

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6513. A bill for the relief of Ciro Picardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 6514. A bill for the relief of Marion Urbanek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 6515. A bill for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 6516. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Kaneko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

537. Mr. LESINSKI presented a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., urging prompt enactment of legislation providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 10, 1952)

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

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

Father of mankind, to whom all souls are dear and whose tender mercies are over all Thy works: Before facing waiting tasks, we would bow at this our morning altar of prayer to ask for guidance and for strength. Save us, we beseech Thee, from all error, pride, and prejudice. In all our deliberations grant us that candor which is the high courage of the soul. Help us to find in each problem and perplexity the prelude to those larger understandings, which in today's desert of denials and betrayals of truth and freedom shall be as trees whose leaves are for the healing of the nations. Grant us inner greatness of spirit and clearness of vision to meet and match the large designs of this glorious yet demanding day, that we may keep step with the drumbeat of Thy truth which is marching on. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 7, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 493. An act to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes;

S. 905. An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rozanoff and Mrs. L. A. Ushkova;

H. R. 4948. An act to suspend certain import duties on lead; and

H. R. 5448. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. BRIDGES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 10 days, including today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Federal Security and Labor of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

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

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

REPORTS ON APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Two letters from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on the apportionment of appropriations to the Veterans' Administration for readjustment benefits and servicemen's indemnity, for the fiscal year 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

INCREASED EFFICIENCY OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

WAREHOUSE SPACE FOR CIVIL DEFENSE PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to au-

thorize the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to acquire, by lease or license, warehouse space for civil defense purposes at Sikeston, Mo., Zanesville, Ohio; Downingtown, Pa.; and Paw Paw, W. Va., respectively (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF VIOLATION OF REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, a violation of subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal all laws inhibiting free trade in gold in the open market

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted laws restricting free trade in gold produced in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and compelling that all such gold be sold only to the Government of the United States at a price fixed by statute at \$35 per fine ounce; and

"Whereas the aforesaid fixed price was established in 1934 at a time when both labor and materials were readily obtainable at a reasonable price; and

"Whereas wage costs and material costs have more than doubled since 1934 and no longer can be met by gold producers in the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas gold mining is a major industry in the State of Nevada and has, in the past, enabled the development of lead, copper, zinc, and silver properties which were of inestimable value to the Nation during World War II; and

"Whereas the restrictions and inhibitions on free trade in gold, coupled with the arbitrary and unreasonable fixed price on gold, have compelled the closing and abandonment of gold mines in the State of Nevada, resulting in unemployment and hardship for the people of Nevada and drastically affecting the economic and tax structure of the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States proposed legislation to permit free trade in gold in the open market within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and to permit gold to be exported without the imposition of duties, excise taxes, or licenses, permits, or any restrictions whatsoever; and

"Whereas the enactment of such legislation will be of inestimable benefit to the people of the State of Nevada; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact Senate bill 13, Eighty-first Congress, first session, or similar legislation repealing all restrictions on trade in gold and permitting gold to be freely bought, held, sold, or traded in the open market, and permitting gold to be exported without duties, taxes, licenses, permits, or any restrictions whatsoever; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the

President and Vice President of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States."

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

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on income, inheritances, and gifts

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, That this legislature respectively petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

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

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent."

"SEC. 4. The limitation upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall, however, be subject to the qualification that in the event of a war in which the United States is engaged creating a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolution or transfers of property with like power, while the United States is actively engaged in such war, to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

"SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

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

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

"House Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution making application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas article V of the Constitution of the United States reads in part as follows: 'The Congress * * * on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States'; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, in view of the increasing tax problems of the State, caused in large part by the invasion of tax sources by the Federal Government, believes that its problems as well as the problems of other States similarly situated, can be solved only by some restraint upon present unrestrained exercise of the taxing power by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is using and has been using for a number of years the taxing power to produce revenue beyond a legitimate necessity of a Federal Government, other than defense needs, and has been using the funds so raised to invade the province of legislation of the States and to appropriate in many fields that which amounts to a dole to the States of the money raised therefrom to accomplish many purposes, most of them worthy, but by the described process making the money available only under conditions which result in a control by the Federal Government from centralized agencies in Washington, in many cases unfit, and in other cases unable to administer the laws according to the local needs because of varying conditions in the country as a whole, resulting in inequities in the administration of the very benefits purported to be granted; and

"Whereas State and local needs are disadvantaged because the people are already taxed far beyond the real need for any purpose other than forcing the centralization of all government in Washington; and

"Whereas the framers of the Constitution of the United States clearly foresaw the possibility of a condition similar to that herein described, and made provision in the Constitution for safeguarding the States against any oppression or invasion of rights by the Federal Government; Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That said legislature, hereby and pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, make application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the proposing of the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The power to levy taxes and appropriate the revenues therefrom heretofore granted to the Congress by the States in the several articles of this Constitution is hereby limited.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be in effect except during a state of war, hereafter declared, when it shall be suspended. The suspension thereof shall end upon the termination of the war, but not later than 3 months after the cessation of hostilities, whichever shall be earlier. The cessation of hostilities may be declared by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by concurrent action of the legislatures of 32 States.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of article V, this article may be suspended for a time certain or amended at any time by

concurrent action of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

"SEC. 4. There shall be set aside in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund into which shall be paid 25 percent of all taxes collected by authority derived from the sixteenth amendment to this Constitution, except as provided in section 5, and 25 percent of all sums collected by the United States from any other tax levied for revenue.

"SEC. 5. There shall be set aside in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund into which shall be paid all sums received from taxes levied on personal incomes in excess of 50 percent thereof and from taxes levied on income or profits of corporations in excess of 38 percent thereof.

"SEC. 6. Before paying any sums into the funds created by sections 4 and 5 hereof, the Treasurer of the United States shall deduct therefrom 20 percent which shall be used in payment of the principal of the national debt of the United States.

"SEC. 7. No tax hereafter be imposed on that portion of the incomes of individuals which does not exceed, in the case of unmarried persons, the sum of \$600 per annum, and in the case of married persons the sum of \$1,200 per annum jointly. A minimum deduction of \$600 per annum shall be allowed for each dependent.

"SEC. 8. The Treasurer of the United States shall once in each year, from the separate fund created by section 4 hereof, pay to each of the several States one-fourth of 1 percent of said fund and from the remainder of said fund shall pay to each State a portion of such remainder determined by the population of each State in ratio to the entire population of the several States according to the last Federal decennial census or any subsequent general census authorized by law.

"SEC. 9. The Treasurer of the United States shall, from the separate fund created by section 5 hereof, pay to each State, once in each year, a sum equal to the amount of money in such fund which was collected from persons or corporations within such State.

"SEC. 10. Any sums paid hereunder to the several States shall be available for appropriation only by the legislatures thereof. The legislatures may appropriate therefrom for any purpose not forbidden by the constitutions of the respective States and may appropriate therefrom for expenditures within the States for any purpose for which appropriations have heretofore been made by the Congress except such purposes as are specifically reserved by this Constitution for the exclusive power of the Congress. The people of each State may limit the expenditures of funds herein made available to the legislature, but shall not direct the appropriation thereof.

"SEC. 11. Each legislature shall have power by rule or resolution to provide for the assembly thereof in special sessions for the purpose of considering amendments to, the suspension of, or the ratification of amendments proposed to this article.

"SEC. 12. Each legislature shall have power to elect one or more persons to represent such legislature in any council or convention of States created by concurrent action of the legislatures of 32 States for the purpose of obtaining uniform action by the legislatures of the several States in any matters connected with the amendment of this article.

"SEC. 13. The Congress shall not create, admit, or form new States from the territory of the several States as constituted on the 1st day of January 1949, and shall not create, form, or admit more than three States from the Territories and insular possessions under the jurisdiction of the United States on the 1st day of January 1949, or from territory thereafter acquired without the express consent of the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"Sec. 14. On and after January 1, 1949, the dollar shall be the unit of the currency. The gold content of the dollar as fixed on January 1, 1949, shall not be decreased.

"Sec. 15. Concurrent action of the legislatures of the several States as used herein shall mean the adoption of the same resolution by the required number of legislatures. A limit of time may be fixed by such resolution within which such concurrent action shall be taken. No legislature shall revoke the affirmative action of a preceding legislature taken therein.

"Sec. 16. During any period when this article is in effect the Congress may, by concurrent resolution adopted by two-thirds of both Houses wherein declaration is made that additional funds are necessary for the defense of the Nation, limit the amount of money required by this article to be returned to the several States. Such limitation shall continue until terminated by the Congress or by concurrent action of a majority of the legislatures of the several States. Upon termination of any such limitation the Congress may not thereafter impose a limitation without the express consent by concurrent action of a majority of the legislatures of the several States.

"Sec. 17. This article is declared to be self-executing; and be it further

Resolved, That attested copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress, and that printed copies thereof, showing that said concurrent resolution was adopted by the Legislature of New Mexico, be sent to each House of each legislature of each State of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That this application hereby made by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico shall constitute a continuing application in accordance with article V of the Constitution of the United States until at least two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States shall have made similar application pursuant to said article V; and be it further

Resolved, That since this is an exercise by a State of the United States of a power granted to it under the Constitution, the request is hereby made that the official journals and Record of both Houses of Congress, shall include the resolution or a notice of its receipt by the Congress, together with similar applications from other States, so that the Congress and the various States shall be apprised of the time when the necessary number of States shall have so exercised their power under article V of the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That since this method of proposing amendments to the Constitution has never been completed to the point of calling a convention and no interpretation of the power of the States in the exercise of this right has ever been made by any court or any qualified tribunal, if there be such, and since the exercise of the power is a matter of basic sovereign right and the interpretation thereof is primarily in the sovereign government making such exercise and since the power to use such right in full also carries the power to use such right in part the legislature of the State of New Mexico interprets article V to mean that if two-thirds of the States make application for a convention, to propose an identical amendment to the Constitution for ratification with a limitation that such amendment be the only matter before it, that such convention would have power only to propose the specified amendment and would be limited to such proposal and would not have power to vary the text thereof nor would it have power to propose other amendments on the same or different propositions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New Mexico does not, by this exercise of

its power under article V, authorize the Congress to call a convention for any purpose other than the proposing of the specific amendment which is a part hereof; nor does it authorize any representative of the State of New Mexico who may participate in such convention to consider or to agree to the proposing of any amendment other than the one made a part hereof; and be it further

Resolved, That by its actions in these premises, the Legislature of the State of New Mexico does not in any way limit in any other proceeding its right to exercise its power to the full extent; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress, in exercising its power of decision as to the method of ratification of the proposed article by the legislatures or by conventions, is hereby requested to require that the ratification be by the legislatures."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Puerto Rican Manufacturers' Association, San Juan, P. R., signed by Juan Suarez, president, relating to the sale of surplus Puerto Rican sugar (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the secretary of state of the State of Delaware, notifying the Senate that an authenticated copy of an interstate civil defense compact entered into by that State had been submitted to the Senate on July 25, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The memorial of Mrs. Louis Spring, a citizen of the United States, remonstrating against the extravagance in Government (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A resolution adopted by the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 4544, to establish in the Bureau of Customs the United States Customs Port Patrol and the United States Customs Border Patrol in order to improve the enforcement of the anti-smuggling laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Association of Retired Police and Firemen, Inc., of Miami, Fla., signed by John H. Ruddy, secretary, praying for repeal of the income tax on pensions; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by Miami Townsend Club, No. 22, West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, and Miami Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, all in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of Hardy B. Ogden, and sundry other members of the Pleasant Grove Baptist Church, remonstrating against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Presbytery of western Kentucky, of Paducah, Ky., signed by Charles M. Bunce, stated clerk, remonstrating against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of Hazel V. Brandeburg, a citizen of the United States, remonstrating against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Dean F. Hatch, citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Mrs. Wm. E. Hamilton, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase retirement benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 194. A bill to prohibit age requirements or limitations with respect to the appointment of persons to positions in the competitive civil service during periods of war or national emergency; with amendments (Rept. No. 1164); and

S. 1539. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service," approved March 2, 1931; with amendments (Rept. No. 1165).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 11, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 493. An act to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; and

S. 905. An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rozanoff and Mrs. L. A. Ushkova.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. CAIN):

S. 2633. A bill for the relief of John H. Miller;

S. 2634. A bill for the relief of John Axel Arvidson; and

S. 2635. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 2636. A bill for the relief of Jose Deang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. IVES) (by request):

S. 2637. A bill for the relief of Peter Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2638. A bill for the relief of John K. Schmidt; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KERR, Mr. MOODY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. IVES):

S. 2639. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S. 2640. A bill to revise requirement for award of additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents; and

S. 2641. A bill to elevate the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension for disability or death and to provide certain exclusions in determining annual income for purposes of such limitations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2642. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2643. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Cowley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HENNINGSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. THYE, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

S. 2644. A bill to provide for the development of a Mississippi River National Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2645. A bill to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 2646. A bill to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 2647. A bill for the relief of Wong Shu Ging; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

By Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. DIRKSEN):

Address by Senator DIRKSEN as a part of the Justice for Poland Radio Series, 1951-52, sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress, together with the introductory remarks by Attorney Edward J. Ziemba.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him at a Lincoln Day dinner under auspices of Republican Committee of Essex County, N. J., at Newark, N. J., on February 9, 1952.

Address delivered by him before anti-Communist rally sponsored by Ukrainian Congress Committee of America at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 10, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Guard Liberty: Amend Constitution," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on February 9, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Ask Delaware Democrats," published in the Wilmington Morning News of February 9, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Too Much Whitewash," published in the Washington Post of February 9, 1952.

By Mr. MOODY:

Articles entitled "The Detroit Story—Auto Labor Caught in Odd Pinch of Output for War and Peace" and "More Metals Held Only Cure for Detroit's Unemployment," written by James Y. Newton and published, respectively, in the Washington Star of February 8 and February 10, 1952.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting

several nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Reports of committees are in order. If there be none, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified. That concludes the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, is it the purpose of the Senator from Texas to have the Senate resume normal legislative session?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum because I have been informed that there is a Senator who desires to make a few remarks before the Senate takes a recess until Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be necessary that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business. Without objection, the Senate will return to the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMERCIAL LENDING AND GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on December 3, 1951, Mr. E. C. Sammons, president of the United States National Bank of Portland, Oreg., delivered an address at the Hotel La Salle, in Chicago, Ill., before the National Credit Conference of the American Bankers Association, on the subject Commercial Lending for 1952. I wish to make a few brief comments on Mr. Sammons' speech before I ask unanimous consent to have the speech inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I am very much disturbed about the fiscal policies of our Government and the relationship of those policies to a proposed \$84,400,000,000 budget. I am absolutely satisfied not only that we can cut the budget substantially, but that, in the interest of a sound economy, we must cut it. I think it behooves us to give heed to some of the financial problems which confront the banks in regard to what I think is an obligation on their part to do what they can to help expand production. When all is said and done,

the most effective check we have on inflation is, of course, the expanding of production, because inflation itself involves the problem of a scarcity of consumer goods as against a surplus of purchasing power.

As one reads the speech of this outstanding banker from my State, he is not left with any doubt as to the surplus purchasing power. However, he does find, in studying the speech, the great concern which the bankers entertain in regard to the lending policies which they can justify following, because, after all, the obligation of the banker is to his depositors. He cannot justify the granting of loans, even in the interest of an alleged proposal to expand a particular industry, unless he has some assurance that the loan will pay out.

I think this problem of the banker has a direct relationship to the problem of the Congress in handling this year's budget. I am convinced that we cannot economically and efficiently spend the money which is asked for in the budget in the period of time for which it is asked. I do not mean that it would not be spent, but I emphasize the words "economically and efficiently." I have no doubt, for example, that if we give to the Military Establishment every last dollar for which it asks, it will spend it. I would be greatly encouraged if some departments of Government, including the Military Establishment, would each year let a little money revert to the Treasury of the United States. However—and I speak now half facetiously—sometimes I am of the opinion that if any administrator within our Government were to let any money revert to the United States Treasury at the end of the fiscal year he would be considered a very poor administrator, and certainly a traitor to his colleagues within the administrative branch. They seem to be constitutionally unable to allow any money to revert to the Treasury. So each year during the last 60 days of the fiscal year there is experienced what I think, by way of understatement, can be described as an orgy of uneconomical spending.

Yet, Mr. President, the matter of Government spending is directly a part of the cause-to-effect chain of causation for an ever-cheapening American dollar. Mr. Sammons, in his speech before the bankers' group in Chicago on December 3, pointed out very clearly the problem which the banker faces in connection with an ever-cheapening dollar when called upon to make long-time loans for expanding some particular industry in the economic environment of the bank. He cannot very well justify making a long-time loan, to help out with the most effective check we have against inflation, which is expanding our production, if the loan is going to be paid back with a cheaper dollar than the dollar he lends. So Mr. Sammons says in his speech:

The commercial bankers of the country should find considerable opportunity to lend money to business over the next year, for essential production, for inventory, and for accounts receivable; but they should be extremely careful, it seems to me, on capital loans, because tax gatherers will not leave enough margin of the earnings in the business to repay loans made for capital purposes. An exception to the capital loans program

can be made in the case of regulation V loans for defense production. Quite a few banks have availed themselves of that program, and as defense production is stepped up in the months ahead, probably more of those loans will be made. They can be made safely.

However, Mr. President, with a depreciating dollar loans for civilian production cannot be made safely for a very long time. If my major thesis is correct, that the most effective check on inflation is, after all, the expansion of the base of the production structure, then as rapidly as we can we are going to have to expand the production base of the civilian economy, consistent, of course, with the use of scarce material in a priority position for defense purposes. It is elementary that inflation represents a split between availability of consumer goods in scarce supply and an oversupply of purchasing power.

Mr. Sammons goes on to say:

Following through on the ordinary capital loan, not too many years ago bankers could estimate that around 87 percent of a corporation's earnings were available for payment of debt, for dividends, and for plant expansion. At that time the income-tax rate was 13 percent. Today it is quite a different story. The normal tax rate is now 52 percent, and all but 15 States in the Union have an excise tax in addition. In my State of Oregon the excise tax is 8 percent—highest of all the States. The next highest is Georgia, with 7 percent; Minnesota, Mississippi, and North Carolina come along with 6 percent; Wisconsin, North Dakota, and Kentucky each have a graduated tax which reaches a maximum of 6 percent; in New York the tax is 5½ percent; in Colorado, 5 percent; and so on, with 33 of the States exacting a tax in some amount.

