office was under investigation. He was paid more than \$10,000 in a lump sum for accumulated leave when he left the service.

I think it is appropriate at this time, also, to clarify the situation regarding the leave privileges of career Federal employees as distinguished from the high officials covered by H. R. 4039.

It is a generally overlooked fact that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has never considered the question of leave for Federal employees. The 1951 Annual and Sick Leave Act—which established the present graduated annual leave system—originated in conference as a Senate rider on postal rate legislation. Yet this is the law that governs the leave of most of our Federal employees.

The so-called Thomas leave rider requires that all annual leave earned by Federal employees during any calendar year after December 31, 1951, be used by June 30 of the next calendar year. This provision, which constituted a major change in the Government's leave policy, originated as a rider on an appropriation bill.

There have been a great many proposals as to what should be done regarding the leave of Federal employees and a wide variety of views have been expressed on the subject. Close examination and careful study of these proposals will be necessary before this committee can determine what action is to be taken with respect thereto. It would be most inadvisable, in my judgment, for the committee to act on any such proposal without full opportunity to consider all phases of this broad and important subject.

I plan to schedule hearings soon after the Easter recess to consider the whole problem of annual and sick leave for Federal employees.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINE and to include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. CRUMPACKER and to include an article.

MESSRS. HILL and CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. FARRINGTON and to include an article.

Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. CLARDY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAHAM and to include a short editorial.

Mr. RADWAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER in five instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN and to include an excerpt from an article appearing in a magazine.

Mr. THORNBERRY and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. DURHAM and to include an article on the medical research program.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and to include an address delivered by a former Member of this House, Mr. Darden, at a Jackson Day dinner held in Richmond, Va.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINE and to include an editorial.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. LESINSKI) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in four instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include a letter.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. CHURCH (at the request of Mr. RIEHLMAN) and to include an article.

Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. RIEHLMAN) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG (at the request of Mr. RIEHLMAN) and to include an article.

Mr. FERNOS-ISERN (at the request of Mr. RIEHLMAN) and to include an article.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, previously today I got permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a speech by a former colleague, the Honorable Colgate Darden. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it exceeds the limit and will cost \$250. Notwithstanding the excess I ask that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina and to include an article.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CONDON, for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. VORYS), for the period March 30 to April 20, on account of travel on official business for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.



Mr. MERROW (at the request of Mr. VORYS), for the period March 30 to April 20, on account of travel on official business for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CARNAHAN (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for the period March 31 to April 20, on account of travel on official business for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

597. A letter from the Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a revised draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

598. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to prohibit false advertising or misuse of names indicating the various exchange services of the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 4390. A bill to regulate the issuance of identification tags for motor vehicles and trailers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 4391. A bill to exempt from tax cigarettes sold to veterans' organizations for distribution, as gifts, to hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 4392. A bill to provide that amounts erroneously paid to the United States as unemployment tax may be transferred to the State to which such amounts should have been paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit schoolteachers and other professional people to deduct, as business expenses, certain educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the taxpayer to deduct, as a business expense, the cost of providing care for children under 16 years of age, if such care is for the purpose of enabling the taxpayer to be gainfully employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that individuals may deduct from gross income expenses paid or incurred for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 4396. A bill to extend the excess-profits tax for 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4397. A bill providing for the construction of distribution systems on the Central Valley project, California, by irrigation districts and other public agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit certain actions for the recovery of overpayments of income taxes to be brought before the expiration of 6 months from the date of filing a claim for refund or credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4399. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4400. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that receivers and trustees in proceedings under chapter XI shall receive compensation on the same basis as those in proceedings under chapter X; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4401. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, so as to permit certain suits for the recovery of taxes to be brought in the district of the taxpayer's residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4402. A bill to permit actions against the United States for the recovery of internal-revenue taxes to be brought in United States district courts without regard to the amount in controversy and to permit any such action to be tried by the court with a jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 4403. A bill to exempt admissions to moving-picture theaters from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 4404. A bill to allow for construction of distribution systems by irrigation districts in the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 4405. A bill to exempt publications of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', and fraternal organizations or associations from the minimum rate of postage prescribed by law for each individually addressed copy of publications entered as second-class matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 4406. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Functions and Fiscal Resources; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 4407. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine-arts programs in State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and in other nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4408. A bill to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, relating to retirement of judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4409. A bill to amend section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate its provisions regarding affidavits, and to provide that the National Labor Relations Board shall not act upon a matter raised by a labor organization unless the organization's constitution bars membership to Communists and certain other individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 4410. A bill to reduce certain rates of postage on parcels sent to or by members of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed outside the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 4411. A bill to authorize certain works of improvement on the Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4412. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Wyoming, respectively, of mineral interests in certain lands in such States acquired by the United States under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4413. A bill to provide for the repair, restoration, and preservation of the U. S. S. *Hartford*, flagship of Admiral Farragut; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4414. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healy Act); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4415. A bill to extend for 2 years the period of time within which former prisoners of war may file certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4416. A bill to amend section 4 (1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, so as to provide shorter periods of service for certain doctors and dentists who are inducted thereunder after serving on active duty in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4417. A bill to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4418. A bill to amend the act of July 28, 1942 (ch. 528, 56 Stat. 722), relating to posthumous appointments and commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4419. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Rayne, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4420. A bill to extend the time for filing applications for lump-sum death payments under title II of the Social Security Act with respect to individuals who died on or after December 7, 1941, while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 4421. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least \$100 per month to all American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been citizens 10 years or more, to be prorated according to the cost of living as

