

work of the whole committee, and not of only one man.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senate should appreciate what the chairman of the committee did.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator, as chairman of the subcommittee, very thoughtfully accepted an amendment to authorize the continuation of rent controls for Oak Ridge, pending a time when the property can be disposed of and the people can own their own homes.

It has been suggested that plans are being made for substantially increased rents, which would upset the economy there, and also that plans were in the making to bring about a means of disposing of properties, so that people could buy them. I hoped that the conference committee would agree to meet this interim continuation of rent control, but I see from the report that the Senate conferees yielded on that issue.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Tennessee that we yielded for the reason that we received a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission in which it was stated that this provision would, in substance, violate a certain budget circular, A-45, which, in substance, ordered an increase in the rents in that area so that the rents would be self-supporting and they would not have to come back on the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission. That is my understanding. For that reason, and because the House had received the same information and felt very strongly about it, we decided, after some discussion, that it was better to eliminate that provision.

I was glad to take the amendment into the conference for the Senator, because it gave us a chance to understand the problem.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In my opinion, the substantial increase in rent as proposed is not justified. But I am sure the Senator did the best he could.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe my colleague from South Carolina will support me in the statement which I have made.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts did everything he could. I think the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] will agree with me that he did everything he could for TVA. I again say, Mr. President, that the Senator from Massachusetts did a remarkable job, considering the attitude of the House.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts exerted every effort to have the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee included in the bill. As the Senator from Massachusetts has stated, there was a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission, and the House simply would not yield.

I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Carolina, in his words of commendation and praise of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. He was our chairman, and was a most effective and fine captain of the team.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank both my colleagues.

FRED P. HINES—VETO MESSAGE
(S. DOC. NO. 62)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 152, "An act for the relief of Fred P. Hines."

The bill directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay to Mr. Fred P. Hines the sum of \$778.78, representing the amount claimed as the cost of private hospital and medical expenses incurred in 1948 in treating a disability not connected with his active military service.

Mr. Hines served in the United States Army during the Spanish-American War and was honorably discharged on November 18, 1898. He did not incur a disability while in the military service and he has not suffered any service-incurred disability since then.

This veteran is eligible for medical care and hospitalization in a Veterans' Administration hospital for conditions not of service origin, provided facilities are available and he is unable to pay for such care elsewhere. He has availed himself of Veterans' Administration treatment on numerous occasions. On the occasion in question he chose not to do so.

The record, I believe, reasonably supports the conclusion that this veteran had personal knowledge of the limiting rules and policy governing his case. He was aware that they precluded the Federal Government from assuming responsibility for the costs of private care. In 1947, he requested the Veterans' Administration to pay a private hospital bill which he incurred for a non-service-connected condition. By letter dated February 21, 1947, Mr. Hines was advised by the Veterans' Administration of the denial of his claim for the reason that the expenses were incurred for treatment of non-service-connected conditions.

Despite the legislative finding in the bill, the record establishes that a medical emergency did not exist when Mr. Hines first began to incur the private medical and hospital expenses involved in his claim. In my judgment, no question of professional or administrative malfeasance is involved.

The extenuating factors advanced in the committee reports for special legislation do not, I believe, present acceptable grounds for equitable relief for Mr. Hines or the basis for exceptional and preferred treatment.

The plight of this elderly veteran provokes a spontaneous desire to lighten his burden. Were this an isolated case, I would have no hesitancy in approving this bill. But it is not. We have 20 million veterans who are eligible for hospital care in Federal hospitals under varying restrictive conditions. The precedent that would be established by approval of this bill cannot be dismissed. Many, many other cases have been denied simi-

lar relief. The Veterans' Administration annually, by administrative action, disallows more than 500 similar claims of Spanish-American War veterans alone for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses based on equally justifiable reasons. The Veterans' Administration estimates that the same kind of claims filed annually by veterans of other wars aggregate several thousand annually.

I believe that in a Federal program as large as the veterans' hospital program it is particularly important to administer the laws and regulations uniformly and with special favor for none. Yielding to compassion or special pleas would eventually destroy the effectiveness of the program. The end result would be to set aside the sound and desirable distinction between service-connected and non-service-connected disability cases. From every standpoint the choice presented by this bill is the same. If the bill were to be approved, it would mean acceptance of the premise that any veteran should be given the right to determine when and where and under what circumstances he may commit the Federal Government to the payment of private medical and hospital expenses for non-service-connected disabilities. I believe that the establishment of such a policy would be unsound and indefensible.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 20, 1953.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED
RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2047) to amend the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended, to provide for the sale of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, to repeal and modify certain of its provisions affected thereby, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 2047, the bill to amend the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The amendment follows the law of 1944, when Congress disposed of aluminum plants and other important items. The amendment applies to the anti-trust laws. It refers to the same law that was in effect when Mr. Roosevelt was President and when Mr. Truman was President. I think there should be such a law, so that monopolies cannot exist.

CONSTRUCTION-COST ADJUSTMENTS WITH GREENFIELDS DIVISION, SUN RIVER IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 525, which is H. R. 1991. The bill was on the Unanimous Consent Calendar on Saturday, but was objected to by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. I am informed that he has now withdrawn his objection, and the Senator