With the Federal income tax and the State excise tax, we in Oregon must pay out 60 percent of earnings, leaving only 40 percent of each earned dollar to the owners of the business. Then, if by chance the corporation is in the excess-profits tax bracket, it really hurts. We must therefore think in terms of a different kind of dollar which our borrowers will have to work with. We have, in fact, two kinds of dollars. First, is the 48-cent dollar, decreased by whatever State excise tax is applicable; and then—this is the extreme case—we in Oregon have the 27.4-cent dollar. The latter is what will be left after paying an excess-profits tax. There is not a lot of margin left for the businessman or taxpayer to play with, and so caution in making loans of a slow or capital nature is in order, certainly for the next few years.

Mr. President, I call attention to that fact because for some years I have been debating in the labor halls of America the negative of the proposition, advanced by so many labor leaders, that all we have to do to meet the fiscal problems of the Federal Government is to increase the corporation taxes. I have said to labor for a good many years, in opposition to that point of view, that labor is only defeating its own purposes by advocating, as many labor leaders do, corporate taxes beyond the point of equity and beyond the point of ability to pay on the part of corporations, and at the same time restricting rather than expanding the operations of the corporations.

Let me make very clear, Mr. President, that I shall always be found fighting for fair, equitable, and reasonable taxes upon corporations. They should pay

their way. I will always be found fighting for excess-profits taxes. However, I will not be found fighting, upon the recommendation of any labor group, for a tax structure upon corporations which in effect reduces the jobs of the American workers. I will not be found fighting for a tax structure upon corporations which places the banks of the country in the position which Mr. Sammons describes in his very able speech, where they will not make long-time loans—and they cannot be expected to make long-time loans—for the expanded activities of a particular corporation, because the dollar that is left to the corporation to pay back the loan has become so cheapened that the very security which the bank must protect, so far as its depositors are concerned, becomes endangered.

Our problem here again is the problem of balance, of finding what the traffic will bear, in a manner that will not restrict the economy but will expand the economy. I take the position that our capitalistic system must always be put to work for the primary purpose of advancing the general welfare of our people. That is its great justification. It does not exist for the purpose of amassing fortunes for selfish and greedy interests. The owners of capital are entitled to a fair return on their investment. It becomes a question of judgment time and time again as to what a fair return is, but reasonable men can usually reasonably agree upon what it is.

Yet, I want to say on the floor of the Senate today that I believe there are economic groups in the country, particularly represented by some labor groups, who seem to feel that there is a justification for shifting the whole tax burden or much of the tax burden off the shoulders of individuals as individuals and putting it on the so-called whipping boy of the American economy; namely, the corporate entity.

To follow such a course of action, as I have argued for years, defeats labor's best interests, as well as the best interests of every other consumer group. Therefore, I am putting Mr. Sammons' speech in the RECORD at this point because I believe it is well, not only for Members of Congress, but also for labor leaders, to look at the problem of taxation from the standpoint of the bankers' lending problems. After all, the workers of America are more dependent for their jobs than I believe most of them realize upon a sound financial structure, including the ability of bankers to lend money safely and to protect the interests of their depositors in expanding the productive enterprises of the great corporate system of the United States.

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

COMMERCIAL LENDING FOR 1952

There is an old adage that "a milking stool needs three legs." Our American economy is like the milking stool: it has three legs—capital, labor, management. Without capital invested in tools and equipment, labor could not make anything like the kind of living it makes today, which, incidentally, is the highest standard of living in the world. Without labor in the shape of human energy

and skills to use effectively the tools and equipment, capital invested in the tools and equipment would be a total loss. Without management to bring the two together and make the best use of both, neither capital nor labor could prosper. When any one of these three legs—capital, labor, management—falls to function properly, the entire economy becomes upset and everyone suffers. When each one of the three carries its full share of the load, the result is greater individual and national prosperity.

One of the principal tools needed in the economy is credit, and you as bankers know only too well, our credit system is founded upon the lender's confidence in the borrower, or in his collateral and general possessions.

The chief function of credit is to transfer capital from those who own it to those who can use it in the expectation of profits in an amount greater than the interest cost on the loan.

Going back to fundamentals, credit is our lifeblood in the banking system. Credit increases the productive processes of capital. With these few sentences as a beginning let me now discuss with you possibilities of commercial lending in 1952.

Out in my part of the country where some of the primitive forests are still in existence, there is a saying among woodsmen that "you can generally tell where you are going by where you have been," and that is literally true, because the experienced woodsman always blazes a trail as he goes through new forests. He whacks big chunks out of the bark so that in case he becomes lost, the blazes will guide him back to his starting point. Where we have been in the lending field may therefore give us a clue to where we are going.

First of all, I will say that business seems definitely better. The slackening that began in the second quarter, and which frightened so many people, has apparently run its course. A gradual upturn seems to be indicated. The Federal Reserve Index of Industrial Production grew two points in September to 219 percent of the 1935-39 base. This is still below the peak of 223 percent reached last March. Compared with September a year ago, there is an increase of 8 points—from 211 percent to 219 percent. The total value of goods and services for the third quarter was at the annual rate of \$328,000,000,000, which was a gain of approximately \$2,500,000,000 above the rate for the second quarter.

Industrial production, which declined more than seasonally during the summer months, has turned upward. Armament is just beginning to be felt in a big way. The Congress has appropriated \$146,700,000,000 and only 25 percent of that amount has been spent. Goods delivered against armament orders amount to \$35,000,000,000; \$111,000,000,000 more are to be spent. It has taken time to tool up and get into production, but defense production has started to roll and will roll faster from now on and throughout 1952.

As Henry Heimann will probably tell you in his talk which follows mine, trade during the coming holiday season should be exceptionally good, since more people will be working than ever before, and at the highest wage rates ever known. There is plenty of money to spend, and it seems likely that retail trade in the fourth quarter will exceed that for the same quarter last year by at least 5 percent.

In the matter of Commercial Lending for 1952—the topic assigned to me—I think we might be guided in 1952 by what has happened in the past few years, as I stated earlier. It should be helpful to examine for a few minutes the loan and deposit record of all commercial banks in the United States over the past 5½ years. The figures I quote are for commercial banks only: mutual sav-

ings banks and others have been excluded. My source of information is the Federal Reserve Board's report. The figures are as of December 31, except for 1951 in which they are as of June 27.

First, let us examine the record in 1946, when 14,044 banks reported. They held deposits of \$139,033,000,000, and had loans of \$31,122,000,000, so 22 percent of deposits were loaned over the counter—and I repeat, these were all commercial banks. In 1947 the score stood at \$144,103,000,000, deposits; loans \$38,057,000,000, or a percentage of loans to deposits of 26.41. In 1948 deposits declined to \$142,843,000,000, but loans went up to \$42,488,000,000. The percentage that year was 29.74. At the end of 1949 deposits had increased slightly to \$145,174,000,000. Loans remained practically stationary at \$42,965,000,000, and the percentage was down slightly to 29.59. At the end of 1950—11 months ago—deposits had risen by a little over \$10,000,000,000 over the previous year-end, and stood at \$155,265,000,000. Loans, however, increased \$9,400,000,000 to a total of \$52,249,000,000 and the percentage of loans to deposits stood at 35.99. As of midyear 1951 (June 27), at which time 14,107 commercial banks reported, deposits had eased off seasonally to \$150,280,000,000, but loans had increased to \$55,040,000,000, lifting the percentage of loans to deposits to 36.62.

I think it would be interesting to you to see what has happened since 1939, and to see what a great "shot in the arm" the business structure has had as reflected in both deposits and loans. On December 30, 1939, deposits in all commercial banks over the country stood at \$59,718,000,000, and loans amounted to \$17,238,000,000. That was a percentage of loans to deposits of just under 30. On June 27, 1951, these same commercial banks (the number had changed slightly) held deposits of \$150,280,000,000, which is an increase of 151.47 percent. But loans rose at even a higher rate, increasing from \$17,238,000,000 to \$55,040,000,000, or percentage-wise, up 219.29.

I might point out here that loans of commercial banks have expanded substantially since the war started in Korea, the increase being almost \$10,000,000,000. Most of the expansion took place in the 9-month period ending March 1951. There has been only a small increase since that time. It therefore looks as though the action of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, plus the general caution on the part of lenders in adhering to the voluntary credit restraint program, have put brakes on such inflation as would be inevitable from unbridled bank lending. Again let me repeat that, compared to like periods, the expansion of commercial loans since March has been less than half that of 1950.

Borrowing by business keeps climbing, but at a more restrained rate than at this time a year ago. Bank credit has not been used as freely this summer as last. This point was made by Oliver S. Powell, Governor of the Federal Reserve System, who is in charge of the voluntary credit restraint program. Mr. Powell quoted some figures which seem quite significant to me, and I share them with you now. He said that between June 28, 1950, and September 27, 1950, business loans increased \$2,123,000,000, but that in the corresponding weeks this year the increase was only \$858,000,000, which is only about 40 percent as much. It would seem reasonable to credit the voluntary credit restraint program with a good deal of the accomplishment cited. I believe there should be no let-up in this program.

It was unfortunate, I think, that the Congress allowed some weakening of regulations W and X, and I feel we should, as bankers, caution against any further weakening. We must continue to screen new credit applications, and we should see to it that borrowers pay back the money when it has served the purpose for which borrowed.

There may be a tendency, because of the present excess-profits tax, to borrow more freely—more than is customary—for the sake of creating a larger excess-profits tax base. In that case, one of the incentives for paying back a bank loan is completely removed. A part of our job is to encourage customers to borrow in the spirit of the voluntary credit restraint program.

We must all agree that from a national and a world standpoint, much has happened since 1939. We had a world war, then a synthetic peace for a few years, and now we have the beginning of what eventually may be a third world war. I refer to the Korean incident, which, however, is considerably advanced from the beginning, since up to the end of November we had been fighting the Communists 523 days.

The Government debt has risen from \$40,439,000,000 at December 31, 1939, to \$256,677,000,000 (as of the end of August 1951). The pumping of all this money into the blood stream of business accounts for the changes I have cited, plus many others—rise in deposits (of \$102,758,000,000),¹ the rise in loans, our higher prices, higher wages, and inflation. And unfortunately the end is not yet in sight.

If Treasury estimates can be relied upon, we shall have a \$7,500,000,000 deficit the current fiscal year. The national debt will therefore be some billions higher next June 30, which is the end of the fiscal year. Pumping more money into the already badly inflated balloon will raise wages and prices still higher, thus adding to our present ills. Loans, as has already been shown, follow a sympathetic trend.

The banking system still has some margin to spare when it is loaned only to a level of 36.62 percent. But if the rise should continue at the same rate for another 5 years trouble will follow, to the detriment of our entire financial structure. (Five-year story—deposits up from 155 to 170 or 10 percent. Loans up from 35.6 to 63.7 or 80 percent.)

Based upon all the facts of the moment, and what one can foresee, the conclusion seems reasonable that there will be ample opportunity in 1952 for commercial banks to lend all the money they wish to lend. Defense expenditures will undoubtedly be accelerated from here on out, or as long as need remains for this increased rate of production. Production against Government orders should offset the reduced output of consumer goods.

The National City Bank's letter for November has this to say:

"The business news still indicates an approximate state of balance between inflationary and deflationary forces, with little to suggest that either will take full charge of the situation in the early future. On the one hand, record-breaking expenditures for plant and equipment and growing outlays for defense sustain employment and keep up the flow of purchasing power. The slow rise of personal incomes, augmented by wage increases, has continued. In the aggregate, demand for goods has been strong enough to hold prices firm; the official wholesale price index rose in 4 weeks out of the 5 ended October 23, for a net advance of four-tenths of 1 percent.

"Looking further ahead, the inflationary dangers that lie in growing Treasury expenditures and prospective deficits, together with new increases in wage rates and industrial costs, are emphasized in almost every analysis of the economic situation. On the other hand sensitive commodities show irregularity and there is a good deal of bearish sentiment, which argues against the development of a broad upward price movement at this time."

¹ All banks, June 27, 1951, \$170,900,000,000; all banks, December 30, 1939, \$68,242,000,000; increase, \$102,758,000,000.

A year ago at this time buyers were scrambling for goods of all kinds. Inventories skyrocketed, loans likewise, but an inventory scare set in early this year and distributors and processors of consumer goods earnestly went to work to reduce inventories. The process is still going on. A scanning of the newspapers across the country indicates that forced sales are being held everywhere in the interest of reducing inventories and it is doubtful whether a resurgence of inventory buying will occur reasonably soon.

A savings psychology came to the people, and over the past 8 months they have saved a greater share of their incomes than ever before in peacetime and have steadily been adding to their liquid assets. People have money. There are more persons employed and at higher wage rates than ever before in our history, and this makes for a buying potential of great volume. When buying psychology comes again, and it may if the cease-fire is accomplished in Korea, as an illustration, we might see another tremendous boom in business. A cease-fire might slow down some of the defense expenditures and prolong it for a longer period of time. While in the National City Bank's trend of thought, I should like to add this further quotation from its November letter:

"Production increases will add to purchasing power, and thus potentially to demand, as well as to supply. In theory, they cannot solve the problem of inflation, which is the pressure of too much money, too much spending, and too little saving, irrespective of the level of output. Actually, however, the behavior of people during the past 6 months appears to show that well-supplied markets, free from fears of shortages, together with enjoyment of a high standard of living, encourage the natural instinct to save which is precisely what the situation demands."

As Walter Heimann will tell you in his talk, the tax situation is one for banks to conjure with. I shall not trespass upon his theme other than to say that the commercial bankers of the country should find considerable opportunity to lend money to business over the next year, for essential production, for inventory, and for accounts receivable; but they should be extremely careful, it seems to me, on capital loans, because tax gatherers will not leave enough margin of the earnings in the business to repay loans made for capital purposes. An exception to the capital-loans program can be made in the case of regulation V loans for defense production. Quite a few banks have availed themselves of that program, and as defense production is stepped up in the months ahead, probably more of those loans will be made. They can be made safely.

Following through on the ordinary capital loan, not too many years ago bankers could estimate that around 87 percent of a corporation's earnings were available for payment of debt, for dividends, and for plant expansion. At that time the income-tax rate was 13 percent. Today it is quite a different story. The normal tax rate is now 52 percent, and all but 15 States in the Union have an excise tax in addition. In my State of Oregon the excise rate is 8 percent—highest of all the States. The next highest is Georgia, with 7 percent; Minnesota, Mississippi, and North Carolina, come along with 6 percent; Wisconsin, North Dakota, and Kentucky each have a graduated tax which reaches a maximum of 6 percent; in New York the tax is 5½ percent; in Colorado, 5 percent; and so on, 33 of the States exacting a tax in some amount.

With the Federal income tax and the State excise tax, we in Oregon must pay out 60 percent of earnings, leaving only 40 cents of each earned dollar to the owners of the business. Then, if by chance the corporation is in the excess-profits-tax bracket, it really hurts. We must therefore think in

terms of a different kind of dollar which our borrowers will have to work with. We have, in fact, two kinds of dollars. First, is the 48-cent dollar, decreased by whatever State excise tax is applicable; and then—this is the extreme case—we in Oregon have the 27.4-cent dollar. The latter is what will be left after paying an excess profits tax. There is not a lot of margin left for the businessman or taxpayer to play with, and so caution in making loans of a slow or capital nature is in order, certainly for the next few years.

There is one last thought I wish to leave with you concerning taxes. I trust it will bring a ray of hope. You know we have had three increases in taxes since hostilities broke out in Korea. In World War I we taxed 32 percent of the cost of Government, and went into debt 68 percent. We passed the latter on to posterity. In World War II we taxed 46 percent, borrowed 54 percent. We have been more realistic lately, and up until the beginning of the fiscal year 1951-52, we were on a pay-as-you-go basis. We taxed for 100 percent of the cost of Government. This year it is different: we are running up a deficit of undetermined amount—some say \$7,500,000,000. Whatever the deficit, it will add to our already swollen total debt. The latest tax bill, signed 2 months ago, was for a 2-year period only, and there is some hope that affairs of Government can be so conducted that this latest revenue act increase can expire by limitation on January 1, 1954. We as bankers and financial advisers should plan to hew to that line and help bring it to pass. If we do, and if we are fortunate enough to have a lessening of war threats around the world, defense expenditures might drop. In that case, a drop in taxes could very well be the order of the day.

Joseph Stagg Lawrence, writing in the Empire Trust Co.'s financial letter, unequivocally stated that "the battle lines are not on the bloody ridges of Korea, but are on the banks of the Potomac." The real fight in America is a battle over the integrity of our dollar. We must entrench ourselves against any further erosion in the value of our currency. We must erect dikes against further inflation. We must insist through our congressional delegations that all unnecessary expenditures be eliminated. Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, says "we can cut out \$11,000,000,000 without hurting anything." The CED and the NAM each say we can cut out \$6,000,000,000. The right amount is probably somewhere in between. These vital savings are possible, as Senator BYRD points out, without detriment either to the defense program or to essential Government. As a first step we should work for that achievement.

Another contribution we can make is to pay our taxes, unpalatable as taxes are, in order to say as close as possible to a pay-as-you-go basis. It is to the credit of our Government that Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder was able to point out last spring that the Treasury had taken in \$7,500,000,000 more in the past 5 years than it had spent. That is all to the good, provided the money is wisely spent. I have my re-ervations about the spending. Finally, we must encourage thrift through systematic saving, in banks, through life insurance, or in United States savings bonds. Such a program will sop up potential inflationary dollars which, if spent for scarce goods, would raise Cain with our economic situation.