on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 4422. A bill to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4423. A bill to provide for the payment of lump-sum death benefits to the survivors of certain employees of contractors with the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim March 20 of each year as Cancer Education Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution providing that sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations be started with prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. Res. 196. Resolution proposing study of the feasibility of establishment of on-the-job training program for career diplomats in the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

### MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the removal of the Federal Government from the field of motor fuel taxation, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the recreational use of Government lands under the control of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 4424. A bill for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 4425. A bill for the relief of Angel Shirvanian Aykanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4426. A bill for the relief of Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 4427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Piasecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4428. A bill for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 4429. A bill for the relief of Adolf Klein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4430. A bill for the relief of Frigyes Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4431. A bill for the relief of Maswood Bakt Choudry, Abdul Kadir Aftab Miah, and Abdul Whab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4432. A bill for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York (by request):

H. R. 4433. A bill for the relief of John Carlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4434. A bill for the relief of Nikolai, Gerda, and Annerose Korotkevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4435. A bill for the relief of Thomas Marfoe (also known as Tao-Wen Ma); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4436. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Giuseppe Collura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4437. A bill for the relief of Louise Rank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4438. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maisie A. Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4439. A bill for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Hilde Kretz Sforza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4441. A bill for the relief of Stamatoula S. Roumanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Waltraud Mieske Pengelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

132. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition of James W. Jewett, and 27 other members of the Pennsylvania Railroad Retired Men's Association No. 3, of Harrisburg, Pa., urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and abolish that part of the said act pertaining to the interlocking of the said act with social security and make them separate funds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

133. By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia: Petition of the W. C. T. U. and Virginia Church Temperance Council, Inc., in support of H. R. 1227, which penalizes interstate transmission by mail or otherwise, of newspapers, periodicals, newsreels, photographic films, or records advertising alcoholic beverages or soliciting orders therefor or advertising by radio, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

134. By Mr. WESTLAND: Petition of the National Pension Federation of Washington, D. C., requesting passage of H. R. 1041 and H. R. 4230, bills to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least \$100 per month to all American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been citizens 10 years or more, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 1953

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

O Thou Lamb of God, who takest away the sin of the world, in the holy pilgrimage of this sacred week we fain would join devout multitudes treading the way of sorrow. We lift our eyes to a green hill outside a city wall and to a lone cross against the sky, a cross so old and yet so new, hallowed by forgiveness

for hate's most cruel blows; a cross sanctified by loving solicitude for all mournful mothers weeping at crosses where hang their sons.

Make us worthy of those who, day by day, are making the supreme sacrifice in the spirit of Calvary, that the flag of our dear country may become a symbol of peace on earth and of brotherhood among all men. May the cross of the Redeemer, about which men under all skies are now gathering, be for us as never before the sublime symbol that truth will conquer error, that light will dispel darkness and that, at last, life will prove stronger than death. Steady our hearts and steel our wills to pay the price for the coming kingdom, knowing there is no way to dawn except by dark, no way to light except by night, no way to Easter except by Calvary. We ask it in the name of that One who despised the shame and endured the cross. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 1, 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.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4233) to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1110) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order agreed to yesterday, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has the floor. Does the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my impression was that this was the morning hour. The Senate adjourned, and the consent applied, as I understood, at the conclusion of the morning hour. In any event, I ask unanimous consent that the order be so modified.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.