It is interesting to note that there are still in the hands of our people practically as many savings bonds of the E, F, and G variety as there are time deposits in every bank in the United States, including postal savings. At the end of June there were outstanding bonds of the three varieties to the amount of \$57,572,000,000. Time deposits in all the banks of the country are shown by

the Federal Reserve bank's bulletin to amount to \$57,210,000,000 as of that same date. In my State of Oregon we have \$468,000,000 of savings bonds in the hands of the people. That is about \$10,000,000 more than the savings in all the banks and savings and loan associations in the entire State. This is a fine substantial backlog of future security and credit for the people.

Two final thoughts I wish to leave with you and then I am through.

When discussing commercial loans, it seems to me the banks of the country should give consideration to greater diversification in their own portfolios, so as to embrace both wholesale banking and retail banking. By retail banking, I mean the handling of installment paper originating from the sale of goods to customers, whether they be hard goods, like automobiles, refrigerators, furniture, and the like, or soft goods, which are being financed on time. The paper is in existence, but many of the banks lend intermediary concerns at low rates and let them go out and handle the paper of their own customers at more profitable rates. I am a believer in a bank being "a department store of finance," so that the bank's customers, whether they be large or small, can find funds for their every financial need. It matters not whether the money is needed for purchasing a supply of logs, lumber, grain, steel, or other merchandise for resale, or for constructing and furnishing of a home. If we all adopt that attitude, we can do it profitably and at the same time gain invaluable customer good will, which is the basis of all successful banking.

"Thar's gold in them thar hills," as the old California prospector said. Let's dig it out. It really is worth while.

"Hats off to the past. Coats off to the future."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE CLOTURE RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I wish to say a word or two before introducing some other material into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on some other points.

I note that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has recommended an amendment of the cloture rule, the effect of which, if adopted, would be to restore the voting requirement which was in effect from 1917 to 1949.

Mr. President, the function of a cloture rule, as the word "cloture" indicates, is to close debate after a subject has been fully elucidated and after there has been time to get the public reaction. Past experience affords a pragmatic test of the effectiveness of voting requirements in the performance of this function. Twenty-one attempts have been made to invoke cloture in the Senate since paragraph 2 of rule XXII was first adopted in 1917. Only four of those attempts succeeded. Cloture was first successfully invoked in the Senate in 1927. If the rule had required 64 votes, a constitutional two-thirds, to close debate, it would have been effective three out of 21 times since 1917. This has been the voting requirement since 1949, as we who serve in the Senate know.

If the rule had required 49 votes, a constitutional majority, to close debate, it would have been effective 9 out of 21 times since 1917.

If the rule had required a simple majority to close debate, it would have been effective 14 out of 21 times since 1917.

Thus, Mr. President, I submit that the plain lesson of history is that the most effective cloture rule is one requiring the affirmative votes of a simple majority of those present to bring debate to a close. The average attendance in the Senate on cloture votes since 1917 has been 84, of which a simple majority is 43 and a simple two-thirds is 56.

Mr. President, I make these statements today—I thought it was as good a day as any to do so—because at each session of the Senate now for some years I have made my record on the majority-rule principle in regard to limiting debate in the Senate. I have no illusions about the possibility of success at this session of the Senate. Yet, I suppose that at each session some Member of the Senate at least should rise, as I do today, to point out what I think is a very obvious fact; namely, that without a majority cloture rule, the Senate is controlled by a minority. There is no way to escape that conclusion; it is a fact.

That raises a question of public policy. The people of the United States should, and I hope will, take an interest in that public policy. There are available to us adequate safeguards for protecting minority rights in the Senate and at the same time having a majority vote cloture rule.

At the appropriate time, when the Committee on Rules and Administration makes its report to the Senate and when the recommendation of that committee is before the Senate for vote, I shall offer my usual amendment for a majority cloture rule, an amendment which will protect the minority by providing that after cloture each Member of the Senate shall have at least 1 hour to discuss the merits of any issue, and the right to farm out all or a part of his time, which certainly gives ample time for debate on the merits and gives ample time for the Senate to hear from the country, but, consistent with what I think is one of the most fundamental principles of our democratic form of government, namely, guaranties that the will of the people will be protected through a majority vote rule in the Senate, rather than frustrated and defeated by a minority bloc in the Senate.

Mr. President, I have found it simply impossible to discover any logic in the proposition that in a parliamentary body under our representative Government there is any justification for continuing a principle of minority rule in the legislative body of the people, which I always thought at least was supposed to implement majority will.

SENATOR HAYDEN'S REASONS FOR SUPPORTING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no other Member of this body is so successful in keeping his light under a bushel as is the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. By great good fortune, I have found a letter on the subject of universal military training which the Senator from Arizona has written to a constituent, and in which he explains his support of that proposed legislation.

It will be recalled that the Senator from Arizona served as a major of in-

fantry in World War I, and is thoroughly familiar with military matters.

In the letter to his constituent, the Senator from Arizona develops a somewhat new approach to the problem which concerns the Congress and the country in dealing with universal military training. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

SENATOR HAYDEN SETS FORTH REASONS FOR UMT SUPPORT

All men are born to die but we live in a land where many men, from the Revolution to this day, have been perfectly willing to give up their lives ahead of time to make the Nation free and to keep it free. That very freedom has made it possible to create such favorable living conditions that the average American can now expect to live 20 years longer than his ancestors of only three generations ago. It is not unreasonable to require a young man to devote up to 2 of the early part of those added 20 years to performing a duty to his country which is designed to maintain peace and to insure that his American way of life will be preserved.

As a Member of Congress, I favored the adoption of universal military training after the First World War. If that had been done it might well have prevented World War II because the captured German records show that Hitler did not believe that the United States could get ready to fight until he had conquered all of Europe after which it would be impossible for us to defeat him. Fortunately, Great Britain did not surrender which gave us the 2 years time that was needed to build up our armed strength.

As I see it, the primary purpose of a system of universal military training and service is the defense of our own country against Communist aggression. We all now know that the quick demobilization of our Armed Forces at the close of hostilities in 1945 was a serious mistake. That was not done in Soviet Russia or in any of the satellite nations. The Politburo not only set up a Communist government in North Korea but supplied that government with equipment and munitions for a powerful army and a large number of Korean veterans were taken out of the Soviet armies to become the backbone of the surprise attack on South Korea.

I do not agree that service in the Armed Forces of the United States, at a time when resistance to the active threat of Communist control of the entire world is essential, is an evil to be avoided. Upon the contrary, I am firmly convinced that the great majority of the millions of Americans who are veterans of the First and Second World Wars gained more than they lost by their military service and are today better citizens because of it.

On the moral side, if a young man does not know the difference between right and wrong by the time he is 18, the fault lies either with his parents or his church. The temptations which surround youth are just as great in the civilian life of most towns as in the Armed Forces and even greater because the discipline acquired by prompt obedience to lawful orders strengthens a man's will to do what he should do and do it promptly.

There is no way of preserving a democracy except upon the basic principle that every individual participating in it owes a duty to defend it according to the best of his ability. Consequently, it is entirely proper to require those who are the most capable of performing military service to learn how to do so in an efficient manner which includes the best means of protecting their own lives in battle.

ANOTHER PLANE CRASH AT ELIZABETH, N. J.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am sure that by this time the entire membership of the Senate of the United States is aware that tragedy has again raised its ghastly head in the city of Elizabeth.

This morning, at 12:20, a DC-6 National Airlines plane, with 59 passengers and 4 crew members aboard, took off on a scheduled flight for Florida from the Newark Airport.

Some 3 minutes later, the plane ripped into a 60-family apartment house, turning it into a funeral pyre for an as yet undetermined number of residents.

This is the third catastrophe of this character in the same general area within a period of 2 months.

Obviously, Mr. President, there is an important mission ahead for the Congress. Just what our role will be, it is difficult to predict at this moment. However, we in the Senate can congratulate ourselves that the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado] and his very efficient staff, are already exploring all phases of these recent tragedies, not only to ascertain our responsibilities as Members of the Congress, but also to find the physical means to reduce the hazards which so seriously jeopardize so many people everywhere throughout the country as a result of the ever-increasing traffic in the air.

Mr. President, immediately following the shocking crash this morning, the Port of New York Authority issued an order closing the airport indefinitely. I am sure that my colleagues of the Senate join me as I commend the Port of New York Authority for this courageous course of action.

I hasten to add that the Port of New York Authority held a conference at ten o'clock this morning for the purpose of establishing facilities at other airports to handle the Newark Airport traffic.

And now, Mr. President, in order that the public may know the great concern of the Senate in respect to this latest tragedy, as well as those which preceded it, I should like to read into the RECORD a communication which was addressed to both Senators from New Jersey early this morning. It speaks more eloquently on the subject of Senator JOHNSON's vigilance and his expeditious treatment of an urgent need than any words which I could marshal.

I again commend him, and I know in this commendation my able and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey, joins wholeheartedly.

Before reading the letter, Mr. President, I also want to say that I have discussed this matter by telephone with Senator SMITH this morning, and not only does he join in the sentiments which I have expressed here, but I know he stands ready to join the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress to bring to an end this shocking, nerve-shattering and needless loss of life.

I now desire to read into the RECORD the letter from the Senator from Colo-

rado. It came to my office very early this morning. Said he to the Senators from New Jersey:

FEBRUARY 11, 1952.

This is a preliminary report of the latest airplane crash at Elizabeth. The Commerce Committee's staff is on the ground to ascertain causes. Investigators for the CAB and the CAA were in a hotel at Elizabeth at the time of the crash and were at the scene of the crash 25 minutes after it occurred. They have been working all night.

After taking off, the pilot reported that one engine had failed and asked permission to swing around and land. He was told to land on any strip he could reach. The stewardess is alive and was not shaken up sufficiently to cause her to go to a hospital. She says two engines failed, but an examination of the engines does not bear out her report. The plane was 2,600 pounds under the allowable weight. It carried 59 passengers and 4 crew members, and suffered 29 fatalities. Four or five, and possibly six, persons were killed on the ground. The port authorities closed the airport at 3 a. m. At the time there were 60 airplanes preparing to depart. They were given permission to do so. All have gone except perhaps 10 or 12; 5 or 6 will depart this a. m. The balance are receiving minor repairs at the airport.

The port authority is holding a conference at 10 a. m. today to set up facilities at other airports to handle the Newark Airport traffic.

E. C. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign
Commerce Committee.

Mr. President, I think it is very commendable to have a man of the experience of the Senator from Colorado ready and willing immediately to undertake the responsibilities which lie in the hands of his able committee. I again commend him.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

STATEHOOD

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today, as on 29 occasions in the past, the Senate is concerned with a bill to enable another Territory to join the Union as a free and equal partner.

Although there is at this moment only one bill pending before the Senate, we have as a matter of fact two pending bills. One is for the admission of Alaska. The other is for the admission of Hawaii. Both these Territories aspire to statehood. Both deserve statehood. Both should be granted statehood.

In the past, throughout our history, three simple tests have been put to each aspiring Territory, to determine at once its ability and its desire to enter into this irrevocable contract. These tests, historically shown to be effective, are, first, that the Territory has attained a sufficiently large population to support statehood; second, that that population is imbued with, and is wholeheartedly in support of, democracy and the American form of Government; and third, that the people of the Territory in question actually desire statehood.

Mr. President, today, in regard to Alaska and Hawaii, the ability of these two Territories to satisfy the requirements I have just listed is not even questioned. Measured against each and all of these standards both Territories prove

themselves to be eminently qualified for statehood.

In regard to Hawaii, which has a somewhat longer record as an applicant for statehood, there have been over the past 16 years hearings and deliberations by nine separate committees of Congress. Each committee on each occasion, after hearings and subsequent deliberation, found Hawaii fully qualified for statehood.

But it is clear today, Mr. President, that after admitting 29 new Territories and six other communities as new States to our Union—Maine, Vermont, Kentucky, West Virginia, Texas, California—we are now embarking on a new course. We are saying that the tests applied in the past are not enough. Some Members of the Senate have put forward new tests, other methods of deciding whether to admit new States to our Union.

What are these new tests, Mr. President, and how do Alaska and Hawaii qualify in regard to them?

From the remarks of certain of my colleagues, I assume that in order for a Territory to become a State today, it must not only pass the three requirements I have already mentioned, but must also prove what direct benefits the rest of us can receive by allowing the entrance of a new State.

While I believe that admitting Alaska and Hawaii to the Union as free and equal partners will be of great benefit to every citizen of this Nation, still I feel that an important breaking with tradition is involved in this fourth new test. I think this new test is an unwise criterion which denies the expanding nature of our country and the concept of the goodness of growth.

Mr. President, when our Constitution was written, 165 years ago, it was hailed as a great document, a document conceived and dedicated to a truly democratic way of life. While some of the ideas contained in our Constitution were relatively new in the history of government, it was conceded then, and now, that many of the basic principles of that Constitution were taken from the then revolutionary ideals of the French, as well as from the basic concepts of government as formulated by the British. The American plan was, for the most part, a refinement of these ideas and principles—a refinement which has proved its value throughout the years.

But while there was much in that document which was recognizable—much which came from these two, and other sources there were other points that were new—new ideas, new principles, new and untested values in the history of government and politics.

Such was the principle as laid down by article IV, section 3, which states:

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.

This sentence, Mr. President, written at a time when the Dutch, the French, the Spanish, the Portuguese, and the British had thoroughly indoctrinated the world with their ideas of colonialism—this sentence expressed a completely new and dynamic doctrine. The founders of our Constitution had come through the experience of colonial status. They had

felt the stings and humiliations of government without the consent of the governed, of taxation without representation, of the navigation acts. They recognized too well the unfairness of that type of relationship, and recognizing it, they were determined themselves never to be a party to colonialism in any form.

Discarding colonialism and all of its ills, our founding fathers launched this new approach to the problem of national growth—an approach based on the concept of an ever-growing union of free and equal States. This concept stipulated complete equality in the Federal Union between all States, whether one of the original 13 or one of those admitted later on.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this one constitutional phrase, "new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union," has been one of the very touchstones of the greatness we have achieved. And, as a basic principle of American life, it has been followed and adhered to through all the years of our brilliant history.

When Louisiana was purchased from the French, there was never a thought that it should remain a colony to be paternalized and ruled from Washington or from the neighboring States. That possibility was not even contemplated. The Louisiana territory was instead immediately carved into separate territories, as was the Northwest Territory before, each with its own degree of local government, and each preparing for the eventual day when it would join the Union. When Florida was purchased, it was with the same idea. When the Mexican lands were ceded, when the Californians asked admittance, when the Oregon territory was settled, and finally when the great expanse of Indian country in our western plains and mountains was settled—in each of these cases, territoriality was only a step toward ultimate statehood. So ruled our Supreme Court, and so ruled the Congresses preceding ours which voted these territories equal partnership in the Union.

Each of these territories, Mr. President, presented varied problems—problems that were overcome either before or following admittance. The Louisiana territory was populated by French, Spanish, and Indians, all of whom were thought to be strange and alien in 1820. New Mexico and Arizona were, in great measure, Spanish-speaking communities. Oklahoma was Indian territory, and Michigan, in 1837, wanted a piece of Ohio before entering the Union. While these and other arguments were vigorously put forward, the argument that expansion should cease, that no more States should be admitted, was never even presented as a major point. Of course, there were some complacent citizens who felt that 26 States would be sufficient, and later that 38 were all that were needed, or that 42 States would be our ultimate destiny. But these arguments were never allowed to prevail. Had they been accepted, we might today be a nation of 20 small States along this eastern seaboard, with other nations bordering us to the west.

The growth of the United States in 165 years to its present-day position of leadership in the family of nations has been the fastest growth in the history of the world. Not through conquest or greed; not through subjugation of peoples. It was a growth predicted and directed by the founders of this Nation—predicted by their hopes and aspirations and directed by that one small phrase they wrote into our Constitution.

In the light of this growth to greatness, and with the experience of history to bear them out, it does not seem possible to me that this Congress can, in all sincerity, finally close down the barrier which our founding fathers left open.

But, Mr. President, if we should deny statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, we would do exactly that. We would be serving notice to our own people and to all the world that we are closing the doors on the expansion of America as a growing union of free and equal States.

Back in 1898 the Hawaiian Islands requested annexation and were satisfied with our decision, at that time, to incorporate those islands and their people as an organized Territory and thus as an integral part of our Nation.

Hawaii was satisfied 54 years ago because becoming a Territory had always meant in the past an irrevocable step toward statehood.

Obviously the people of Hawaii and the people of Alaska want statehood. They know statehood will benefit them.

But now some of the Members of the Senate are asking, "is it going to benefit the rest of the Nation? How is it going to help the rest of us?"

I do not know whether these questions are fair, but they certainly can be answered. It is going to benefit us the same way it benefited the Nation when Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, and the other States were admitted to the Union. It is going to benefit the rest of us through the continued growth of our Union in a continued affirmation by the American people of their intention to abjure colonialism. However, today there are new reasons, which were not particularly important in the last century and in the early part of the present one in regard to the admission of new States.

Today what the Congress does interests and affects not only the United States of America but the entire world.

With tyranny and totalitarianism rampant in the world, the peoples of the world, both free and enslaved, look to America, as never before, as the hope and the inspiration of free and democratic life. And so our actions today, in regard to admitting Alaska and Hawaii into our Union as free and equal partners, is of importance not only to ourselves, not only to the citizens of Alaska and Hawaii, but also to the peoples of the world.

Today our sons, including many of the sons of our fellow citizens in Alaska and Hawaii, are fighting against the world menace in Korea. They fight for the right of self-government, for the right of government with the consent of the

governed. With that in mind, can we seriously and logically continue that fight in Korea, while here denying that same right to hundreds of thousands of our own people in integral parts of our Nation?

Can we go to the world espousing this cause with our arms and with our young men, when in the same breath we deny this same privilege to Alaska and Hawaii—where self-government could be granted without bloodshed? Mr. President, it would seem a strange paradox for America, and for the American people, to fight with all our resources for a cause in Korea and at the same time oppose that same cause in America.

The luxury of such paradoxical situations is one we can no longer afford.

Mr. President, we in America have long thought ourselves a showcase of democratic living, where the people of the rest of the world could see how man can be benefited by this form of government. For many years, we on the eastern seaboard especially, have entertained our visitors from Europe, shown them our homes, our factories, our schools, and our way of life.

Since the city of New York in my State is the port of entry most often used by these people, we have become the part of America which the visitor from the east usually sees first and from which he gets his first, and often, his lasting impression.

In the very same manner, Hawaii, or Territory astride the sea and air lanes of the Pacific, is the first taste, the first impression of America gained by visitors from Australia, Japan, Korea, China, and the other Asiatic nations. As many of my colleagues know, it is hard indeed to miss Hawaii, when traveling from the west coast to any nation of the Pacific.

And so, just as the eastern seaboard is America's showcase of democracy to the world of Europe, so Hawaii is the fairground of American democracy in the Pacific.

We are, in a very few weeks, to begin discussions on a treaty with the Japanese—a treaty of friendship, rather than of conquest. We are embarked on a Pacific policy to gain the respect and friendship of all the peoples bordering the Pacific.

In order to gain that friendship and that respect, and in order to show our good faith to these peoples, it is necessary for our Nation to prove its principles by deeds. A testing ground for those principles is in Alaska and Hawaii.

I have spoken of Hawaii as being the fairground of American democracy in the Pacific. In the same way and with equal force Alaska is the fairground of American democracy in the North Pacific and in the Arctic Sea. Just across the Bering Strait from Alaska lies the great Siberian land mass. On clear days people living under Soviet domination can see with the naked eye the shores where the American flag flies.

Is it not to our high credit and advantage to have in Alaska, just across from Siberia, just a few miles from the territory of the Soviet Union, a state of

the American Union, representative in every form and practice of the best traditions of American democracy?

I think that the granting of statehood to Alaska would be a ten-strike in the contest for freedom the world over. Once upon a time Alaska was Russian territory. Now it can be an equal State in the American Union of States. That is a goal which we dare not deny.

Statehood at this time would be a strong indication of our sincere intentions in the Pacific, intentions to be without prejudice, and intentions to abjure colonialism in all its forms.

Mr. President, the issue of statehood for Hawaii has been brought before the Congress each year since 1903. Each year it has been shunted aside for consideration of other business. Each year it has gained some ground, but never has it been brought to a vote by this body.

I believe that it is imperative that without delay the Congress vote admittance to Hawaii and also to Alaska.

I would urge this legislation if there were no other reason than the display to the world of our belief in self government.

I would urge this legislation if it were only a matter of granting justice to the half million American citizens who live in these Territories.

But beyond these reasons, as I have said today, the future of our Nation is involved. Our future as an ever-expanding democracy of free and equal partners, the future that was foreseen by our founding fathers, the future that each succeeding generation has fought for—to my mind, that future is at stake. By rejecting the ideas of colonialism, by embracing the constitutional provision assuring free and equal treatment of all who are tendered admittance, our Nation has grown and prospered to its present greatness. Discarding that principle today, or even putting off a decision on it, may have a serious effect on our future growth and security.

Mr. President, I hope with all my heart that the Senate of the United States will vote to admit to the Union as States both Alaska and Hawaii.

DICTATORSHIP IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on last Wednesday the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] stated on the floor of the Senate that "an increasing number of Senators are becoming concerned" with allegations of dictatorship which have been leveled against Governor Muñoz-Marín and his administration in Puerto Rico.

I certainly can be counted among those Senators who are so concerned, and I concur in the opinion of the Senator from Maine that a full investigation should be made by a committee of the Senate.

In this connection, I invite the attention of the Senators to an instance whereby the Interior Department has nurtured an atmosphere in Puerto Rico in which dictatorship can flourish.

On July 26, 1947, the Senate of the United States passed H. R. 3309, amend-

ing the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, which was signed by the President and became the law on August 5, 1947.

Section 49b of that act reads as follows:

Sec. 49b. (1) There shall be an administrative officer whose official title shall be the Coordinator of Federal Agencies in Puerto Rico, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and who shall hold office at the pleasure of the President for the purpose of coordinating the administration of all Federal civilian functions and activities in Puerto Rico. He shall receive as compensation for his services an annual salary of \$7,500.

(2) The Coordinator of Federal Agencies shall coordinate the administration of all Federal civilian functions and activities in Puerto Rico. The administrative heads of all Federal civilian agencies in Puerto Rico shall make such reports to the Coordinator of Federal Agencies as he shall require and he shall through the Secretary of the Interior make recommendations to the heads of such agencies with respect to their personnel, functions, and activities in Puerto Rico. The President may, however, by Executive order exempt any Federal agency from making such reports to the Coordinator of Federal Agencies. The Coordinator of Federal Agencies shall make recommendations for the better coordination of the Federal civilian functions and activities and may make recommendations for the elimination or reduction of those which duplicate or conflict with each other or with activities carried on by the government of Puerto Rico. He shall report through the Secretary of the Interior to the President and to Congress concerning the administration of all Federal civilian functions and activities in Puerto Rico, specifying the recommendations made by him to the Federal agencies and the results of such recommendations. He shall advise the Secretary of the Interior, who shall advise the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress with respect to all appropriation estimates submitted by any civilian department or agency of the Federal Government to be expended in or for the benefit of Puerto Rico. He shall confer with the Governor of Puerto Rico with respect to the correlation of activities of Federal and insular agencies and all plans and programs and other matters of mutual interest.

(3) The President of the United States may, from time to time, after hearing, promulgate executive orders expressly excepting Puerto Rico from the application of any Federal law, not expressly declared by Congress to be applicable to Puerto Rico, which as contemplated by section 9 of this act is inapplicable by reason of local conditions. The Coordinator of Federal Agencies may, from time to time, make recommendations to the President for such purpose. Any such recommendation shall show the concurrence or dissent of the Governor of Puerto Rico.

(4) The Coordinator of Federal Agencies, in the name of the President of the United States, shall have authority to request from the Governor of Puerto Rico, and the Governor shall furnish to him all such reports pertaining to the affairs, conditions and government of Puerto Rico as the Coordinator of Federal agencies shall from time to time request, for transmission to the President through the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) The President of the United States shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Now, Mr. President, I draw attention to the fact that the Interior Department has never acted to carry out the provisions of the act which I have just quoted.

No Coordinator of Federal Agencies in Puerto Rico has been named, although the law requires that this be done. This law was enacted nearly 5 years ago.

Let me point out that we pour millions of the taxpayers' dollars into Puerto Rico annually, while not 1 penny of tax revenue is returned to the United States Treasury. It is for this reason, above all others, Mr. President, that it behooves us to see that the Government of Puerto Rico operates efficiently, honestly, and in all other respects properly. Can we be certain in these vital questions when our own law is flouted and ignored in such a way as to obscure the operations of the Puerto Rican government and the many Federal agencies in Puerto Rico?

Why, Mr. President, has the Interior Department chosen to neglect this matter? Is it an oversight? Or is it the design of the Interior Department to ignore a law passed by the Congress?

Mr. President, it is my understanding that there has been no compliance with this law because the present Puerto Rican administration did not want compliance. This administration told the Interior Department that they wanted no interference from a coordinator, and the Interior Department, without consulting Congress, did their bidding and ignored a statute which is a part of the body of laws of our great Nation.

Mr. President, if that be true, why did this present Puerto Rican administration not want a coordinator appointed as had been provided for by law? The answer to that question is simple.

They do not want a Federal coordinator who will know what goes on, who is bound by law, for example, "to advise * * * the Congress with respect to all appropriation estimates submitted by any civil department or agency of the Federal Government to be expended in or for the benefit of Puerto Rico."

Mr. President, dictatorships the world over thrive on vagueness. They never want to make reports, to itemize budgets, to submit to examinations and investigations of their operations and the conditions which exist as a result of their operations.

Mr. President, I have today sent the following letter to the Interior Department in this matter:

HON. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Interior Department has never complied with the provisions of Public Law 362, section 49b (Eightieth Congress) which directs that an administrative officer whose official title shall be Coordinator of Federal Agencies in Puerto Rico shall be appointed by the President, and so forth.

Inasmuch as the Interior Department is charged with primary responsibility in connection with the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, I am sure the President would depend on the Department to recommend a nominee for the post of coordinator.

Would you be good enough to advise me as to why this law has been ignored, as it seems to have been, and what are the intentions of the Department in this matter?

Sincerely,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, the answer to this letter should be enlightening and I shall be glad to insert it in the RECORD when I receive it.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 347)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For the President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, pp. 963-966.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in keeping with the message which has just been received from the President of the United States, I introduce for appropriate reference the bill which I send to the desk.

The bill (S. 2645) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I merely wish to say that the committee will hold hearings on the bill which has been sent to us today by the administration, and the hearings will be held at the same time that the committee holds hearings on the bill introduced last week by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, I agree with some of the things recommended by the President, and I do not agree with others. I hope that the Senator who now is serving as Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. FREAR], who also is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, will agree with some of the President's recommendations, although I realize that he may not agree with all of them.

The committee, nevertheless, will give most careful and serious consideration to all the recommendations.

I am glad the President has sent us the message, since a number of Senators have indicated they wished to submit amendments to the bill I have previously introduced.

Now that the President has sent the message to us and now that we have the administration bill, as well as the committee's bill of last year, I think the committee can expedite the hearings. I am hopeful that after the hearings begin on March 4, it will be possible for a bill on that subject to be reported to the Senate by the committee not later than April 1. I have discussed this with several of the members of the committee and I believe we shall have the cooperation of all toward this end.

I repeat that if any Senator desires to submit amendments either to the administration's bill or to the bill previously introduced and if he wishes to have hearings held by the committee on the amendment, he should notify the committee by March 4. As you know

so very well, it is very difficult to make an accurate and fair appraisal of any amendment when it is offered after hearings are completed and the bill is on the floor.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a summary of the bill.

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

SUMMARY OF BILL TO AMEND AND EXTEND THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED, AND THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED
Priorities and allocations

Section 101 (a) of the bill amends the last sentence of section 101 of the act (the so-called Butler-Hope amendment). That sentence, added by the amendments of 1951, abolished the slaughter-quota program previously conducted by the OPS as part of its compliance and enforcement program, by forbidding any quota or other limitation on the quantity of livestock slaughtered or handled by any processor.

The bill would restore a restricted authority to establish slaughter quotas. Express limitations on the authority are designed to insure that slaughter quotas will not limit total national or area marketings, and that provision must be made permitting non-slaughtering processors and wholesalers in normal channels to obtain their normal share of livestock products.

Section 101 (b) of the bill repeals section 104 of the act (added by the amendments of 1951), which placed an embargo on the importation of certain fats and oils, peanuts, dairy products, rice, and rice products until June 30, 1952, upon a finding by the Secretary of Agriculture that the imports would have any of the following effects—(a) impair or reduce domestic production below present levels or such higher levels as the Secretary may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, (b) interfere with orderly domestic storing and marketing, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditure under any price-support program.

Expansion of productive capacity and supply

Section 102 of the bill amends section 304 (b) of the act by increasing the amount which may be borrowed from the Treasury by Government agencies to finance the procurement, loan, and production assistance activities authorized by title III of the act. To meet the financing requirements of this title, the amendment increases the limit on the amount which may be outstanding at any one time, from the present \$2,100,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000.

Price and wage stabilization

Section 103 (a) of the bill repeals section 402 (d) (4) of the act (the so-called Capehart amendment), which prohibits maintenance of price ceilings below specified minimum levels on nonagricultural commodities; provides for ceilings on manufactured and processed nonagricultural commodities and services (1) based upon the highest price between January 1, 1950, and June 24, 1950, if such ceiling reflects adjustments for increases or decreases in all costs specified in the section, up to July 26, 1951, or (2) established under regulations issued prior to enactment of the paragraph; and requires that upon proper application and showing, any ceiling price must be adjusted in the manner described in (1).

Section 103 (b) of the bill repeals section 402 (k) of the act (the so-called Herlong

amendment), which requires that price ceilings issued after its enactment shall permit sellers of materials at retail or wholesale to obtain their pre-Korean customary percentage margins over cost of the materials.

Control of consumer and real-estate credit

Section 104 (a) of the bill removes from section 601 of the act the paragraph added by the amendments of 1951 which prohibits the Federal Reserve Board in exercising its authority over consumer credit, from requiring down payments in excess of amounts specified in the paragraph, and from requiring maximum maturities shorter than those specified in the paragraph.

Section 104 (b) of the bill removes from section 605 of the act the provision added by the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, which prohibits the President, in exercising control over real-estate credit, from requiring maximum down payments in excess of specified amounts, in connection with home loans made or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. The prior provision, that credit preferences accorded to veterans under existing law be preserved, is not repealed.

Section 104 (c) of the bill repeals section 606 of the act, added by the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, which prohibits the President, in exercising control over real-estate credit from requiring down payments in excess of specified amounts in connection with home loans not made or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, and from requiring a maximum term shorter than 25 years, in connection with any home loan.

Section 105 (a) of the bill extends the power of succession of the Small Defense Plants Administration to June 30, 1954.

Section 105 (b) of the bill extends the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to June 30, 1954.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

Section 201 (a) and section 201 (b) of the bill extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, to June 30, 1954.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Thursday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, February 14, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 11, 1952:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Philip Neville, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota, vice Clarence U. Landrum, retiring.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Charles M. Eldridge, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 22, 1951.

IN THE NAVY

For temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the Navy, Herman P. Riebe, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11, 1952:

POSTMASTERS

HAWAII

Teruhisa Nishiyama, Haleiwa.
Katsue I. Nishiyama, Kunia.

MAINE

Conrad J. Lausier, Danforth.
Alice I. M. Ewing, West Enfield.

MICHIGAN

Harold F. Clark, Morenci.

MINNESOTA

Lester E. Sullivan, Madelia.

MISSISSIPPI

Alonzo A. Vance, Chunky.
Ira L. Moore, West Enterprise.

NEW YORK

Charles F. Fitzgerald, Hague.
John H. Chase, Milford.
Leland F. Griswold, North Chatham.
Catherine V. Paczkowski, Turin.

NORTH DAKOTA

Oscar K. Sovig, Arnegard.

OREGON

Arthur B. Scarseth, Camp White.
Charles W. Garlick, Gladstone.
Vella A. Harlan, McNary.
Russell F. Cooper, Sutherlin.

PENNSYLVANIA

John Albert Vail, Chester Springs.
Mildred G. Spencer, East Springfield.
Beatrice M. Fitzstephens, Genesee.
Vivian C. Geuther, Gwynedd Valley.
Frederick G. McGee, Roslyn.

TENNESSEE

Robert H. McCrary, Waverly.

WISCONSIN

William Schaller, Jr., Barronett.
Donald E. Chape, Bayfield.
John B. Hoffman, Brantwood.
Joseph C. Dinegan, Briggsville.
Clayton B. Hesslink, Cedar Grove.
Joseph D. Robertson, De Soto.
Jennie A. Lane, Fall River.
Earl H. Coder, Franksville.
Fred W. Thoms, Hawthorne.
James R. Morgan, Ladysmith.
Leonard T. Goetz, Manawa.
George F. Rasmussen, Neenah.
Erwin J. Hendrikse, Oostburg.
Herbert W. Johnson, Port Wing.
Jack J. Morgenthaler, Springbrook.
Bertha C. Schippers, Twin Lakes.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all holiness and righteousness, grant that, as we begin this new week, we may be numbered among those who are seeking to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with the Lord.

May every thought of our minds be brought into a glad and willing obedience to the spirit of our Master.

We pray that in these trying times we may be calm in every crisis and steadfast in every strain, placing our confidence in our God whose strength is invincible.

Inspire us to serve our generation according to Thy holy will, and may we have an eye single to Thy glory.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 7, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On January 31, 1952:

H. R. 2662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen;
H. R. 3006. An act for the relief of Antonio Corrao Corp.; and
H. R. 4228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorene M. Williams.

On February 1, 1952:

H. R. 1964. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Bernard R. Novak;

H. R. 2072. An act for the relief of Jeremiah Coleman; and

H. R. 4687. An act to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes.

On February 2, 1952:

H. R. 870. An act for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of O. L. Osteen; and

H. R. 4671. An act for the relief of Mark Paul Crowley.

On February 4, 1952:

H. R. 961. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospera Dunikowski; and

H. R. 2589. An act for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez.

On February 5, 1952:

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of Edward C. Brunett;

H. R. 2505. An act for the relief of Carl Weitlaner;

H. R. 3946. An act for the relief of Master Sgt. Orval Bennett; and

H. R. 4876. An act for the relief of Francesco Fratalla.

On February 6, 1952:

H. R. 4318. An act for the relief of Allen W. Spangler.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 905. An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rozanoff and Mrs. L. A. Ushkova.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AIRPLANE CRASHES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. In there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I know there has been considerable concern, both in the Congress and in the country, over a series of airplane crashes near the Newark Airport in the vicinity of the city of Elizabeth, N. J.

I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in knowing that in connection with this latest crash which occurred in the early hours of this morning a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was on the scene within 30 minutes after the crash occurred. I had a telephone conversation with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] this morning. The subcommittee had returned to Newark to continue the investigation of the accident in which Judge Patterson was killed some few weeks ago and happened to be on the scene when this latest crash occurred. The Members were in conference all night with officials of the CAB, CAA, and Port of New York Authority, and I am sure this subcommittee will bring back to the House as complete a report as it is humanly possible to obtain, and will continue its investigation, not only of this particular crash, but of others.

The residents of the city of Elizabeth, N. J., as well as passengers who travel by air and airline operators, deserve to have this situation fully explored.

THE PLACING OF WAR CONTRACTS IN HIGH-COST AREAS

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

The SPEAKER. In there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Defense Mobilization has issued a policy statement on the placement of defense contracts which will do great damage to our national effort to prepare against Soviet aggression. It will also raise the cost of our military preparation and will subject the whole effort to constant political pressures. It will seriously disrupt the operation of our competitive economic system and, if this policy is permitted to continue, it will destroy our system of free enterprise.

What is this policy? Under the guise of an effort to prevent dislocations in converting from civilian to military production it sets out to give all sorts of reasons why it would be in the national interest to place contracts where the costs are higher rather than where they

are lower. The military budget must be inflated, indeed, if we can afford to throw our money around like that. In fiscal 1952 about \$50,000,000,000 of the total Government purchases of goods and services will be for national security. This will go up to \$66,000,000,000 in fiscal 1953. Even a 10-percent increase over competitive prices could therefore mean a loss of \$5,000,000,000 a year. But under this policy contracts could be placed where the costs are far more than 10 percent higher. The policy carries no limitation except that of OPS ceiling prices where these are applicable. There is no question that certain contracts have to be placed on a negotiated basis or on a cost-plus-fee basis. But, where possible, it has always been the American way to throw Government orders open to competitive bidding. This is the only sure way to bring our productive efficiency to bear on economy of procurement. We have grown great by low-cost production, not by throwing the work to high-cost or inefficient producers.

What are the objections to the new DPA policy?

First, it is unfair to the public which is carrying the tax burden and which has a right to demand that the officials who are spending this money economize as they would if the money were their own. Our national budget is reaching levels where it will take about one-third of our national income. Millions of citizens are paying 20 percent or 30 percent or even 50 percent or more of their income in direct taxes. We have no right to play around with the sacrifices they are making. They willingly contribute these large amounts to the national defense. Shall they be asked to contribute even more so that the procurement agencies shall have a free hand in buying the supplies needed for national defense at higher prices than competition makes available to them? Shall these officials be paid salaries to squander the people's money?

Secondly, the new policy of the DPA is discriminatory and, while it sets out to help some favored communities and firms, it will definitely do harm to workers and communities in sections of the country which will be discriminated against. Their high productivity and low-cost production will be set aside while favored high-cost firms and communities will be given the contracts. The plants of these low-cost producers are in place; their workers are trained; together they produce most efficiently and save the taxpayer even greater burdens. What will happen to these plants in these days of curtailing civilian production if they are deprived of the legitimate defense business on which they are the low bidders? We have had a recession in the textile business. No one knows how long the defense program will last, but we know it will last for some time. Is it fair to destroy efficient productive capacity in the hope that you can help inefficient and high-cost firms to recoup from the public treasury? This policy will create unemployment in areas which are discriminated against.

Third, this policy will inevitably make a political football of our vast de-

fense effort. We have a small amount of unemployment in the Nation as a whole—less than a shifting of 3 percent of the labor force. Most of it is temporary, seasonal or frictional, due to conversion to the manufacture of war items. For short periods, during retooling or while changes in specifications are being made, there might be some unemployment anywhere. This is made up as military production gets under way and schedules are stepped up. Is the established American practice of giving the business to the lowest responsible bidder to be abandoned when some pressure group persuades the procurement agencies that they have a little more temporary unemployment than the area in which the lowest bidder is located? Will defense contracts be handed out like WPA jobs, and in response to political pressures, or will they be handed out cleanly to the lowest responsible bidders? The only sure way to keep politics out of the defense effort and to protect the public is to adhere to the principles of competitive business. Otherwise, every low bid can be ignored to give a favored firm or community the contract upon which it can lay no other claim than political preference.

This new policy of the DPA will apply to all procurement in the defense effort, but it will hit the textile industry in South Carolina and neighboring States hardest of all. For years the textile industry has been growing in my State. New investments, new plants, superior equipment and larger work forces have cooperated to develop a textile industry which served the Nation well in World War II, and which is now even better equipped to produce at low cost the various textiles required by the defense establishments. Shall the progress of a generation of effort be nullified by giving Government officials up and down the line the power to determine the fate of this great industry? The policy is un-American, confiscatory, and a long step toward the political management of our economy. This is a delegation of power which the Congress never gave the bureaucracy and we should let them know it in no uncertain terms.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday, February 19, for 1 hour, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next for 20 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next for 35 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FARM INCOME REDUCED

Mr. D'EWART. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, farmers are getting a shabby deal under the Truman administration's defense-production policies, particularly in material allocations and price controls.

The Office of Price Stabilization has allowed retail food prices to rise 18.5 points, from 215.4 in December 1950 to 233.9 in December 1951, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index. While consumers pay more for food under price control, farmers are getting less for the food they sell. Farm prices dropped from 313 in February 1951 to 300 in January 1952.

On the other hand farm costs during 1951 rose 5.5 points. Squeezed between falling prices and rising costs, estimated net farm income for 1951 dropped to \$15,000,000,000, \$500,000,000 less than 1950.

Farmers' efforts to maintain their income level by increasing production are stymied by shortages of fertilizer and farm machinery, which have resulted from short-sighted administration policies.

Supplies of fertilizer will be an estimated 600,000 tons short of farmers' needs this year, primarily due to a shortage of sulfur. In spite of this, the State Department has committed the United States to export a million tons of sulfur.

Less than two-thirds the amount of farm machinery needed will be produced this year because of cut-backs in steel allocations for this vital industry. But, heedless of farmers' needs, the administration continues to export enormous quantities of steel.

The administration is using its defense-production powers to reduce farm income and thereby crush farmers' resistance to socialistic Government controls which they will have to accept in exchange for a Federal guaranty of subsistence-level income.

TRUMAN SLAMS DOOR ON IOWA

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, apparently President Truman does not know that Iowa is in the Union and an integral part of the Missouri Valley Basin—either that or he does not care.

In typical discriminatory fashion, he left Iowa without representation on his 11-member so-called Missouri Valley Basin Planning Commission, and in typical Pendergast fashion, he gave his own State of Missouri two representatives, the only State accorded such double-barreled favoritism.

Mr. Speaker, this is to make it clear to the President that Iowa is one of the 48 States of the Union, that the Missouri River comprises almost the entire western border of Iowa; and that, therefore, the people of Iowa insist on having a voice in this future planning of the Missouri Valley Basin instead of having the door slammed in their faces.

YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. HALE. 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, today is the seventh anniversary of the signing of the pact at Yalta which has now won the practically universal condemnation of the American people.

For some years I have had a resolution pending in the Committee on Foreign Affairs to denounce the Yalta agreement. Several resolutions of a like nature are also pending in the committee. I am at a loss to understand why it has been impossible to procure action on these resolutions. The adoption of such a resolution by both our bodies would be acclaimed the world over as indicating a willingness at least to recognize the tragic and wicked betrayal of both Poland and China. Even though it is too late to correct the evils which have been done, millions of people would take heart if they knew that the American Congress had condemned the enslavement of peoples which was the sequel of this Yalta Conference.

LINCOLN A MOUNTAIN IN GRANDEUR OF SOUL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Homer Hoch, now deceased, a former Member of Congress and a Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas for a period of 12 years, was a student of Abraham Lincoln. While a Member of this body Homer Hoch delivered a eulogy on the life of Lincoln that is a classic. It is a real masterpiece. It is worthy of thoughtful consideration by Members of this House, as well as the public, and so on the occasion of the commemoration of Lincoln's birthday I am reading this eulogy to the Members of the House:

There is no new thing to be said of Lincoln. Nor is there a new thing to be said of the mountains or the sea or the stars. The mountains ever tower in solemn majesty above the drifting clouds, the mysterious sea ever sobs upon the shore, and the silent stars ever keep holy vigil above a tired world, but to mountain and sea and star men turn forever in unwearied homage. And thus was Lincoln. For he was mountain in grandeur of soul, he was sea in deep under voice of sadness and mystery, he was star in steadfast purity of purpose and of service. And he abides. With the name of Lincoln tears are called from old men's eyes, and with the name of Lincoln childhood learns to lisp a patriot's devotion. And there is no new thing to be said of him—what need for such as he? But while the Republic stands on whose altar he laid his great mind and heart, while liberty is cherished, while civic virtue and service and sacrifice are honored in the earth, the name of Lincoln will be spoken in undying love by the sons of men.

THE LATE FRANK B. KEEFE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was grieved to learn of the death of my close friend, Frank Keefe. We served together for 6 years on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Federal Security and joined in many causes here on the floor of the House. Frank was a great humanitarian and those of us associated with him in his work on the subcommittee came to know him as the champion of the afflicted. He worked unceasingly and his own health broke under the strain. The Nation lost a valued Representative with his enforced retirement. However, those of us who knew him best realized that his intense interest in helping others would preclude his absolute retirement and in a recent telephone conversation, I cautioned him about taking care of himself. No constituency in America ever had a Representative who was more devoted to their interests. The people of Wisconsin have lost a staunch supporter.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Keefe and her children in their great loss.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

INTERFERENCE WITH WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in western Michigan, in the county of Berrien, not so long ago, we had a man named Thomas Flynn who took an active part in more than one strike. He was frequently on the picket line, was active in creating and participating in violence. Several times he was cautioned by police officers against a violation of the law. The warnings were disregarded. Finally, on one occasion, after an automobile had been tipped over and damaged in the presence of the sheriff, he was told not to tip over another one. Brazenly, he disregarded that warning, called other pickets to his assistance, and tipped over and damaged another automobile.

The prosecuting attorney of Berrien County, Joseph Killian, a young man of ability and courage, ordered his arrest. Erwin Kubath, sheriff of the county, who lacks neither ability nor courage, escorted Mr. Flynn to the county jail.

He was tried before a jury, which found him guilty. Judge Tony Westin

sentenced him, as the law required, to a term in prison, his conviction being for a felony.

Then Governor Williams, of Michigan, pardoned him after he had served but 30 days of his sentence. The pardon was evidently granted on the ground that Mr. Flynn's offense was only a minor one and that his open defiance of the law was excusable.

Now Governor Williams' protégé is out and again on the picket line at Sturgis, Mich. From his former conviction, which was appealed to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and there affirmed, Flynn has learned part of a lesson. When I was in Sturgis last Saturday, Flynn was not openly, actively himself engaged in violence. He was, however, apparently taking an active part in the intimidation of employees who desired to continue at their jobs. Flynn, it was stated in Sturgis, was also active in two other strikes in Michigan.

So what has Governor Williams—commonly and affectionately known as "Soapy" Williams, he being a prospective heir to the Mennen-Williams fortunes—accomplished by the pardon granted Flynn? First, he has put his judgment over that of a jury, a circuit judge, and the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan; all of whom said that Flynn was guilty.

Flynn was a chronic offender. A jury of his peers said he was guilty of a felony. A fair and upright judge sentenced him to a prison term. The supreme court of the State said the conviction and the sentence were justified. But your Mr. Williams said that Flynn, after serving 30 days, should go free. No one can question his conviction; can it be that the Governor's pardon was issued because Flynn was prominent in CIO councils, and the Governor depends on the CIO vote for his reelection? Whatever the reason, the pardon of the Governor granted to Flynn was the Governor's public proclamation to those who engage in violence, to those who stop work in factories engaged in defense production, that they have a friend in the State-house at Lansing.

What the Governor did was to release from the State's prison a man who had previously been engaged in violence on the picket line, in defying the State law. Then that man immediately proceeds to do what he can to promote and continue strikes even though those strikes hinder the production of munitions of war which our men in Korea, in the planes which are being shot down, need to carry on a war into which President Truman has precipitated us.

Judge for yourself whether Governor Williams was ill-advised, whether he used good judgment, or whether he is just playing a political game out of which he hopes to personally profit next November.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

ANSWER TO SILLY ATTACK

Mr. RANKIN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers are screaming with headlines and carrying an attack on me by a man who calls himself Dr. Robert L. Johnson. He claims to represent the so-called Hoover Commission. I think he is connected with Temple University in Pennsylvania.

He accuses me of pulling down an "iron curtain" to keep him from testifying before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman. That statement is utterly unfounded and I think he knew that when he made it, because the committee agreed several days ago to hear these men who herald themselves as representatives of the Hoover Commission, and to cross-examine them. That decision was made some days ago, and I am sure this man, Johnson, knew that before he issued that silly statement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of clause 5, rule XXII, requiring a report within 1 week, the committee on Foreign Affairs may have until Wednesday, February 20, 1952, to file a report on House Resolution 514.

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

There was no objection.

THE CRIMEA CONFERENCE—YALTA

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the Crimea Conference—Yalta—took place from February 4 to February 11, 1945, between heads of the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Seven years have elapsed since the signing of the Yalta agreement.

February 11, 1952, marks the seventh anniversary of the agreement signed by the Big Three, which led to Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Balkan Nations, China, and North Korea being in the grasp of the Red Russians. This has created the potential threat of world war III.

Poland was always a country dedicated to the love of liberty and freedom. She

was the first to resist the Nazi attacks and the Russian hordes during World War II. During the occupation of Poland, many thousands of Poland's brave soldiers fought heroically shoulder to shoulder with the Allied armies.

I believe the spirit behind the Yalta agreement, insofar as the United States and Great Britain are concerned, was well-intentioned. But Yalta represented an expression of confidence on our part in the U. S. S. R., a confidence which the Communists have since betrayed.

Following Yalta, the U. S. S. R. took over the defenseless countries of Poland and other central nations of Europe, and today is enslaving them with her ruthless policies and is thrusting the hateful doctrine of communism down the throats of these innocent victims.

I hope and pray that in the near future we will see a Poland, free from the shackles of communistic despotism, resuming her rightful place among the free countries of the West. This she will have earned through her proven loyalty to the cause of righteousness and independence.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF SURRENDER TO COMMUNIST RUSSIA AT YALTA

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh anniversary of the infamous surrender to Communist Russia at Yalta.

It was on February 11, 1945, that the secret agreements were finally consummated which betrayed Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic and Balkan Nations, and our old ally and friend, China, into Red bondage.

This black day of despair for oppressed people everywhere has already cost the free world billions of dollars and thousands of lives. We can only pray that the toll will not increase before freedom can be restored everywhere.

No one can be sure about what is going on behind the iron curtain. But the courageous spirit of the Poles can never be completely snuffed out by the police-state methods of ruthless communism.

We know deep in our hearts that these oppressed people will rise again as they have risen countless times before against aggressors.

If we are to make restitution for America's tragic part in the "sell-out" at Yalta, we must unsparingly endeavor at all times to conduct ourselves in international relations to the single end that the victims of Yalta will eventually know freedom and peace once more.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to pay my personal respects to my American friends of Polish descent in the Second District of Massachusetts and throughout the country. At the same time, I would speak to all other citizens who perhaps do not realize what a huge wrong has been done

to a country and to a people who were our staunch allies in the last great conflict and with whom we in America have had a historic tradition of friendship and mutual help. Many people in America are inclined to take for granted the basic principles of freedom and justice on which our democratic form of government is based and without which it cannot survive. There never was a time in the history of the world when it was more important for those who enjoy the fruits of freedom to assume their responsibility to prevent that freedom from being destroyed.

No country has suffered more for the cause of freedom than has Poland. The Polish struggle for independence has always been characterized by fierce determination against tremendous odds. This struggle is continuing today against the most dangerous threat to freedom the world has ever known. We know that Poland has been fighting for her freedom for centuries and that Poland will never cease that fight until her freedom is secured. We must pledge that her struggle for independence has not been and will not be forgotten. We shall not waver in our determination to build a United Nations devoted to peace with justice—to the kind of peace that allows small nations throughout the world to work out their destinies according to the desires of their peoples. We do not expect this to be an easy task, nor do we expect to accomplish it overnight.

The tragic events following Yalta must be corrected. There must be a repudiation and denunciation of a situation that has enslaved a freedom-loving people.

DID WE CONTRIBUTE TO THE ENSLAVEMENT OF POLAND?

Mr. BURDICK. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, prior to World War II, Poland was a great nation and we maintained the most amicable relations with her. The war came, and there was so much selfishness shown by other nations fighting Germany that when the war ended the great Polish nation had been destroyed. Today she stands there, with her former liberties gone and her people abject slaves to a system they do not want. When our President went to Yalta in 1945 he was not in good health. He was surrounded by Communist sympathizers, and as a result the high standard of the United States in always favoring freedom to all peoples was released; and not only Poland but all other countries, outside of Russia, which are now controlled by communism, were absolutely deserted and the signal for Russia to go ahead was given.

Russia has never demonstrated that she will not take other countries by force of arms unless she has a perfect agreement with other powerful nations to do so. She might not have overrun Poland unless the United States had consented to it. It will take much more than one

generation to establish the kind of friendly feeling the Poles had for the United States before we abandoned them. That same policy which we adopted toward Poland at Yalta was followed in other friendly countries, China being the largest. We agreed to Russia's domination over these far-eastern countries, and today we see the result—communism is on the march.

The longer the United States tries to interfere with affairs in foreign countries, the more we will become involved and will finally leave other countries in worse condition than they were before we entered the conflict. Poland might finally have been overrun by Russia, but not in the manner it was done by the absolute consent of our representatives at Yalta.

I am afraid that our future efforts will meet with the same result as our past ones. We fought World War I to make the world safe for democracy; and after it was over democracy was safe nowhere. We entered World War II to establish the four freedoms, of which fear was the cardinal one. After that war was over we had nothing but fear throughout the world. We are in Korea now to stop the spread of communism; but communism spreads without armed forces.

We can keep up our foreign program until we are bankrupt, our manpower spent, and our resources wasted. Then will come distress here; and in that condition communism will come to this country without the landing of a single Russian division.

We should help others, and especially those countries which our action has helped to put where they are, but we should keep the spirit of liberty alive here and provide, as we always have, an asylum for the downtrodden of every country.

YALTA AGREEMENT MUST BE NEGATED

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the seventh anniversary of the signing of the Yalta pact, which had evoked much controversy and criticism—criticism which had been at times carried to extremes, and which was often intended purely for political purposes. With that type of criticism I have never agreed, for I believe that it breeds destruction instead of trying to remedy the ills, and in this particular case has been frequently used as an emotional appeal for the furthering of personal ambitions and purposes.

There were a number of provisions in the Yalta agreement which were not wise. The shortsightedness of those provisions was immediately apparent to a handful of those whose study of the Soviet philosophy and tactics, and experience in dealings with the Soviets, taught them to understand the true nature of communism as a totalitarian, aggressive and unjust political force, aimed at the eventual mastery of the world.

Wider circles of our population have since joined the ranks of those few, for the subsequent world developments have plainly shown that the trust which the parties to the Yalta agreement placed in the word of Soviet leaders and representatives was unjustified and unwarranted.

In addition, there was one provision in the Yalta agreement which found no justification in historical facts, nor in the traditional spirit and policies of the American people. I am referring to the arbitrary change of Poland's eastern border from its pre-World War II position to the so-called Curzon line, accomplished without the consent or knowledge of the rightful and functioning Government of Poland, and giving to the Soviets practically one-half of the territory of the Polish Nation.

Aside from this unjust and unprecedented, in our Nation's history, instance in which representatives of our Government participated in the bartering away of other people's land, many other provisions of the agreement showed something that we should all acknowledge. They pointed out plainly that the allies, whose leadership in that crucial year rested to all practical purposes in our hands, were not ready and willing to recognize the true aims of the Soviet Union and to take a firm stand—which in all probability would have demanded the continuation of war in 1945—against those aims.

It was deeply gratifying and encouraging to witness the subsequent clarification and formation of a definite, positive stand on our part. It was not long after the Yalta agreement that the United States was to lead the free world in calling for a show-down. Our aid to Greece and Turkey, to Iran, the Berlin airlift, the Marshall plan, the Rio Pact, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the United Nations' participation in stopping aggression in Korea—all of these instances and many more were evidence of the fact that we had adopted a realistic, positive policy in dealing with the Communist threat. We acknowledged the fact that the Soviets were out to extend their control over as much territory as they possibly could, and we resolved to stop their expansion. Had we done so earlier, the odds in favor of true peace in Europe and Asia would have been more favorable today.

This does not, however, alter the fact that our firm stand against the Soviet Union came after some damage had been done, and an injustice rendered to Poland.

It does not help Poland, or help us in our fight against communism, to merely cry about the betrayal at Yalta, perhaps with the hope of soliciting for ourselves the political support of Americans of Polish ancestry. A sincere and positive attempt to rectify the situation would be more proper, praiseworthy, and effective.

It is my contention and belief, repeatedly expressed, that we should put our shoulders to the wheel and bring about the negation of the entire Yalta agreement. There are several grounds on which this can be accomplished. First of all, it is uncertain that the late President Roosevelt intended to enter into an

agreement at Yalta legally binding on the United States; secondly, there is no body of established precedents with respect to Executive agreement to show that any is to be regarded as valid beyond the term in office of the Chief Executive who entered into it and there is nothing in the Yalta agreement as to its intended duration; and, thirdly, the agreement has been already nullified by the repeated violations and nonobservance by the Soviet Union of various of its provisions.

The negation of the Yalta agreement will not free Poland immediately, no more than would have the complete absence of this agreement prevented present Soviet domination of that nation. The fact is, and we should all remember it, that at the time the Yalta agreement was entered into Russian armies had already moved through Poland and were within 32 miles of Berlin. Even if the Yalta agreement had never materialized, we probably would have had to start waging a new war at that time in order to push back those armies and to free that territory.

The negation of the Yalta agreement would, however, partially rectify our past shortsightedness and give us a starting point for demanding the restoration of Poland's proper boundaries and Poland's return to the family of free nations, where she rightfully and historically belongs.

FREEDOM FOR POLAND

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, all the free world has a feeling of sorrow at the plight of the people of the country of Poland.

We in the United States can scarcely realize the horrible conditions and their sufferings under the heel of the iron rule of the power-hungry masters of the Kremlin.

Let us hope and let us pray and let us do all we can as a nation of free people to bring to a realization the dream of every right-thinking inhabitant of that country to regain its freedom and take its proper place in a future world of justice and peace.

POLAND

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, the many public speeches made about Poland indicate that the fate of that liberty-loving country has not been forgotten.

It is one of the tragedies of our age that the Polish people should be lying under the tyrant's heel. Their unjust

fate will no doubt one day be corrected; but when and how is not known. It occurs to me that a people who have been so devoted to their faith and strong under extreme persecution would not be left by Almighty God to endure indefinitely the unhappiness that is theirs today. One thing is a certainty—the ruthlessness of the tyrant in Moscow will never destroy their deep love of country nor their faith in eventual liberation. The Polish people deserve a far better fate than is theirs today, and it will be the prayer of all their friends throughout the world that the yoke under which they linger will soon be removed.

MINE SAFETY LAWS

Mr. EBERHARTER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on page 361 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, January 22, of this year, appears a message from the President of the United States. Accompanying it is a report from the Secretary of the Interior referring to a tragic mine disaster which occurred on December 21, 1951, in which 119 miners lost their lives. Also, a tragic disaster occurred 4 years ago in the same State, entailing the loss of 111 lives.

Mr. Speaker, all of this loss of life was entirely unnecessary. Practically every day thousands of persons are being injured in the mines, and many are losing their lives weekly. All of this points to the fact that the safety laws of the Federal Government with respect to the mining of coal and other metals are inadequate. It is the responsibility of this Congress to pass adequate legislation. I am sure if the Committee on Education and Labor would bring out a bill it would pass this House almost unanimously. I hope this committee will act promptly.

AIRPLANE DISASTER AT ELIZABETH, N. J.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] discussed the air tragedy which took place this morning in Elizabeth, N. J., near my district.

I would like to explain why I have just introduced a joint resolution for the Congress to rescind the consent it gave to a compact entered into on August 23, 1921, between New York and New Jersey, setting up the Port of New York Authority.

This resolution calls for a full-scale investigation into the commercial operations of the New York Port Authority, which some say is a State agency; yet it is above the State. Some think it is an

interstate agency; yet its powers seem to be above those of the Congress of the United States. I am sure that the original intent, setting up this port authority, was not to make it a legal giant independent of all possible judicial review.

Accordingly, I ask that serious consideration be given to a full-scale investigation of the operations of the Port of New York Authority to close the gap between this free-wheeling agency and the will of the people.

Joint resolution to rescind the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey creating the Port of New York Authority, and for other purposes

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress granted in public resolution, No. 17, approved August 23, 1921, to the compact or agreement between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey creating the Port of New York district and the Port of New York Authority is hereby rescinded until such time as legislation is enacted by the Congress approving amendments to such compact or agreement which provide for the more effective exercise of the authority and control of the Congress of the United States over air and other commerce in the Port of New York District.

[From the Jersey Journal-Observer of February 8, 1952]

FEDERAL MOVE MAY MENACE PORT BOARD—SIEMINSKI MAY ACT TO RESCIND APPROVAL

WASHINGTON.—A Jersey City Congressman yesterday threatened to offer legislation ending the life of the Port of New York Authority, charging it was a "legal giant that can virtually do as it pleases."

Representative ALFRED SIEMINSKI, Hudson County Democrat, blasted the port authority for its operation of Newark Airport and what he called a new threat to Bayonne from the rerouting of planes.

In a statement, SIEMINSKI called the authority a legal monstrosity; not responsible to the will of the people; a usurper of congressional powers, and a dictatorship that violated the spirit of the Constitution.

Since "the people have a right to be governed by their consent," SIEMINSKI said he is "seriously considering legislation asking Congress to rescind its approval of the August 23, 1921, compact B between New Jersey and New York."

CONGRESS CONSENT

Congress must give its consent to the formation of such interstate agencies as the port authority. To "rescind" the approval, as SIEMINSKI suggested, could kill the authority.

SIEMINSKI's threat to rescind would last "until such time as this compact is amended to make the Port of New York Authority responsible to the people and the Congress of the United States."

The port authority "is said to be a State agency, yet it is above the State," he notes. "It is supposedly an interstate commerce agency, yet above the Congress. What is this legal monstrosity?" SIEMINSKI asked.

He was "sure that Congress never meant, in its approval of the compact that created this 'enigma,' to permit a body to exist that would usurp the powers of Congress."

He charged the authority is "immune to control by people immediately concerned." There is no review of its policies; it is run by men not responsible to the people; there is no executive, legislative, or judicial control over it, he insisted.

SEEN AS THREAT

Its policies "constitute a threat to the safety and welfare of people in certain com-

munities," SIEMINSKI said. It affects "the livelihood of thousands of people in New Jersey to their detriment," he added.

"The threat of enemy aircraft over the Bayonne Naval Base is one worry; must another be added relative to friendly aircraft over the city, without the consent of its people?" he asked.

The tax-free authority, the lawmaker charged, "is engaged in enterprise in direct competition with private citizens."

A BILL TO EFFECTIVELY CURB THE ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN NARCOTICS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 7 minutes if the two gentlemen having special orders ahead of me do not object.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during my recent stay at home I devoted a great deal of time to a study and investigation of the activities of our law-enforcement officers, both Federal and local, dealing with the apprehension and prosecution of those charged with various crimes, particularly with those cases involving drug addiction and the traffic in narcotics. After a conference with Commissioner Anslinger, of the Bureau of Narcotics, which he has so ably directed since its creation in 1930, I prepared a bill which I believe will effectively control the importation of narcotic drugs if enacted into law and which I am introducing today. I feel very strongly that something must be done now to save our youth from the terrible scourge of this devastating evil.

From time to time we have enacted legislation increasing the penalties on the peddlers and the small fry engaged in this unholy trade. We appropriate millions each year through our Public Health Service in an effort to rehabilitate unfortunate addicts, an almost hopeless task. Less than one out of four so treated return to useful citizenship. As recently as the last session of this Congress we enacted the Boggs bill materially increasing the penalties for violators of our narcotics laws.

I have received hundreds upon hundreds of letters from high-school students in my district pleading for strong and effective legislation to do away with the drug traffic, as well as from civic groups, law-enforcement agencies on the local level, from women's organizations and parent-teacher groups, and from parents who unfortunately have suffered the heartaches and mental anguish accompanying their children's involvement in its evils. We must strike and strike hard if we are to effectively deal with these murderous, crime-producing, unconscionable traffickers who prey upon the frailties of human nature to reap their ill-gotten returns.

To accomplish this end I have proposed a radically different approach to the problem of effective control. My bill strikes at the source of the importation of narcotics. It places the responsibility for the importation where it belongs—on those directly or indirectly connected with its production, manu-

facture, and transportation to our shores. My bill will also materially implement present law which deals with enforcement and punishment within our borders. It requires banks, shipowners and operators, air transport owners and operators, and insurance companies insuring cargoes destined for our ports to take effective steps to cut off at its source the supply of narcotic drugs which feed the drug traffic in the United States and its possessions. It also provides for full cooperation by those countries producing and manufacturing narcotics.

You know and I know when our teenagers become addicted to drugs they stop at nothing to obtain funds with which to buy more; they commit all kinds of offenses and crimes. They fall into the hands of the unscrupulous individuals who invade our universities and colleges, and who, for a few dollars, secure their cooperation in many wrongdoings. For the protection of the youth of our country, and in order to eliminate the crime attending the illicit drug traffic I feel this bill I have introduced after many weeks of study deserves favorable consideration on the part of the committee to which it is assigned and also on the part of the House. I think it is greatly needed legislation and should receive favorable action by both the House and Senate so that it might become law, thus providing an additional blow at the illicit traffic in the destructive narcotic drug trade.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 347)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Defense Production Act is now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1952. That act is essential to the defense mobilization effort of the Nation. I recommend that it be extended for 2 years and strengthened in a number of respects.

Our need for a strong Defense Production Act is perfectly clear. We are now well along in our program to create invincible defensive strength in the free world. But, in order to complete that program rapidly and effectively, we must continue to have the authority contained in the Defense Production Act.

This law contains authority to channel materials for defense, to help expand essential production, and to help small business make its vital contribution to the mobilization effort. This law also contains authority to stabilize prices, wages, credit, and rents so inflation and high prices will not disrupt production, increase the cost of defense, and cause hardship and suffering among our people.

These powers will be needed for at least two more years. We are just now entering the period of greatest strain in our mobilization effort.

Since the attack on Korea, we have been building plants to turn out large amounts of planes, tanks, and other mili-

tary items. And we have been rapidly increasing our output of military goods. In many cases, we are now producing equipment three or four times as fast as we were a year ago.

But under the budget program now before the Congress, the peak production rates for complex military items are still ahead of us in nearly all cases. And for some items, particularly the new models of jet aircraft, we will not reach volume production until 1953 or 1954. This means that the military use of steel, copper, aluminum, alloy metals, electronic equipment and many other things will be high for many months to come—and will continue to require substantial diversion from less essential uses.

Within the next 2 years, under our present plans, most of our new plants for producing military equipment should be completed, and by the middle of 1954 we should have on hand the great bulk of the equipment we need. Changes in the international situation or in technology, of course, could result in changes in our plans at any time, but if the situation develops as we now foresee, it should be possible by then to reduce the military demand for many materials and supplies.

Moreover, during the next 2 years, we should be obtaining substantial results from the tremendous expansion that is now under way in our capacity to produce minerals, metals, chemicals, power, and other industrial necessities. For example, we are now building plants that will allow us to raise our production of primary aluminum from 720,000 tons a year in 1950 to 1,500,000 tons a year in 1954, and additional capacity may be needed. We are building nitrogen plants that will raise our capacity from 1,600,000 tons a year in 1950 to 2,900,000 tons in 1955.

These examples could be multiplied many times. All across the face of our country new plants and factories are being built which will give us additional metals and chemicals and electrical power.

In addition to building plants in our country, we are helping to expand the production of many materials abroad—for example, of nickel in Cuba, copper in Chile and Rhodesia, and bauxite in Jamaica. This will help to increase supplies for the whole free world, and will allow us to raise our imports of many materials we need from abroad.

Over the next 2 years, therefore, we expect progressively to accomplish many of our military production goals and to add progressively to our basic industrial capacity. We hope to reach a position in 2 or 3 years in which we can sustain the continuing amount of military production that we now expect to be necessary, and at the same time support rising living standards for our people.

But in order to carry through our defense production and expansion programs, we must continue to allocate scarce supplies as long as they remain scarce and continue to accept curtailment in civilian production where necessary to meet defense requirements.

These facts about the nature of the defense mobilization program over the next few years require extension of the

production features of the Defense Production Act. And they also require extension of our powers to combat inflation.

At the present time, there are strong, continuing pressures on prices in many important areas of our economy. Some prices have receded in the past year from ceiling levels. But well over half of the Nation's business today is done at prices held down by price ceilings, and many of these prices are pushing hard against their ceilings. This is true, for example, on such basic commodities as metals and chemicals, industrial equipment, and many foods. There are also strong upward pressures on many wages and rents.

We are seeing right now how vitally important it is to have firm price and rent controls if we are to have effective wage stabilization. And we are seeing how important firm wage policies are if price and rent controls are to be effective.

It is clear that, without the controls we have today, a great many prices—and wages and rents as well—would be much higher than they are right now. And our present control powers—seriously weakened by changes in the law last year—enable us to hold the present price level only with great difficulty where demand is large and costs are pushing up.

Moreover, in addition to the pressures that face us now, there are present in the economy two factors which could combine at any time this year or next to start new inflationary fires all through the economy. Inflammable materials are all around us; we must prevent the fires from breaking out.

The first of these factors is the inevitable limitation on the production of consumer goods—because we have had to cut back the output of some goods, such as household appliances and automobiles, and because we cannot expand rapidly the output of others, such as foods. The second factor is the existence of very large reserves of purchasing power, and of very high personal and business incomes. This potential purchasing power could turn into a sudden flood of demand. If businessmen and consumers were to throw their funds into a competition for the limited supply of goods, the result would be tremendous new pressures on prices.

Only strong controls can give businessmen and consumers assurance that prices will not be allowed to get out of hand, and that there is no need for panic buying. And only strong controls could stop the deadly spiral of inflation if a renewed wave of spending were touched off.

We have had two dramatic illustrations of what can happen when consumers—and businessmen—go on a buying spree. Right after the invasion of Korea, and again in the late fall of that year, after the intervention of the Chinese Communists, consumers stopped saving and went into debt to buy goods. Businessmen scrambled for inventories. As a result, prices skyrocketed. The wholesale price index rose 17 percent in the 7 months from June 1950 through January 1951 and the consumers price index rose 8 percent.

All this occurred at a time when we were having the biggest civilian production boom in our history. There were no shortages of any kind. The economy had not even begun to feel the effects of the military expansion program.

Now the situation has been sharply changed.

Military production is high and rising, and is using large amounts of manpower and materials. Production cut-backs are in effect for many kinds of consumer goods, though fortunately not for food and clothing.

At the same time, with high savings, high business profits, and 60,000,000 people at work, there is plenty of purchasing power available if consumers and businessmen choose to step up their spending. Moreover, we face a sizable deficit in the Federal budget, even with the revenue increases I have recommended to the Congress—a deficit which will add to inflationary pressures.

Consequently, the potential pressures toward inflation are now greater than they were when the price upsurge took place a little more than a year ago. The reason that inflation was checked early in 1951, and why considerable price stability was maintained during most of the year, is not that the inflationary danger disappeared. It is rather that the inflationary danger was counteracted and contained by tax increases, by credit controls, by price and wage stabilization, by allocation measures, and by increasing the supplies of some vital lines of production. The inflationary upsurge was halted, not by inaction, but by action.

Voluntary saving by consumers, and voluntary self-restraint by businessmen, contributed much to the halting of inflation. But it was the installation of price and wage controls that induced public confidence, and put an end to speculative buying based upon anticipation of higher prices.

Looking at the record, it is clear that we need strong anti-inflation weapons now, just as we did a year ago.

We cannot take chances with the present situation. We cannot afford to gamble. That is why I have been calling for good, strong anti-inflation laws. That is why it was so damaging last year when the Congress weakened the Defense Production Act instead of strengthening it. That is why it is so vital that the act be strengthened now.

Now I want to turn to the specific changes that are needed in the present law.

The production features of the act appear to be generally adequate at the present time. A few amendments are needed, two of which I should like to call specifically to the attention of the Congress.

First, the law now permits the Government to make a variety of loans, guaranties, and purchase commitments where essential to help expand production of critical materials at home or abroad, or to develop high-cost sources of supply without forcing increases in general price ceilings. At present, the law sets a limit of 2.1 billion dollars outstanding at any one time for these purposes. In all probability, this will not be

adequate for programs which will be needed, and I recommend that it be raised to 3 billion dollars.

Second, a legislative rider was included in the act last year which unnecessarily restricted imports of certain agricultural commodities. This rider, the so-called cheese amendment, needs to be repealed quickly. Otherwise, the friendly countries who are being hurt by this amendment may retaliate—as they have a right to do—against American exports of apples, tobacco, and other products.

So much for the production side of the present law. On the anti-inflation side, a great deal more needs to be done.

First of all, I renew my urgent recommendation that the Congress repeal last year's three principal weakening amendments to our price control authority. These amendments are the Capehart amendment, the Herlong amendment, and the Butler-Hope amendment.

All these amendments are bad legislation. All of them are hurting us in the fight against inflation. Each gives special treatment to certain favored groups—lightening their share of the mobilization burden—while saddling a disproportionately heavy burden on the rest of the public, both as consumers and as taxpayers.

By far the worst and most damaging provision in the present law is the Capehart amendment. This allows manufacturers and processors to demand and get price ceilings high enough to cover all cost increases incurred between the Korean outbreak and July 26, 1951. Though plausible on the surface, this provision in fact disrupts effective price control. Costs and prices obviously do have a relationship one to another. Price increases are sometimes necessary to compensate for cost increases. But it is absurd to conclude from this that every cost increase has to be translated in its entirety into increased prices, regardless of whether they are needed.

Our economy never did, and never should, operate on a cost-plus basis. By technological progress and increased productivity and by changes in the volume of production, American business has often been able to hold the price line or even to cut prices in the face of increasing costs. This is a fact of our economic life, and one of the sources of strength of the American economy.

It is true, of course, that price ceilings cannot be maintained without reference to costs, and cost increases cannot be disregarded. That was true before the Capehart amendment was enacted and will be true after it is repealed. Other provisions of the law require that prices be generally fair and equitable and that due weight be given to cost increases.

Our stabilization agencies have long since adopted the principle that if an industry's rising costs are eating too far into profits the industry is entitled to reasonable price relief. But there is no reason whatever why there should be an automatic pass-through of costs so long as sellers are making ample profits. Yet, this disastrous notion of an automatic pass-through is the central—and fatal—idea behind the Capehart amendment. All the amendment requires is for sellers

to show cost increases occurring before July 26, and higher price ceilings are theirs for the asking. This is not price control, but, rather, a form of built-in inflation.

It has prices going up when they should be held down.

Let me give some examples of the results of this amendment. One large and highly profitable metal manufacturing company was scheduled, under the previous law, for price reductions amounting to almost \$2,000,000. That decrease would have been fully fair and equitable to all concerned, protecting the interests of both the company and its customers. Instead, under the Capehart amendment, this company was able to push up its ceiling prices by \$7,500,000. Another company that produces vacuum cleaners was scheduled for a 2-percent price reduction; instead it got a 3-percent increase. A producer of gas ranges would have had a 5-percent reduction; instead the Capehart amendment gave him a 2.5-percent increase. A candy-bar producer got a 15-percent increase from the Capehart amendment. A producer of household water softeners was scheduled for a 4-percent reduction, but instead came out with a 5-percent increase. These are not isolated cases, they are just a few examples from among the 5,000 requests for Capehart increases already filed.

This is the kind of thing I warned of last August when I urged the Congress to repeal the Capehart amendment before the damage was done. At that time, the Senate did act on a bill which would have removed the worst features of the amendment. But the Congress adjourned without taking final action and the Office of Price Stabilization had no choice but to grant Capehart increases.

A great deal of damage has already been done as a result. Much of it can never be undone.

Undoubtedly, many of the Capehart increases now in effect could not be revoked because they have already been built into too many costs and prices in the various stages of the production process. Undoubtedly, fairness would require that all firms producing similar items be accorded equal treatment on their prices, to take account of the fact that smaller companies may not have been able to gather the cost data required for the Capehart increases that have already been granted to larger firms.

And, of course, the higher prices required at the manufacturing and processing level by the Capehart amendment must be taken into consideration in allowing fair and equitable price ceilings all down the line from manufacturers to retailers.

Thus, even after the Capehart amendment is repealed, its price-raising effects will continue to be felt all through the economy for a long time to come.

On the other hand, prompt action by the Congress would enable us to prevent the spread of Capehart increases to additional areas where they have not yet been granted and where they are not needed. And it would also give us the flexibility we need to get all ceiling prices

on a fair and equitable basis. Prompt action is urgent. For Capehart increases are necessarily being granted all the time, and the longer remedial action is delayed, the more completely and irrevocably our whole price structure will be Capehartized.

The price raising effects of the Capehart amendment have been compounded by the Herlong amendment. This guarantees pre-Korean percentage mark-ups to wholesalers and retailers. Naturally, this pyramids ceiling price increases at the manufacturing level into much bigger ceiling price increases at the consumer level.

For example, when manufacturers' excise taxes were raised last fall, most wholesalers and retailers had to be permitted not merely to pass the amount of the tax on to the consumer, but to add on top of this a percentage of the tax as profit for themselves.

The Herlong amendment actually required that these sellers be allowed to charge a profit for collecting a tax from the consumers.

Just as in the case of the Capehart amendment, the sellers whom the Herlong amendment seeks to protect have their interests well safeguarded by other provisions of the Defense Production Act. Wholesalers and retailers have a right, under these other provisions, to obtain treatment that is fair and equitable for all concerned. If the Herlong amendment is repealed, that does not mean all percentage mark-ups will be abolished. Quite the contrary, they will be retained where they are needed to assure fair treatment to the sellers.

But there are a number of cases where maintenance of pre-Korean percentage mark-ups under changed conditions is unnecessary to assure equitable treatment; in other cases, like the excise tax example, they are downright unconscionable.

The Capehart and Herlong amendments have one thing in common. They are both aimed directly at raising prices. And they do just that. Capehart increases recently obtained by automobile manufacturers, together with Herlong mark-ups for the dealers, will cost automobile buyers up to \$400,000,000 in the coming year.

The Butler-Hope amendment, on the other hand, does not directly aim at higher prices. Instead, it was intended to free certain groups—the cattle growers and the meat packers—from administrative controls which they incorrectly feared would hurt them, but which, in fact, gave us a most important means for assuring a fair distribution of livestock—and thus of meat—among both sellers and buyers.

This amendment bans the use of slaughtering quotas on livestock. In periods of tight livestock supply, such as occurred last summer and fall and will in all probability occur again, lack of quotas can cause chaos in meat distribution—and that's just the sort of situation made to order for the black marketeer.

As the law stands now, without any authority for quotas, the orderly distribution of meat can be completely upset by some packers grabbing up a dispro-

portionate share of the livestock while others are squeezed out of the market.

We need authority for slaughter quotas. I urge the Congress to restore it to the law, either in its original form or in the form now pending on the Senate Calendar. That is the best way to make sure we have the tools we need to insure a fair distribution of our meat supply.

If the Congress acts promptly on the Capehart, Herlong, and Butler-Hope amendments—together with one or two other improvements which will be presented by the stabilization agencies—our price-control powers will be substantially stronger. By and large, they will be adequate to do that part of the anti-inflation job which price controls reasonably can be expected to handle. But we will still lack other anti-inflation powers needed to do a completely effective job.

In particular, we need stronger controls over credit. Last year, the Congress seriously weakened the Government's powers to limit the availability of credit to finance purchases of consumer goods and real estate. In periods when supplies of goods are necessarily restricted, the dangers implicit in relaxed credit controls are great. We dare not take the risks involved in a loose policy on consumer and real-estate credit. The Congress should close this inflationary loophole by restoring full authority for flexible administration of credit controls—so that they can be expanded or contracted quickly to meet any eventuality.

If these steps are taken, we will be far better equipped to keep our economy reasonably and effectively in balance, despite the stresses and strains inherent in our defense mobilization drive.

Businessmen then—and only then—will be protected against sudden destabilizing increases in their costs of operation, including their wage costs.

Farmers then—and only then—will be protected against a loss in real income as a result of skyrocketing prices of the things they must buy for their farms and their families.

Workers then—and only then—will be protected against a soaring cost of living to which their own wages might never quite catch up.

I am sure I do not need to remind the Congress that what we are dealing with here are not abstract economic principles, but the welfare of men and women and families. The over-all rise in incomes and the great increase in consumer savings conceal the fact that millions of our people have suffered losses in real income, or barely held their own, over the past 2 years.

Most people are already having trouble paying present prices. For their benefit, we should be working, not to legislate formulas for raising prices, but instead to find ways of moving prices downward, as increasing productivity and more production makes that possible.

We can prevent inflation from weakening us if we have the will to do so and the courage to take the necessary steps.

I am glad to know that the Banking and Currency Committees of both

Houses of Congress are planning early hearings on the needed legislation. I earnestly hope the Congress will act as promptly as possible to extend the Defense Production Act and to strengthen it along the lines I have recommended.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 11, 1952.

Mr. EBERHARTER. 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. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with attention and deep interest to the reading of the President's message.

I regret that the House adopted the Herlong amendment and the so-called slaughtering quota amendment, but can say that at the time I was active, but unsuccessful, in trying to defeat them. As to the Capehart amendment, it was Senate action and I could do nothing. I wish every citizen could have the opportunity of carefully reading the President's message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYLE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT THREATENS COASTAL DEFENSES

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced Joint Resolution 373, which resolution will for the first time definitely fix the boundaries of the inland waters around the coast of the United States and Alaska. This is necessary from the standpoint of national defense, and also as a safeguard against untoward international incidents which might take place very near our coasts should we fail to definitely notify foreign nations that we consider certain water areas such as bays and channels to be within what are known in international law as internal or inland waters. Action at this time has become necessary because of a decision by the International Court of Justice at The Hague, in which decision certain principles were laid down to guide nations desiring to fix the boundaries of their inland waters without violating international law. The Court, in that case between Great Britain and Norway, held that Norway was entitled to delimit her inland waters by drawing straight base lines along the coast of Norway across bays and around the outer edge of off-lying islands along the Norwegian coast.

It is important that Congress act now because the rules of international law have been made clear. Our past assertions relative to the method of fixing boundaries of inland waters were based upon a misconception of international law. We must not now further jeopardize our international position with respect to these waters by making assertions which can no longer be excused on the basis of our lack of understanding of the law.

The Justice Department, in the case of the United States against California, is introducing evidence by which it hopes to prove that the coast of California is practically devoid of any inland waters area at all. Its motive for doing this is the fact that the Federal Government has disclaimed any intention of asserting rights in lands underlying inland waters. To get the most out of its decision in the case, the Justice Department finds itself compelled to practically deny the existence of inland waters along our coasts. The restrictive theories advanced by the Justice Department would cause the area known as high seas to come very close to the entire coast of California and other coastal States. This would give foreign nations certain rights equal to ours in these areas and, in the case of California, between the mainland and the offshore islands which are part of the State of California. Such a surrender of the area to international control is dangerous and completely unnecessary now that the International Court has ruled that a nation may claim such areas and rightfully assert absolute jurisdiction over them as internal or inland waters.

Joint Resolution 373 fixes the boundary of our inland waters in a manner consistent with the decision in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case. It asserts the maximum jurisdiction which we may assert in consonance with the principles enunciated in that decision. When one considers that the air above the high seas is considered free air in which airplanes of all nations have the same rights, one can see immediately the importance of taking advantage of the rules of international law to protect ourselves in the matter of designating our inland or internal waters. This is even more important when viewed from the standpoint of the fact that the United States has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, thereby binding ourselves to submit disputes with other nations to that Court (United Nations Treaty Series, p. 9; registration No. 3).

It should be emphasized that international law does not compel us to take advantage of the rules laid down in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case. We are at liberty, if we are foolish enough to do so, to fail to designate or describe our inland waters by drawing the boundary around our outer islands, and if we fail to do so, the Court will respect our failure and hold in any future case in which we may be a defendant that foreign nations have a right, as against us, to regard as high seas whatever coastal waters we designate to be high seas, and therefore that they have rights very close to our coasts, and in the case of California, international rights in the channels off our coast, and even in such well-known bays as San Pedro Bay and Santa Monica Bay—bays which, incidentally, according to the Justice Department theories would not even be considered to be bays.

By declaring such waters to be inland waters, we can remove them from the international realm and insure against unwanted international incidents occurring in them. While it is true that

we presently have the naval and air power to police these areas, whatever their character, it is also true that we have agreed, except in case of hostilities, to rely upon law, and not upon our power. We hope to be able to rely and to induce others to rely upon the rules of international conduct—rules which we are fighting to uphold in Korea. We cannot ask others to rely upon international law and to respect it if we fail to do so, and needlessly rely upon power in defiance of law. In the matter of inland waters, the law is now clear and will afford us a satisfactory protective belt provided we are willing to claim it. But we owe it to other nations to be clear about the rights we claim, and therefore it is necessary for us to notify all the world right now that we claim as internal waters the maximum area permitted by international law. This is, of course, what other nations will do, and very properly so.

We have heretofore excused our failure to definitely set up a proper protective belt of inland waters around our coasts by asserting that we were accepting a very limited definition of inland waters in order to try to persuade or compel others to do so, thereby hoping to obtain for our own ships and planes greater rights in and over the waters of other nations. This excuse is no longer valid, since the proposed rules upon which we relied have been held not to have the force of international law, and therefore we cannot compel other nations to accept or abide by them regardless of what we ourselves do. I repeat, other nations are now free, pursuant to established rules, to assert the maximum permitted jurisdiction over and above coastal inland waters regardless of what we do. Therefore, we have no excuse for not doing the same thing in order to better protect ourselves, and to exercise full jurisdiction near our coasts, and especially within bays and channels.

The Justice Department, in its proceeding against the State of California, placed great emphasis upon the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case while the case was pending. The Justice Department very obviously thought Great Britain would win the case. In a memorandum and brief filed with the Supreme Court and signed by Solicitor Perlman, the Justice Department said:

In connection with its consideration of this question, the Court should be advised of the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case, now pending before the International Court of Justice. That proceeding, which was instituted by the United Kingdom on September 28, 1949, involves a challenge to the validity of certain point-to-point lines established by Norway along its coast as base lines for the delimitation of the marginal sea and the control of fishing activities therein. For the purposes of the dispute, the United Kingdom has conceded Norway's claim to a marginal sea 4 miles in width for the enforcement of fisheries regulations, but has insisted that such a zone may be measured only from base lines drawn in accordance with the principles of international law and has taken the position that the base lines prescribed by Norway (which resemble those claimed by California)¹ are in violation of international

¹ In original.

law. The United Kingdom has asked the International Court of Justice to declare the principles of international law to be applied in defining base lines along the Norwegian coast, to define the base lines insofar as may be necessary, and to award damages for Norwegian interferences with British fishing vessels outside of the zone Norway is entitled, under international law, to reserve for its nationals. See *The Twenty-Eighth Year of the World Court*, 44 AJIL (January 1950), 21-22. Time limits for the submission of the United Kingdom memorial, the Norwegian countermemorial, the United Kingdom reply, and the Norwegian rejoinder were fixed by an order of November 9, 1949. Following certain extensions, the time limits for the reply and rejoinder were scheduled to expire early in 1951. See also *The Twenty-ninth Year of the World Court*, 45 AJIL (January 1951), 27. Oral argument was expected during the present calendar year, and it is understood a decision in the case may be forthcoming near the close of the year.

The importance of the Anglo-Norwegian litigation in relation to this cause lies in the fact that it places before the International Court a controversy which is in many respects similar to that involved at the present stage of these proceedings, particularly insofar as it will require a delimitation of the marginal sea along a coast line where there are numerous indentations, as well as offlying rocks and islands. Of great significance, we think, is the contention of the United Kingdom that Norway may not unilaterally prescribe the base lines of its marginal sea. This is, in effect, what California proposes be done in this case (report, 1951, p. 10). It is also noteworthy, in connection with California's demand for oral testimony on the principles of international law, that these important questions are being heard by the International Court of Justice on the briefs (memorial, countermemorial, reply, and rejoinder) and oral arguments of the parties, without the necessity of any prior hearing or the taking of any testimony.

Having thus emphasized the importance of the case and likened the position of Norway to the position of California, the Justice Department was naturally embarrassed to find that Norway's position was sustained by the International Court. Thereafter, on January 21, 1952, Solicitor Perlman decided that the case was not so important after all, and in a letter to the chairman of the committee of the Senate said:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL,
January 21, 1952.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The Attorney General has asked me to reply to your letter of January 12, in which you request a statement respecting the recent decision of the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case (judgment of December 18, 1951, ICJ Reports 1951, p. 116) and the effect of that decision on the issue of Federal or State control over the mineral resources of the submerged lands.

The question before the International Court in the Fisheries case did not relate to the nature or extent of the control to be exercised by a coastal nation in adjacent waters and the decision thus has no bearing on the issue of Federal as against State control over submerged lands. The sole issue before the Court was the validity of certain base lines prescribed by Norway for the measurement of its territorial sea, or marginal sea, wherein exclusive fishing privileges have been reserved for Norwegian vessels.

The case of *United States v. California* (332 U. S. 19), in which the basic issue as

to Federal control over the marginal sea has already been decided, is still before the Supreme Court for the determination of the base line of the marginal sea along portions of the California coast, and hearings on the matter are scheduled to begin before the special master on Wednesday, January 23. Any effect of the ruling by the International Court on these issues will be considered and determined in that proceeding, and this office is now at work on the subject. Our studies have not been completed, nor have we yet been able to finish our consultations with other departments directly concerned. Until then it would not be possible to give any detailed opinion, but, for the purpose of the legislation being considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which you are chairman, you should be informed that nothing in the International Court's opinion seems to require any modification of the legal position of the United States with respect to the determination of the location of the marginal sea.

The question as to what are inland waters, such as bays, etc., as distinguished from the open sea, will, of course, be determined by the Court in the pending proceedings, and there does not seem to be any reason why the Congress should give consideration to matters which do not affect the necessity for the Government to develop the areas subject to its sovereignty and control. Senate Joint Resolution 20, introduced by you, does not purport to determine the exact boundaries of those areas, and the Court will, in the course of pending litigation, determine and apply the proper principles.

For your information, I am enclosing a short summary of the majority opinion of the International Court in the Fisheries case.

Sincerely,

PHILIP B. PERLMAN,
Solicitor General.

This letter is obviously an evasion of the fact that the United States has not fixed its boundary and that the decision of the International Court setting up principles by which we may properly designate our internal waters has a very great bearing upon the case of the United States against California. But the issue involved in the fixing of our boundaries transcends the issues involved in the California case. It is noteworthy, however, that the Justice Department, in order to get control of off-shore oil located in bays and channels, is threatening to usurp the powers of Congress and to narrow our protective belt by insisting upon judicially defining away all of the internal waters which are indispensable to sound administration of the areas and to the proper exercise of unhampered jurisdiction in close proximity to the coasts of the United States. The fixing of the boundary of our internal waters is a question for the political branch of the Government and not one for the Justice Department alone or the Supreme Court to decide.

The Solicitor General appears to be guilty of slight exaggeration when, in his letter set forth above, he speaks of consultation with other departments. Mr. Speaker, I myself have talked to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Interior about this matter; and while the Secretary of the Interior has been consulted and the Secretary of State's office had been asked for a letter by the Justice Department, I found that the Secretaries of Defense and State had not been personally consulted and due emphasis had

not been placed upon the matter, especially when the request for the aforesaid letter was made to the State Department by the Justice Department.

I remember back in 1939 when the United States Navy sent Commander Ellis M. Zacharias, now Admiral Zacharias, to an executive session of a committee of the California Legislature for the purpose of urging greater control of the persons fishing in California waters. This able and highly respected officer was sent because the Navy at that time viewed with alarm some of the activities which were carried on near our coast under the guise of fishing. One cannot tell what similar situations may arise in the future, but it is certain that if the Justice Department has its way, and our coast is left unprotected by an ample area designated internal waters, we may at some future time find ourselves lacking the civilian control that we need to exercise jurisdiction without becoming involved in international difficulties.

It seems clear that this is a matter for the political branch of the Government; one which Congress should decide. In the meantime, it would appear wise for the Justice Department to refrain from attempting to dictate a questionable policy for the United States as a mere expedient to enable it to gain its ends against one of the States of the Union. We do not want our coast defenses unnecessarily exposed. We do not want international areas brought closer to our coasts than is necessary or desirable in view of the plain principles of international law laid down in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case. This is a matter upon which Congress should act after consultation with all of the departments involved, and most certainly the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Interior, the Coast Guard, and the coastal States involved. I hope our Judiciary Committee will see fit to schedule early hearings on Joint Resolution 373, which reads as follows:

Joint resolution declaring the boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the United States to be as far seaward as is permissible under international law, and providing for a survey of such boundaries to be made by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the light of the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case

Whereas the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the United States have never been accurately and definitely established, and the methods previously proposed by the United States for the fixing of said boundaries were based upon an incomplete understanding of the area of inland or internal waters over which a nation may exercise exclusive jurisdiction under international law; and

Whereas the International Court of Justice, in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case on December 18, 1951, held that it was permissible under international law for Norway to establish as the seaward boundaries of its inland or internal waters a series of straight lines running between fixed points on the mainland and around the outer edge of the off-lying islands, islets, and rocks; and

Whereas the International Court of Justice, in such case, held that the validity of a nation's claim relative to the extent of its inland or internal waters would in case of an international dispute, be governed by the following basic considerations: (1) the

boundary of the inland or internal waters must not depart to any appreciable extent from the general direction of the coast line; (2) the sea areas brought within such boundaries must be sufficiently closely linked to the land domain to be subject to the regime of inland or internal waters; and (3) the economic interests peculiar to a region, evidenced by long usage, should be taken into account; and

Whereas it is especially imperative at this time, in order to avoid international incidents and increase the national security, to definitely establish the boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the United States as far seaward as may be permissible under international law, and to give clear and unmistakable notice of such action to all other nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) the United States declares its exclusive right and jurisdiction, as against all other nations, with respect to all inland or internal waters within boundaries established as far seaward along the coasts of the continental United States (including Alaska) as is permissible under the rules of international law set forth in the judgment rendered by the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries Case on December 18, 1951:

(b) The United States accordingly establishes, as the seaward boundary of its inland or internal waters, a series of straight lines running between the headlands of all indentations on the mainland and, where there are off-lying islands, rocks, or reefs, a series of straight lines running around the outer edges of the farthest off-lying islands, rocks, and reefs. In establishing this seaward boundary the United States has taken cognizance of the basic considerations of international law as set forth in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries Case.

SEC. 2. (a) The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey shall survey the seacoasts of the continental United States (including Alaska, and including all off-lying islands, rocks, and reefs) and prepare charts showing the precise location of the seaward boundaries of the island or internal waters of the United States as provided for in the preceding section.

(b) In surveying the seacoasts of any coastal State, the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey shall consult with the State lands commission or other appropriate body or official of such State.

SEC. 3. The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey shall submit to the Congress, within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, a report setting forth the results of the survey made by it under the preceding section. Such report shall show the alternative proposed boundaries where there is lack of concurrence between the Coast and Geodetic Survey and officials of the respective States relative to the seaward boundaries fixed by this resolution. With respect to any portion of the seaward boundary of the island or internal waters of the United States, where there is such lack of concurrence, the survey shall not be final and effective until the Congress by concurrent resolution or otherwise shall have fixed the boundary in question.

For further reference, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to pages A29, A341, and A587 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

AMERICA'S AGING POPULATION DE-SERVES A SOUND, REALISTIC, AND ADEQUATE OLD-AGE PENSION SYSTEM

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, according to cloakroom gossip, the present session of Congress will be short-lived because this is an election year. Some say we may adjourn by July 1 and to do so very few legislative measures can be considered, and only those that are on the administration's must list.

In scanning the so-called must list, I have noticed the absence of any old-age pension legislation. While a brief mention was made by President Truman in his Economic Report to Congress of the need for a \$5 monthly increase in old-age and survivors benefits, such a recommendation is only political bait in an election year. It is designed to divert attention from the real plight of our aged citizens.

The plain truth is that the administration and the Democratic leadership of this Congress have no intention of scheduling for consideration any of the several old-age pension bills introduced in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

To the contrary, I have noticed where the leadership has scheduled early consideration of appropriation bills designed to rehabilitate foreign nations, and especially to provide aid to backward countries.

In other words, the needs of our aging population have been placed in a secondary category and completely ignored. These deserving Americans in their want and misery are left to suffer in a Nation that delights in playing Santa Claus to the peoples of the world.

No doubt an attempt will be made to answer my criticism by pointing to the benefits paid under the Social Security Act.

Anyone who read the hearings concerning recent amendments to social security will find that experts in the field of economics, spokesmen for the aged, and for business and labor were in complete agreement that social security is not doing the job. It was the consensus of opinion that a thorough examination of the old-age problem, should be made by Congress in the direction of securing approval of an adequate Federal old-age pension law.

As the Social Security Act operates today, there are millions who are depending upon old-age assistance which is administered by the individual States. The benefits received are so meager that thousands of recipients are in destitute circumstances.

To become eligible for these meager benefits, these deserving elderly citizens are forced to take a pauper's oath and if through the years they have been thrifty and accumulated a home of their own they must dispose of it or allow a lien in favor of the State to be placed against it.

In addition to these recipients of old-age assistance, we have millions of other American citizens who, because of the pauper's oath, prefer to struggle alone and thereby exist in a manner that is a disgrace to the American standard of living.

I know of aged couples in my congressional district that have not had three meals a day, even of simple food, for the past several years. The high cost of living has made it impossible for them to provide the daily necessities of life.

For many years a group of us in Congress have been trying to convince the leadership that Congress has a responsibility in this field and that old-age pension bills should be made the subject of separate congressional hearings.

At this moment, there are over 200 Members of this House who have indicated their interest in legislation proposed by the American pension plan.

At the same time, 167 Members have signed the discharge petition being circulated in behalf of the Townsend old-age pension bill.

Regardless of this interest in old-age pensions expressed by nearly 50 percent of the membership of the House of Representatives, every effort to get separate hearings has been denied by the Democratic leadership, usually with the aged excuse that there is a war on, and that tax measures must have priority.

This game of pussyfooting and giving us the proverbial brush-off has been going on since I came to Congress in 1939.

Those of us in the Congress who are asking for immediate consideration of the question of old-age assistance have no special bill in mind. All we want is to drag the problem of the aged out into the open, so that congressional debate on the subject will turn the legislative spotlight on the plight of our senior citizens.

I am confident that when the Members of Congress learn the whole truth on the problem of the aged of this country, the inadequacy of the Social Security Act to cope with the situation will be recognized, and a sound, realistic, and adequate old-age pension system will be formulated.

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. FORTY in three instances.

Mr. KILDAY and to include a column by Robert C. Ruark.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mr. RICHARDS and to include a letter.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include two editorials appearing in the Denver Post.

Mr. KEARNEY.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) and to include an article by General Romulo.

Mr. VURSELL.

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a speech.

Mr. MERROW and to include an article he wrote entitled "Abraham Lincoln" which appeared in several New Hampshire newspapers last week.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAMBLETT and to include an article by Willard Edwards.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. NORBLAD).

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include an editorial about the St. Lawrence seaway.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan and to include two editorials, one from the Muskegon Chronicle, Muskegon, Mich., and one from the Record Eagle, of Traverse City, Mich., both referring to the St. Lawrence seaway, and in another instance to extend her remarks on the seventh anniversary of the signing of the Yalta pact.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and to include an editorial.

Mr. LYLE.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this being the anniversary of the birthday of Thomas A. Edison, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include some extraneous matter, and also to include an address I made with reference to Mr. Edison.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include copy of an address he made recently in Washington, D. C.

Mr. BRYSON and to include an editorial by David Lawrence.

Mr. JENKINS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. FURCOLO (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI) to extend his remarks at that point in the RECORD with reference to the Crimea Conference.

Mr. MITCHELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE in three instances and in each to include appropriate extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCARTHY and to include an editorial.

Mr. CHATHAM.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI) beginning February 4, 1952, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. LARCADE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4948. An act to suspend certain import duties on lead; and

H. R. 5448. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 493. An act to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; and

S. 905. An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rozanoff and Mrs. L. A. Ushkova.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock p. m.), the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, February 14, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1138. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1139. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of a violation of subsection (h) of subsection (1) (2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1140. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting reports of certain expenditures in excess of allotments of funds made under apportionments approved by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1952 for the Federal Housing Administration, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1141. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Servicemen's indemnity," for the fiscal year 1952, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1142. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Readjustment benefits," for the fiscal year 1952, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1143. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the Fifth Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1144. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Seventeenth Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission, pursuant to section 4 (k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1145. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6030. A bill to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts; with amendment (Rept. No. 1329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5609. A bill to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of poisons in the mails to persons or concerns having scientific use therefor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2078. An act to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala; with amendment (Rept. No. 1333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 615. A bill for the relief of Samuel David Fried; without amendment (Rept. No. 1334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 755. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eleftheria Paidoussi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of Karel Vaclav Malinovsky; with amendment (Rept. No. 1336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1416. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Valdengo and Albertina Gioglio Valdengo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Claude Foranda; with amendment (Rept. No. 1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Henry Ty; with amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of Dorothea Zirkelbach; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1819. A bill for the relief of Hisamitsu Kodani; with amendment (Rept. No. 1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carla Mulligan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2178. A bill for the relief of Lee Lai Ha; with amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Kazuyoshi Hino and Yasuhiko Hino; with amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Hiramoto; with amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2403. A bill for the relief of Leda Taft; without amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2404. A bill for the relief of Mark Yoke Lun and Mark Seep Ming; without amendment (Rept. No. 1347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2606. A bill for the relief of Dimitra Gaitanis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Andrijana Bradicic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:
H. R. 6517. A bill relating to export controls on agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPINALL:
H. R. 6518. A bill providing that excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental or regulated water supply from the San Luis Valley project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATTLE:
H. R. 6519. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:
H. R. 6520. A bill to provide that wool purchased or procured by the Armed Forces shall be produced in the United States as long as such wool is available; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:
H. R. 6521. A bill to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:
H. R. 6522. A bill relating to the approval, as treaties, of certain agreements negotiated by and under authority of the United States with foreign states; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 6523. A bill to prohibit the transmittal of communistic propaganda matter in the United States mails or in interstate commerce for circulation or use in public schools; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:
H. R. 6524. A bill providing that excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental or regulated water supply from the San Luis Valley project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER:
H. R. 6525. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE:
H. R. 6526. A bill to amend the American River Development Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:
H. R. 6527. A bill to provide that voluntary agreements for the coverage of State and local employees under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may include positions covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN:
H. R. 6528. A bill to repeal the 10 percent surcharge on postal cards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENKINS:
H. R. 6529. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the Ohio River in the vicinity of Pomeroy, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:
H. R. 6530. A bill to provide that the clinical research center being constructed for the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., shall be named in honor of the late Frank B. Keefe; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON:
H. R. 6531. A bill to amend the American River Development Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:
H. R. 6532. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:
H. R. 6533. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCKINNON:
H. R. 6534. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands in San Diego, Calif., to the city of San Diego; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:
H. R. 6535. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain lands in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana 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. MARTIN of Massachusetts:
H. R. 6536. A bill to provide that amounts which do not exceed 51 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:
H. R. 6537. A bill to repeal the 10-percent additional charge on postal cards sold in quantities of 50 or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:
H. R. 6538. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):
H. R. 6539. A bill to provide for a study by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the methods and practices employed by Dr. Robert E. Lincoln in the treatment of tuberculosis and cancer; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES:
H. R. 6540. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTS:
H. R. 6541. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation by air of servicemen who have been ordered to duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:
H. R. 6542. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from \$600 to \$1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from \$600 to \$750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH:
H. R. 6543. A bill to provide a more effective method for the elimination of the traffic in narcotic drugs by imposing certain requirements and penalties on banks, ship-owners, and insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:
H. R. 6544. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:
H. R. 6545. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:
H. R. 6546. A bill to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAYLOR:
H. R. 6547. A bill to permit the enlistment of persons convicted under the Youthful Offender Act of the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITTEN:
H. R. 6548. A bill to provide for the waiver of premiums on the national service life insurance and United States Government life (converted) insurance issued to certain former servicemen who are disabled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6549. A bill to provide a 1 year period during which certain veterans may be granted United States Government life (converted) insurance or national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:
H. R. 6550. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide that certain members of the National Guard and other Reserve components, who served during World War II, shall be released from active duty upon completing seventeen

months' active duty after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. Res. 373. Joint resolution declaring the boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the United States to be as far seaward as is permissible under international law, and providing for a survey of such boundaries to be made by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the light of the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 374. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1952, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution to rescind the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey creating the Port of New York Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 376. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Coverage of Administrative Positions into the Classified Civil Service; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the joint committee created pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 197; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 521. Resolution favoring the embracing within the Republic of Ireland of all the territory of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, relative to transmitting an authenticated copy of an interstate civil defense compact as entered into and ratified by the State of Delaware, pursuant to subsection 201 (g) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, Eighty-first Congress); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to transmitting an authenticated copy of an interstate civil defense compact as entered into and ratified by the State of Nevada, pursuant to subsection 201 (g) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, Public Law 920, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, relative to transmitting an authenticated copy of Act No. 330 of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, concerning mutual military aid and assistance by and between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and other States, in an emergency, and empowering the Governor to enter into a compact with the State of New Jersey and the State of New York and any other State concurring therein for such purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, relative to requesting the official designation of the body of water impounded by Wolf Creek Dam, "Lake Cumberland", and asking that the name of the Dam remain "Wolf Creek Dam"; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to urging Congress to lower the premiums on national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging Congress to lower the premiums on national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging Congress to lower the premiums on national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution entitled "Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to work for the passage of legislation to amend the social security act so as to authorize the extension of old-age and survivors benefits under the act to State and local employees who are covered by State or local retirement systems, as passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session, A. D. 1952, and approved by the Governor on February 5, 1952"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 6551. A bill for the relief of Hyeng Pok Sunoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6552. A bill for the relief of Velisarios G. Zavitsanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 6553. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Abilene Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Yetta Mae Slayton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES:

H. R. 6554. A bill to effect entry of Kim Jung Soo to be adopted by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 6555. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Seyre Odichou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6556. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6557. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Polak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H. R. 6558. A bill for the relief of certain members of the naval service, with respect to shipments of household effects; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 6559. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 6560. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Heveran, nee Rigby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 6561. A bill to effect entry of a minor child adopted or to be adopted by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN (by request):

H. R. 6562. A bill for the relief of Andreas or Andrew Voutsinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 6563. A bill for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, Nikola Maljkovic,

and Mile Milanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6564. A bill for the relief of Antonio Tralanga; 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:

538. By Mr. KILDAY: Petition of Richard M. Casillos, M. M. Lugo, Henry Romo, Joaquin Abrego, Wayne E. LeCrory, Fred M. Ramirez, A. M. Ramirez, Martin B. Aparicio, Frank Galvan, R. Rubio, T. G. Hernandez, Joseph N. McCumber, Albert A. Pena, Jr., Julian S. Garvia, and Conrad Salinas, urging legislation to prohibit employing, harboring, or recruiting illegal workers from Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

539. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miami Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, Miami, Fla., requesting enactment of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

540. Also, petition of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, West Palm Beach, Fla., requesting enactment of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

541. Also, petition of Miami Townsend Club No. 22, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

542. Also, petition of Rotary Club of Jacksonville, Jacksonville, Fla., relative to being gravely concerned that many rights and privileges now possessed by us as citizens of this State or of this Nation can easily be impaired by proposed treaties implementing the International Covenant of Human Rights under our United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

543. Also, petition of New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., New York City, N. Y., relative to urging passage of the bill H. R. 4544, dealing with the antimuggling situation and narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

544. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, Houston, Tex., relative to stating its continued opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

545. Petition of Texas Harris County Mayors' and Councilmen's Association, Baytown, Tex., relative to requesting the Congress to act favorably upon and adopt bill S. 940 or H. R. 4484 pending in the Eighty-second Congress, relative to the tidelands areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

546. Also, petition of Ricardo J. de Castro, Valenzuela Subdivision, Manila, Philippines, relative to stating a grievance wherein the United States civil-service regulations were completely ignored, and the true spirit of the Missing Persons Act was misinterpreted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 10, 1952)

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

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

O God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed: As the torch of a new day lights afresh the path of duty we bow before